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We present here the papers which were given at the ninth annual Institute sponsored by the Faculty of the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science and held from Sunday, November 11, to Wednesday, November 14, 1962, at Allerton Park.

The theme of the Institute was "Selection and Acquisition Procedures in Medium-Sized and Large Libraries." It was a happy choice apparently, for announcement of the Institute drew a record registration of about 140, although only 100 could be accommodated. The appeal of the Institute, we think, lay partly in the choice of subject field and partly in the emphasis upon the practical approach to it. Although both public and academic libraries were well represented in the list of conferees, it is our judgment that the values of combining the two types of libraries were outweighed by the disadvantages. Book selection is of greater interest to public librarians than to college and university people, while the problems of acquiring foreign publications and research reports are of greater moment to the latter than to the former group. In some ways the differences between types of libraries are greater than those between libraries of the same type but of different sizes.

The papers are reproduced here essentially as they were given at the Institute. In a few instances the authors modified their remarks after oral delivery; in a few regards the papers were edited by the Chairman of the Planning Committee. In one case the author gave a talk at the Institute which covered the same ground as does his paper, but the paper is different from the presentation in many details. Not given here is any of the discussion which followed the delivery of each paper. This is part of what we think is and should be a plus value for those who take the trouble to come to Allerton Park for these annual institutes.

Allerton Park, the conference center of the University of Illinois, is near Monticello, Illinois, about twenty-five miles west of the University campus. Part of the enthusiasm for the library school institutes each year is undoubtedly the result of the efforts of the staff at Allerton House. We appreciate the help and assistance of Mr. Eugene H. Schroth and his colleagues at Allerton House; of Mr. Hugh M. Davison of the Division of University Extension; and of Mrs. Christina Vestling, Administrative Assistant in the Graduate School of Library Science. Various members of the Faculty of the Library School contributed ideas and time and participated in sessions of the
Institute; we greatly appreciate their help. The Chairman of the Planning Committee is particularly indebted to the two other members of the Committee, Mr. Howard W. Cordell and Mr. Donald E. Strout, for their full and unstinting cooperation; to Miss Jo Ann Wiles, Library Science Librarian, for the exhibit at the Institute of related books and magazines; and to Miss R. Joanne Fields, Assistant to the Editor in the Graduate School of Library Science, who prepared the papers for publication. We thank the individual authors for their contributions recorded herein and for the informal contributions which they made during the Institute. Finally, we thank the librarians who came to the Institute and who made it a learning experience for us all.

Herbert Goldhor
Chairman, Planning Committee

Urbana, Illinois
March 1963
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THE IMPLEMENTATION OF BOOK SELECTION POLICY IN UNIVERSITY AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Robert B. Downs

The development of a great research library has a certain mirage quality, something like approaching infinity or attempting to state the exact value of the mathematical symbol π. We may come closer and closer to our goal, but are doomed never to attain it.

An ideal research library, if we can conceive of such perfection, would contain a complete record of human thought, emotion, and action, without restriction as to languages, dates, places, or forms of publication. In brief, its collections would have achieved universality, comprising everything. Such a concept ought to offer an intriguing plot, I suggest, for a science fiction writer.

However, faced as we are with the hard realities of practical library administration, with inevitable limitations on funds, space, staff, and availability of materials, what are the elements in a reasonable acquisition program for, say, a university library?

The first consideration, naturally, is the clientele to be served: administration, faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students, and, to a certain extent, a miscellaneous public. There will be wide variations in the requirements of these several groups. The undergraduate, for example, especially at the freshman-sophomore level, will be adequately served by a general information collection, consisting of some textbooks, selected editions of important works of major authors, a few historical surveys, biographies, and a limited number of general periodicals, mainly those indexed in the Readers' Guide. It has been estimated that as few as 5,000 titles are adequate to meet all the legitimate needs of undergraduates, and none of the new separate undergraduate libraries contemplate total collections in excess of about 100,000 volumes.

As we move up the scale, the demands grow. The better upperclassmen, the honors students, and the beginning graduate students call for a wider range of basic texts; complete collections of the works of the more important authors and critics; selections from the writings of authors of secondary importance; a well rounded collection of journals, general and special, current and retrospective; and fundamental bibliographical tools. Library holdings of a quarter of a million volumes, if carefully chosen, would leave little for this group to desire.

Robert B. Downs is Dean of Library Administration and Director of the Graduate School of Library Science, University of Illinois, Urbana.
The next stage--involving doctoral candidates, post-doctoral research staff, and faculty members--brings us into the realm of fundamental research collections. Here university libraries are expected to provide all the significant or useful texts, frequently in original editions; published collections of primary sources; an extensive assemblage of critical and biographical works; pamphlets, newspapers, and government publications; and the fullest possible list of journal sets and bibliographical compilations in all areas of pertinent interest. In addition, for certain highly selected fields of narrow scope, we may aim for completeness, and thereby extend library resources into original and variant editions for comparative textual and bibliographical studies, manuscripts, letters, photographic copies of unique items in other collections, and everything else which can be gathered on a subject. For such purposes, a general university library probably should possess a minimum of one million volumes.

Let me pause here, however, to remark that mere size does not guarantee a great library or even a good one. The quality and richness of the book collections are even more significant. There are scores, perhaps hundreds, of good libraries in the United States--places where one could expect to find almost any ordinary book for which he might be searching. The number of really great libraries is far smaller. What is the difference between a good library and a great library? It is the highly specialized collections built up around special subjects, the unusual books, the rare periodicals and newspapers, and unique manuscripts which, when added to the standard book collections, make the difference between good and great. Perfection in cataloging, classification, circulation and reference systems, or beautiful buildings, while highly desirable, cannot compensate for deficiencies in book resources.

The foregoing remarks assume that we are agreed upon the nature of research materials. But for clarity, a few definitions may be in order. Upon examination, we find that library materials break down into several major categories. Books, of course, make up a considerable proportion of most collections, although books and other monographic works are only a part of the scholar's requirements. For the past century or more, serial literature has been assuming an increasingly important place. The learned and technical journals, transactions of academies, societies, museums, observatories, universities, and institutions of all sorts, and the serial publications of governments take more and more of library funds, space, and attention. In a general university library, supporting graduate study in as many as 25 departments, a current list of 10 to 20,000 journals is the minimum for keeping abreast of research activities and developments. In perhaps a majority of fields, the current trend is toward greater emphasis upon serial publication with less attention to monographic forms.
Another great body of research material is government publications—the documents of the federal, state, county, and municipal governments, of foreign governments and international bodies, such as the United Nations, all characterized by an accelerated rate of production.

The last of the principal categories of research materials is collections of manuscripts. These come in diverse forms: government archives; the records of clubs, societies, schools, and other organizations; letters and personal papers of families and individuals; and business archives.

Summarizing, we may say that separately printed books, serials, government publications, and manuscripts are the leading types of resources for library research. However, they are far from exhausting the varieties of records being accumulated. Note, for example, the statistics of holdings reported annually by the Library of Congress. There we find separate figures for volumes and pamphlets, newspapers, manuscripts, maps and views, microcards, microfilms, motion pictures, music, sound recordings, books for the blind, photographs, prints, slides, fine prints, and a miscellaneous catch-all of broadsides, photostats, posters, etc., with the total number of items into the tens of millions.

As applied to specific fields, there is great variation from one discipline to another in the materials for research. A cursory analysis will reveal the main differences. For most of the sciences, the literature of mathematics is fundamental. In the biological, chemical, and physical sciences, the basic materials are complete sets of specialized journals, followed by transactions of societies, monographic works, handbooks, and encyclopedias. In the applied sciences of medicine, surgery, and chemical technology, the situation is similar. In other words, the biologist, the chemist, and the medical man are concerned first of all with the journals in their fields, because it is there that they learn most promptly about the latest discoveries and investigations.

In the so-called “earth sciences”—geology, paleontology, mineralogy, geography, and geophysics—the journal literature is also highly important, but is supplemented extensively by government publications, such as the innumerable reports of geological surveys. Among the earth sciences, agriculture leads all the rest in the rate and scope of publishing activity, ranging from highly scientific and technical reports to floods of popular bulletins for home consumption, distributed in the form of books, pamphlets, and journals.

The research materials needed by social scientists—historians, sociologists, economists, political scientists, lawyers—are far more diverse than are those for the sciences. They comprise numerous journals and society proceedings, government publications, published
archives, laws, treaty collections, court reports, maps, newspaper files, census reports, and other statistical compilations.

For the huge classification of language and literature, the mass of research material is in book form, although a limited number of important journals are devoted to philological and literary studies.

The fine arts and their applications are marked by considerable diversity of materials: journals and other serial publications, monumental collections of sources, prints, slides, photographs, sheet music, music recordings, and architectural drawings.

For philosophy and religion, books, journals, and society transactions are all present in great numbers. We find in this instance that a large body of collected sources, scriptural commentaries, council decisions, and similar records has grown up, relating chiefly to the history and doctrines of Christianity.

In addition to the fields mentioned, new areas are developing constantly, e.g., in our own time we have witnessed the rapid expansion of education, psychology, business administration, and communications, all prolific in the publication of periodicals, society proceedings, statistical series, dissertations, books, and pamphlets.

The quick summary I have just outlined is indicative of the immense scope of our responsibilities when we undertake to create a university or general research library.

With this attempt at a definition of research materials, to determine just what it is that as university librarians we are attempting to collect, let us turn now to the question of how to attack the multiple problems of developing the library’s resources. The task has many facets, involving, as it does, assembling collections in the special subject fields covered by the institution’s program and general types of material, such as public documents, periodicals, newspapers, and manuscripts. Also closely related are ways and means of enlisting the cooperation of the university administration, faculty, all members of the library staff, and students, along with the constant struggle to assure adequate financial support.

The chief role of the university administration is to provide funds, through regular budget allocations, for the maintenance of the library and its collections. Without strong, consistent backing year after year, the library will be hopelessly handicapped in its growth. Useful financial aid, although usually peripheral and irregular, may also be received through foundations, friends of the library organizations, and individual donors. However, any library forced to rely principally upon such sources for its budget is unlikely ever to attain high distinction, except in such rare instances as finding a Morgan, Huntington, Folger, or Widener.

In the actual building of an outstanding research library, the two key groups are the faculty and the library staff. Both have essential parts to play, a fact not infrequently overlooked. It is a fairly common
practice in college and university libraries for the staff to abdicate responsibility to the faculty for book selection and collection development. Laboring under the delusion that only scholarly specialists are competent to decide what books and journals are worth adding, the librarian assigns practically all funds to teaching departments and treats his acquisition staff as order clerks. The consequences may well be disastrous.

In a talk at the ALA Conference in Miami in June 1962, Robert A. Miller, Director of the Indiana University Library, reviewed his twenty-five years as a university librarian. Mr. Miller asserts that the weakness as well as the strength of our book collections “has resulted from an over-dependence upon faculty members for purchase recommendations, and faculty members have normally been interested and competent only in their areas. . . . In 25 years,” Mr. Miller goes on to say, “I have known only a handful of faculty men who were bookmen in the sense that they used judgment in submitting recommendations in their own fields and who had some knowledge of key books and journals in related fields. I have only known two faculty men whose book knowledge extended into other areas and who approximated the knowledge of our antiquarian book dealers.”

The situation described by Mr. Miller will, he predicts, become worse rather than better. We shall be able to rely in the future even less than in the past upon the faculty for aid in book selection because academic careers are being built increasingly not simply upon teaching, but upon research and publication, “travel and self-promotion,” with “no time left over for the ordering of books.” Hence, the librarians “must take over full supervision and responsibility for selection.”

The opinions and judgements expressed by Mr. Miller are in accord with my own experience as director of three major university libraries, North Carolina, New York, and Illinois. A limited number of faculty members are invaluable in guiding and advising upon the building up of resources for research. These men possess an encyclopedic knowledge of the literature of their own fields, past and present, and oftentimes related areas; they check new and antiquarian book catalogs the same day the lists reach their desks; they are aware of the state of the book market; they are so familiar with the library’s collections, what is there and what is lacking, that they know what titles to be on the lookout for; and, equally important, they maintain a relentless pressure upon the librarian for more book funds.

But for every Harris Fletcher, Thomas Baldwin, William Oldfather, George White, Gordon Ray, William Spence Robertson, and Nathan Weston, there are scores of faculty members who never submit a book order and appear quite unaware of library holdings or lacunae, except perhaps when they ask for a specific item.

Therefore, because we are confronted with a condition and not a theory, as Grover Cleveland remarked, it is essential that librarians
participate actively in the expansion of resources. Every large library has, or should have, subject specialists in its organization, and others can be trained, to assist in selection processes. At Illinois, to illustrate, there are departmental librarians in engineering, physics, chemistry, biology, music, agriculture, veterinary medicine, architecture, law, history, political science, classics, English, modern foreign languages, maps, library science, commerce and business administration, education, and other fields, nearly all of whom are in the thick of our efforts to build a library notable for its research collections. In addition, the personnel of the acquisition and serials departments, the reference and circulation librarians, and the catalogers all contribute, in varying degrees, to the total acquisition program. Upon them falls, for example, the chief responsibility for choosing materials of broad scope likely to be overlooked by specialists: general reference works, comprehensive bibliographies, general periodicals, and similar titles.

Discussing the training of librarians for book selection, Blanche McCrum, Bibliographer in the Library of Congress and former Librarian of Washington and Lee University and of Wellesley College, notes that “Access to basic histories, to current works that include bibliographies in books by specialists, to scholarly reviews in journals as they appear, as well as constant consideration of the qualifications of writers can . . . result in real bibliographical scholarship,” producing people who will readily recognize “the really first-rate, indispensable, basic works, and definitive editions that must be secured.” In brief, these are competencies that can be acquired by intelligent professional librarians who may lack extensive formal training as subject specialists.

Paradoxically perhaps, the larger and more complex the library’s collections become, the less need there is for careful selection, at least in fields of maximum specialization. The small college library with a book fund of a few hundred dollars must choose every title with the greatest of care. In a recent article, Lawrence Thompson recommends that “In universities the librarian should attempt to get away from the concept of selection of individual titles in most cases.” Instead, he maintains, “the major acquisition policy should be concerned with whole fields, and the key decisions should revolve around the intensity with which acquisition in these various fields should be pursued.”

I would not concur altogether with Mr. Thompson’s dictum; nevertheless, where completeness is the goal, as it often is in special collections, a mass of material of a strictly peripheral character will be added. In these instances, as Mortimer Taube points out, we may find ourselves collecting “the bad book, the cheap novel, the pompous genealogy, the insipid poem, the lying history, the dull report, the stupid diary, the ephemeral tract,” along with works of established
literary value. The reason is that such low-quality material has documentary value for the literary, political, and social historian. "Considered as historical evidence," as Mr. Taube notes, "the trashiest novel may be as significant as a literary masterpiece," vide Uncle Tom's Cabin.

Several references have been made to finances. The sums of money required to build and to maintain a large research library are staggering. Several years ago, Robert Delzell of the Illinois staff and I undertook to investigate the actual investment in the University of Illinois Library's collections, from the beginning to date. Using an index dollar, with 1947-1949 equalling 100, we discovered that total expenditures as of June 30, 1959, were $21,741,896. If we were to translate that figure into 1962 dollars, and bring the record up to date, the total value would be approximately $55,000,000, exclusive of capital appropriations, such as buildings. Furthermore, the Library's annual operating budget is currently in excess of $2,500,000. Last year, it might be noted, five American university libraries--California at Berkeley and Los Angeles, Harvard, Texas, and Yale--had book budgets in the neighborhood of one million dollars each, a phenomenal increase over a decade ago, even taking inflation into account.

One of the less pleasant aspects of such booming book budgets is what Time magazine called "The Great Paper Chase," keen competition among research libraries for rare books and manuscripts, forcing prices up beyond reasonable levels, irritating our European friends who have to bid against the rich Americans, and in some instances, it would appear, the acquisition of collections simply for prestige purposes.

Nevertheless, those are the facts of life, and if we expect to procure many of the out-of-print titles needed to bring value and distinction to our collections, we must be prepared, as one critic said, "to spend for a rare imprint or first edition enough money to buy the complete works of a dozen major English poets." That is a conservative statement.

To avoid encroaching on Miss Welch's topic, I shall omit consideration of foreign publications, except to observe that over the past 15 years the collecting interests of American libraries, formerly restricted to the United States and Western Europe, have clearly become worldwide, a fact that has involved us in a host of new problems in the acquisition, cataloging, and use of materials. The expanding library activities closely parallel the increased scholarly interest in area studies. A sizeable number of cooperative and overlapping organizations have fingers in the pie: the Farmington Plan Committee and its seven area subcommittees covering the world, the Latin American Cooperative Acquisitions Project, the Joint Committee on Middle Eastern Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, the Coordinating Committee for
Slavic and East European Library Resources, the Association for Asian Studies' Committee on Library Resources on the Far East, and others. Here is concrete recognition of America's position of world leadership, whether we desire the job or not.

A few general considerations may be outlined briefly in conclusion. First, we are living in an era when the outpouring of print in all its forms has become enormous, pointing toward an acute necessity for carefully defined acquisition policies, specialization of fields among libraries, and cooperative programs of acquisition. Second, in the development of large research collections, we are building as much or more for the future than for the present. A high proportion of books and related materials is acquired by libraries for the sake of completeness and to strengthen existing resources, with potential usefulness in mind, rather than to meet immediate demands. We ought, therefore, to exercise a certain amount of clairvoyance in determining what is actually significant from a long-range viewpoint. Third, the laissez-faire philosophy which university librarians are inclined to follow, attempting to achieve virtual autonomy in wide areas of knowledge and to serve all the needs of their clienteles without reference to other institutions, probably calls for re-examination, although I am not optimistic that there will be any radical change in the attitude unless or until a financial pinch is felt.

Finally, may I say that my intention has been to review only the highlights of the university library's acquisition problems. It should be stressed again that a library is never finished. A book collection that has stopped growing is a dead collection and soon loses most of its interest and value for the scholar and student. Furthermore, our ideas about the nature and contents of a research library are constantly evolving. A library that would have satisfied our clientele in the nineteenth century, or even a generation ago, would be regarded as quite inadequate today, and will be even more so tomorrow. Accordingly, to avoid obsolescence, the university library must be a dynamic, living organism, fully responsive to change, and always looking to the future.
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THE MECHANICS OF BOOK SELECTION

Jack Chitwood

There is not a large mass of literature dealing with the mechanics of book selection. Most references to this or related topics are concerned either with the broader aspects of policy, with the "why" of selection, or with order procedures. It is possible sometimes to ferret pertinent information from these materials; on the other hand, it is obvious that many book selection policies are predominantly concerned with the mechanics of selection rather than with policy.

Within the past four or five years we have had synthetic presentations in textbook form of observations of these mechanics. These texts, Wulfekoetter's Acquisition Work, Carter and Bonk's Building Library Collections, and Wheeler and Goldhor's Practical Administration of Public Libraries have, in general, followed the pattern of Drury in his Book Selection, published over 30 years ago. Comparison of these presentations would indicate that no significant changes have taken place in the routines of book selection.

Only Wheeler and Goldhor mention the Greenaway innovation, which varies from the conventional approval copy method of acquiring books for examination, and only Carter and Bonk give any extensive coverage of methods used in larger agencies to assure systematic mechanical procedures for consolidation of book requisitioning. The latter accomplish this coverage by reprinting statements of procedures from various types of libraries in one of the appendices of their book.

Discussions of related topics often prove quite valuable as well as revealing--a kind of serendipitous discovery, we might say. For example, the book Reviews in Library Book Selection by Merritt, Boaz, and Tisdel should be studied by any administrator contemplating a change in procedure or policy of selection.

Since I felt that the published literature available was too meagre and because I thought I might possibly make some discoveries of benefit to us which would not otherwise be presented to the profession, I decided to send an informal request to librarians asking for a description of book selection procedures in their institutions. A total of 511 libraries were sent these requests. Of these, 300 were medium-sized and larger public libraries serving populations of 50,000 or more. The remaining were college and university libraries having materials budgets of $20,000 or more.

Jack Chitwood is Director of Libraries, Rockford (Ill.) Public Library.
Academic libraries responded as indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 20,000 - 50,000</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - 100,000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001 and over</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public libraries responded as shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 150,000</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,001 - 500,000</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,001 and over</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The response to this request was quite good. Replies were received from 270 institutions, or almost 53 per cent of the total to which requests were sent. Responses from public libraries were 54 per cent (162 out of 300), and from academic libraries 108 replies were received, or 51 per cent. A very small number of respondents refused to supply any information for various reasons, the most frequent one being lack of time, although, surprisingly, unhappiness with their institutions' procedures was given as the reason in four cases. No attempt has been made to treat the data statistically since the information appears to lend itself better to broad descriptive techniques.

Our perspective on this problem was that of "how" libraries select materials, not "why" they select particular items. From this viewpoint there appear to be at least five basic questions:

1. Who is responsible for selecting materials?
   (a) Does anyone review initial selections?

2. How do selectors become aware of the needs for materials and of materials available to fill these needs?
   (a) Are there other than original selection units?
      (1) If so, do they all use the same sources of information?
      (2) If they do not, what are the characteristics of the kinds of sources used?

3. How are original authority unit selectors' decisions communicated to duplicate authority units?
4. Are selections (requisitions) consolidated?
   (a) Who does this?

5. How is the total selection decision transmitted to the ordering unit.

The organization of this presentation is from the viewpoint of type of library. Academic libraries are described as one unit, and because adult materials and children's materials in public libraries have distinctive selection procedures, these are presented separately.

Procedures in Academic Libraries

Academic institutions have traditionally distributed their library materials budgets to their teaching departments on the basis of formulas satisfactory for the given institution. This distribution results in varying, but usually minimal, amounts of unencumbered funds being retained by the library; the remaining funds are ordinarily encumbered for periodicals, continuations, and reference materials. There appears to be a trend away from this traditional division of funds, noticeable in some larger institutions and in those where there have been recent changes in the library administration. This trend places larger portions of the budget under more direct control of the library administrator and, at the same time, makes more real the library's responsibility for the proper development of the collection.

The library's retention of actual control of the funds would appear to provide for a more economical and consistent approach to collection building. While faculty may protest initially, they are free to suggest purchases; many institutions report that they find most current publications requested by faculty already in the collection or on order. In institutions where the faculty has fund control, the administrators indicate that collection building is extremely difficult because of the varying degrees of interest of the faculty personnel. No report indicates a really consistent procedure of faculty selection in these cases. Selection is assumed to be the teaching department's responsibility and is left to its members. Only one control feature is required by the library: all requests are supposed to be approved by the faculty department head or his designee. In a few instances, reports indicate that this practice is strictly adhered to and that unsigned requests are returned for signature.

Publishers' information brochures and out-of-print catalogs are ordinarily referred to faculty for examination. Institutions maintaining central desiderata files search the latter and place orders before referring them to faculty. No institution reports that current trade bibliography is referred to the faculty. This information is usually examined by members of the library staff who prepare suggestion slips and send them to the faculty.
Upon receipt of faculty requests, which may be in any form although, a standard card is usually suggested, the order or acquisition clerk is expected to verify the correctness of the bibliographical information in appropriate standard sources. The Library of Congress Catalogs, Cumulative Book Index, American Book Publishers' Record, or dealers' catalogs are the most frequently mentioned sources, although foreign bibliographies are indicated when appropriate. After the bibliographical information has been verified, the title is searched through the catalog, outstanding orders, and in-process files; it then is placed in the order routine unless it is found to be an unintentional request for added copies.

Larger libraries and libraries with subject departmental organization vary this procedure considerably. In the latter all requisitions are routed through the appropriate subject divisions where the bibliographical verification and searching take place. Larger libraries which have acquisition units have this searching performed in a pre-order unit.

Libraries which retain control of funds, and these are in the majority, depend more upon the library staff to initiate requests; in fact, this becomes a major responsibility. In most subject departmental organizations, the department is responsible for building the collection and devotes a great deal of time to analysis and searching.

Current publication requests may be transmitted to order units by coding brochures and bibliographies, usually Publishers' Weekly. Most frequently, however, these units are expected to use standard request cards which are to be bibliographically correct and adequately searched before they are forwarded to the order unit. Library of Congress proof slips and Library Journal review cards are acceptable requisition forms in some institutions. Retrospective requisitioning for individual titles follows the same routine; however, because speed is an important factor, some routines may be detoured to accelerate the process.

In this type of library operation faculty requests are encouraged; in many institutions active faculty-staff cooperation in the development of segments of the collection is very successful. Particularly encouraging to most of us are those institutions which require faculty-library cooperation in the development of curriculum and specific courses. There are few which report this activity, but undoubtedly it is becoming more frequent.

Several institutions report automatic approval contracts with varying numbers of publishers. Materials received in this manner are examined, and decisions to keep or to reject such materials are made by the appropriate personnel, depending upon the authority pattern of the institution. Very few institutions indicate that the head librarian personally reviews requisitions, although heads of smaller libraries frequently do so. Most institutions mention a cost figure--
most frequently $50--beyond which purchases require the director's signature. The University of Denver reported that the library staff has regular book selection meetings at which it examines requests received and listings of current publications. The purpose of the meetings is to arrive at decisions for ordering, to acquaint the staff with items being purchased, and to reduce the opportunities for areas or titles being overlooked. Such meetings undoubtedly produce other benefits.

Larger academic libraries quite often have professional bibliographers working in areas in which it has been decided to build or rebuild a hitherto neglected segment of the collection. These staff members may or may not be assigned to the library staff; they are hired on the basis of knowledge of a subject, language, or geographical area and usually have almost carte blanche authority to requisition materials. The use of such bibliographers is the most distinctive feature in differentiating the selection procedures of medium-sized academic institutions from those of larger academic libraries.

All staff selectors make the greatest use of current trade bibliographies as their source of information about the availability of materials, Publishers' Weekly being the universally mentioned title. All institutions distribute publishers' advertising and catalogs to faculty and staff. Library of Congress proof slips are mentioned by both San Fernando State College and the University of Connecticut as sources of information; purchasing, although not necessarily requisitioning, in the latter institution is done after the receipt of the proof slip so that processing will not be delayed by waiting for Library of Congress cataloging information. Many other institutions use Library of Congress proof slips for selection information, but Connecticut is the only institution reporting planned delay in purchasing current publications. Retrospective selection and purchasing of foreign titles receive the greatest attention from larger institutions and from those which recently created graduate programs. Purchases in these cases tend to be by extremes, either in isolated titles or in blocks of materials.

There appears to be a growing trend for even the smallest academic institutions to develop an acquisitions unit with at least the authority to coordinate the requisitioning of materials. In many cases, the acquisitions unit actually selects materials and is responsible for the development of the collection. This system may tend to place the public service personnel in the position of suggesting possibilities for purchase rather than to give them selection authority, in which case it removes selection authority from those having direct contact with users.

I should think that an organization with an acquisitions unit of this type will soon find its public service personnel little interested in keeping up with current publications. This practice may become detrimental to morale; yet it also has the advantage of allowing the
public service group more time to concentrate upon the materials actually in the collection. This latter function should contribute more to the creation of superior librarianship than checking reviews and trade bibliography allows. It is even conceivable that libraries could cease purchasing for an extended length of time, but would be able to continue to give excellent service with the materials on hand if the staff continues to enlarge its knowledge of these.

The major distinction between academic and public libraries, as far as mechanics of selection are concerned, is the need in the latter to provide for the coordination of selection between units within the same institution. In order to provide for effective book collections and at the same time reduce costs, means have had to be devised which make possible the simultaneous acquisition and processing of as many copies of the same title as may be wanted. In addition, public libraries are expected to provide new adult titles for circulation as near to the publication date as possible. Some academic institutions are also concerned with speed of acquisition of current titles; one reports that it expects to have half of its orders for current titles filled within two weeks and 80 per cent within one month. No other academic library indicated this interest, however.

Procedures in Public Libraries

The mechanics of selection in public libraries are greatly affected by these factors. All public libraries try by some method to have all units which may expect to want a title to select it at the same time, and they try to see that new adult titles are on the shelves, ready for circulation by the time they are published. They also attempt to involve in the selection process those staff members who are working directly with the public. These requirements contribute toward complex selection methods.

Only slightly less complex are the problems associated with the selection of children's and young adult materials. Because these categories do not have to be ready for use by publication date, a more leisurely pace can be followed. However, most children's librarians and young people's specialists feel that these materials must be read by local staff even though most reviews of these materials are prepared by respected colleagues and appear to be more critical than are those of adult books. In smaller libraries the staff must depend upon reviews and authoritative bibliographies and, when lucky, upon visits to book fairs or larger libraries near them. Reviewing media most frequently mentioned are the Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books, Library Journal, and Hornbook. A number of libraries cooperate by making their reviewing and examination services available to neighboring smaller institutions.

Librarians actually working with these age groups do the selecting. In institutions having limited staff, particularly limited
specialized staff, the professionally trained children's librarian is usually considered the coordinator for the selection of children's materials and in many cases actually selects for all agencies. The heads of extension units, although not specifically trained as children's specialists, often become so by default and necessity. They read or examine and review children's materials in much greater quantity than they do adult materials.

In larger systems or systems where there is adequate staff performing children's services and where a large portion of the materials can be acquired for examination, all materials are read and reviewed. These reviews are presented at children's services meetings where the decision to acquire or to reject is made. In systems having large coordinating or supervisory units, the reviews from the field staff are evaluated and decisions made in the coordinating office. In either of these types the materials are available for examination by selectors and other interested personnel. Lists are prepared which indicate both accepted and rejected titles, and accepted items are often coded to suggest possible value and use.

These lists serve as requisition forms to be checked by selectors and returned to the coordinating office before scheduled times. At this office selections are evaluated in terms of the agency selecting, and quantities are consolidated onto a master requisition form, ordinarily a multicopy type. The requisition is forwarded to the order office while one copy is used for requisitions-out files. In some libraries the consolidation of requisitions takes place in the order department, which appears to be the proper location for such activities. In those libraries having acquisition units with responsibility for coordinating requisitioning procedures, the consolidation takes place in this office. Other institutions make this a function of the book selection unit which may be a part of a larger office.

Three articles detailing children's materials selection practices in three types of libraries, large, medium, and regional and county, appeared in a 1961 issue of Library Journal.9 These articles provide specific details of practices described in general in this paper.

There are three basic methods through which adult materials are requisitioned in public libraries. The first is by the personal selection of key professional personnel. Even in a few institutions serving large geographic areas, such as are found in consolidated county and regional systems, the head librarian performs all of the mechanics of selection. When these institutions are fortunate enough to acquire additional staff, selection duties are assigned to them, usually upon the basis of the function which the new staff member is to perform. Most frequently the head librarian retains fiction as his area of selection, possibly because this is the group of materials he needs to know best because of expected complaints, but also because one of the
first specialists to be hired is one in reference, where nonfiction will be used most frequently.

Institutions which use this method of selection indicate their choices by coding devices marked in reviewing media; the most often mentioned media are the ALA Booklist, Library Journal, and Virginia Kirkus’ Book Service. These media are then routed to clerks who search the catalog and the outstanding order file to prevent unwanted duplication before preparing the order for transmission.

The smaller the budget, the more likely the institution is to deal directly with publishers or local book stores, since in either case the total discount is better than it would be if purchase were directed through a wholesaler. Dealers’ representatives also contribute more to selection decisions in institutions with smaller budgets. Smaller institutions in the vicinity of larger cities frequently go directly to cooperating book stores where they select from a store’s stock. One larger system sends representatives to select from a wholesaler’s shelves the materials to be examined “on approval.”

As institutions grow larger, although no definite line of demarcation can be drawn, complexity in the mechanics of selection is a concomitant development, which leads to the second general method of selection, selection by committee. Since budgets for books and additional staff are likely to increase proportionately, the need for assistance in materials selection occurs at about the same time. The first step in the organization of the committee for selection appears to be the “committee of the whole.” This committee is composed of the professionally trained staff, which at this point ordinarily consists of the head librarian, the reference librarian, and the cataloger. Even in institutions without the formal committee organization, consultation about book selection is usually conducted in an informal committee situation.

At this point of development, coding the reviewing media is still the method used most often for indicating selections; some selectors will indicate a need to read some titles before adding, in which case these will be sent for “on approval.” These are again forwarded to a clerk who prepares a preliminary consolidated order, which is referred for review to the head librarian. The latter then makes the final selection of titles, indicates or approves quantities to be ordered, and returns the approved forms to the order clerk for placement with the vendor.

It should be noted that when there is a special department represented in the library’s organization, the head of this department has almost free range in selection, even though the institution may otherwise be committee prone. Thus, the head of reference selects all reference titles, and the head of children’s work selects all juvenile titles without the aid of assisting committee members. As institutions
grow in complexity, the same principle holds true. Committees are reserved usually for general materials, mainly fiction and popular nonfiction.

The need for complexity in selection mechanics is directly related to the size of staff and number of units which have to be kept informed of the materials being chosen. A library system which has branches responsible for building their own collections has to keep all responsible personnel informed if it is to provide an opportunity for the consolidation of requests at one point and at one time in order to reduce the confusion and consequent extra, expensive labor in ordering and processing. Procedures must provide, too, for the acquisition of materials near the time at which they are being advertised in order to take advantage of the publishers' promotional activity.

This practice creates the need for the third basic method of selection which is common to larger public libraries, a method which involves the preparation of a list of approved titles for the selection of added copies. The major variation in practices is in the method used for qualifying titles approved for selection by extension units and is ordinarily based upon selections of the central or main library units. Sometimes the selections are made by committee, sometimes by individual selectors.

The larger the library, the more likely it is that fiction and at least popular nonfiction will be read; one library indicated that over 70 per cent of the titles purchased during the previous year had been read by the staff. This appears to be a misdirection of time and energy. Most libraries of any given size will buy essentially the same titles in these categories with very few and relatively insignificant differences. Experience has also indicated to the writer that reviews by staff members are very seldom critical or evaluative; rather they tend to grow less so the longer the reviewer has been a librarian. In addition to the doubtful value of such procedures is the difficulty of obtaining approval copies soon enough of all titles which, it may be thought, need reviewing. It also appears to be questionable to neglect the reading of nonfiction, which is based presumably upon facts and which could be evaluated and at the same time to insist upon reviewing fiction, which does not even pretend to be factual and is admittedly imaginative. Staff reviews when used are ordinarily written and attached to the book for examination by other staff members. They are also used at staff book selection meetings when representatives assemble to hear them. Ordinarily they are limited to two to five minutes of presentation time; a large number of larger and medium-sized libraries use the book selection meeting as one of their selection procedures.

Not all libraries try to read all titles, however; and there are almost as many ways of selecting books as there are libraries. A few selected examples of institutions present interesting variations.
The Evansville (Indiana) Public Library is a medium-sized institution using a committee system. The committee in this instance does not operate as a selection unit; the selection is still done by public service personnel representing specific service responsibilities. The function of this committee is to produce a list of acceptable titles from all those which it may know are available and from which the various selection units may choose. The committee is specifically charged to provide enough titles that selectors will have some freedom of choice. The committee is small; it consists of three persons, with the librarian, assistant librarian, or chief of technical services serving as chairman. The chairman is assisted by one professional from the circulation department (Evansville has no subject departments) and one who is doing adult work in a branch.

The committee produces its list from selections made from any sources it chooses although these tend to be the reviewing media familiar to us all. Sixteen titles ranging from the Essay and General Literature Index to Recreation are on the regular reviewing list. Advertisements are considered for titles as are reviews and bibliographies. These are coded to indicate approved titles and are given to a clerk who then prepares the list. In addition, Evansville has Greenaway Plan contracts with a number of publishers and uses selections from these for its list, too. The committee decides by unanimous vote which items are to be listed from those nominated. However, placing a title on the acceptable list does not indicate that the title will ever be in the library, for although the committee has the authority to requisition, this is not its main purpose. Its lists are coded, however, to indicate those titles which it considers especially valuable for specific consideration. The list is duplicated and distributed to all agencies which are expected to indicate titles and quantity wanted; titles not listed are not available to selectors. All selection activities are scheduled, and reviewing media and books, when available, are kept ready for selectors to examine during the time the list is current. At the end of the period the lists which have been returned are given to the order clerk who examines them for requisitions and prepares a consolidated order.

Apparently Evansville is not concerned with having copies of books in the Central Library collection before they are available to extension units, a very common requirement in most public libraries. It would appear that this library has faced an issue fairly which permits a community agency to build its collection to suit the community. On the other hand, this approach must increase processing and public service problems.

The Indianapolis Public Library abandoned general staff reading for selection purposes in 1957. Emphasis was then channeled toward reading for public service in the expectation that those working in any agency should be familiar with the materials in the agency rather than
toward having time diverted from so basic a responsibility. To those who have a basic distrust of professional reviewers this practice is heresy, but it appears to be working quite successfully.

The Indianapolis Public Library is organized on a subject departmentalized scheme, and extension units are not allowed to have materials which are not represented in the central collection other than for special interest reasons, e.g., ethnic communities near a branch. The subject units, of which there are five, are responsible for the original selection for the system, all of which is controlled by coordinators of adult and children’s services. A Young Adult Consultant assigned to the Adult Coordinator’s office serves to advise units on the selection of materials and on service for this age group.

All subject divisions receive general and specialized reviewing media and are sent pertinent publishers’ brochures as they arrive. Extra copies of publishers’ catalogs and brochures are forwarded from the coordinator’s office where files are maintained of all catalogs later than those appearing in the current Publishers’ Trade List Annual. The coordinator also maintains extensive general bibliographic resources. Upon receipt of the general reviewing media, the coordinator’s staff search the files of requisitions outstanding and titles being considered and indicate the status of all titles listed before forwarding them to the subject divisions.

As quickly as the reviews are received the divisional staffs read them and underline informative and evaluative passages. The publications are returned then to the coordinator’s office where a card is typed in duplicate for all reviews indicated. The coordinator’s copy is filed in the master file, which is composed of titles being considered and requisitions outstanding, and the duplicate goes into the divisional consideration files.

On a predetermined schedule the divisions select titles from their consideration files for requisition, the total value of which is based upon a prorated portion of their budget. Arts and Social Science Divisions submit requisitions weekly, while the Science and Technology Division, the Business Library, and the Teachers’ Library prepare monthly requisitions.

The subject unit prepares a three-part requisition form for any title wanted. In addition to the usual necessary bibliographic information the form calls for the number of copies wanted, indicates whether the title is to circulate or to be used for reference, and identifies which unit is requisitioning it. All reviewing information which has been collected to this point is attached to the original and duplicate copies of the requisition and is forwarded to the coordinator’s office. The third copy is retained for agency files.

The coordinator examines each group of requisitions and discusses with the division head any titles of doubtful value or titles not included which should be added to this current requisition list.
Although the coordinator has the authority to disapprove any item, in practice it is seldom necessary for him to do so. The coordinator's staff then place approved titles on requisition lists, two copies of which are distributed to each requisitioning unit. These lists are very comprehensive and omit only the most expensive and specialized titles, since one of their purposes is to inform the entire staff of the total book selection picture.

The requisition list is so designed that it provides a short excerpt from a review as well as the location of other reviews which have appeared and thus serves as an informal index to reviews prior to the appearance of the Book Review Digest. It also is coded by the division heads or the coordinator to indicate titles which are judged to deserve careful consideration by extension agencies. Extension units are free to requisition any titles in the central collection, but are urged to consult with the coordinator concerning titles of doubtful value. They are allowed seven days to make their selections, indicate the number of copies wanted, and return one copy of the list to the coordinator's office.

The coordinator then examines each returned list to evaluate the general appropriateness of the selections made and consolidates the approved extension unit requests into the requisition of the original authority unit. The consolidated requisitions are forwarded to the order office, where the original is validated and returned to the originating unit to be filed in that unit's outstanding requisition file as a record of when given titles were actually ordered. Added and replacement copies are listed on the requisition list if they are in the current requests of an originating agency, and twice each year a general replacement requisition period is announced. Periodically the coordinator examines portions of the collection and prepares a "basic" list of titles in the categories studied. Only titles in print are listed so that extension agencies can use the list for requisition purposes. This list follows the design of regular lists and is processed in the same manner although it is titled to distinguish it from them.

In addition to requisitioning from reviews, Indianapolis participates with a number of publishers in advance copy review plans. Some of these are standard "on approval" agreements which require the return of unwanted items, but most are Greenaway contracts to take and keep all trades titles issued.

When these publications arrive, four to six weeks prior to publication date, they are routed to the adult coordinator's office. If a title is new to the library, a requisition form is typed for it and placed in the book. Files are searched for any evaluative information which may have been collected, and any found is assembled and placed in the book with the requisition. One copy of the requisition form is then forwarded to the division in which the title, if accepted, will be classified to inform the division that the title has arrived and to indicate that
any additional information should be sent to the coordinator's office, where it will be assembled with that already on hand.

The books are placed on shelves by divisional category for weekly examination and decision by division heads. These decisions are reviewed by the coordinator, and those items accepted are separated from those rejected. Extension unit administrators come to the central library at least once each week to examine these materials as well as the new titles which have been processed during the preceding week, which are also on display in the coordinator's office. These administrators indicate their decision by symbols marked in unit blocks on the requisition form; both negative and positive decisions must be shown. At the end of the examination period these requisitions are examined and evaluated by the coordinator and consolidated by the coordinator's staff. The consolidated requisition and the accepted books are forwarded to the order section while rejected Greenaway plan titles are assembled for later disposition. Rejected "approval" titles are returned to their source.

A copy of the weekly listing of "New Books Added to the Library," a publication of the Technical Processes Division at Indianapolis, is used as a requisition form for added copies wanted of the books on the list which are displayed in the coordinator's office for a week. The coordinator's staff consolidate requisitions for these materials at the end of the week and forward the requisitions to the order section. Thus, there are at least two, and sometimes three, opportunities for extension units to requisition most titles. Pamphlet material is treated in essentially the same manner, the exception being that there are no reviews available for these materials.

Although the Indianapolis procedure might appear to be more complex than necessary, it was established to give all units an equal opportunity to build collections systematically and to provide for a continuing information program about books being selected for all staff working with the public. By approaching selection mechanics in such a comprehensive manner, the administrator hoped to interest the staff in a broadening educational program, and thus indirectly to provide better informed assistance for library users since a number of time-consuming functions usually associated with book selection would be consolidated into one office or reduced to routines.

For use as requisition forms the Memphis Public Library prints its own 3" x 5" slips (rather than lists). These are prepared by the order department from codes indicated by the circulation department head in ALA Booklist, Publishers' Weekly, and Library Journal. The slips are distributed to branches and are arranged in the same order in which they appear in the periodical from which they were taken. Information included indicates sources of reviews in addition to the necessary trade and bibliographical data. The branch librarian marks the number of copies wanted of any desired title and returns those
slips to the circulation department where they are consolidated onto the master requisition card, which is one of the copies of the original printing. The branch slip is then returned to the branch for its files.

The consolidated order is prepared in five copies, all a part of the original printing, one of which remains in the circulation department file, one goes to the catalog department, and three are sent to the order department by way of the Director's office. The order department then sends two to the vendor.

This library also has Greenaway contracts. When these arrive, they go to the order department, where requisition slips are prepared, and are then referred to the Book Selection Committee which assigns the book to a staff member for a review, to be written on the requisition slip in the book. Weekly reviewing meetings are held at which selectors mark the review-requisition slip to indicate the number of copies wanted. The circulation department head transfers the number of copies wanted by each agency to individual requisition forms for each and sends them to the appropriate branch. From this point the procedure is the same as that used for requisitioning from reviews.

The largest public libraries have separate book selection units which are usually responsible for at least the functioning of the mechanical procedures of selection and in some instances are the selection authority for the system. For instance, the Milwaukee Public Library operates with an acquisitions librarian. However, the central library subject department personnel, of whom there are 25, are the selectors for the system. At Milwaukee the basic book information tool for the mechanics of selection if Publishers' Weekly which is coded by the selectors for titles which they want ordered. These titles are in addition to the volumes which are received from various other sources, such as gifts from publishers and an automatic approval copy plan which brings about 100 volumes a week into the Milwaukee library selection procedure.

The selectors, who also catalog their selections, serve the public, and maintain their collection, indicate their decision in the books which have been placed upon designated shelves in the processing area. Items having special significance for branch collections are marked to draw the branch selection committee's attention to them. The Milwaukee branches are organized into three groups from each of which a representative is selected to meet with the Acquisitions Librarian each week. From all the materials on the selector's shelves, which includes pamphlets and documents in addition to books, this committee selects items for each of the three categories of branches which it thinks to be of interest to neighborhood libraries. A list of these selections, along with trade and review information and a description form of the material is mailed to all neighborhood branches, which indicates for which group each is recommended.
Milwaukee lists are made from actual examination of materials by committee but the actions of the committee are imposed upon extension units unless the unit objects. A recommendation by the committee for a particular group constitutes a requisition for all libraries in the group unless an agency calls to cancel specific items. Titles listed but not recommended for one group, or unlisted but being added to the central collection, can be requisitioned by agencies in other groups by calls to the processing department.

At Philadelphia control of the mechanics of selection is assigned to a head of book selection. Here, too, subject department heads initiate selection by coding familiar reviewing media. Requisitions are placed for items indicated and upon receipt are sent to a New Book Room. The central library department heads examine these and indicate which are for "central only" and those which are to be recommended for branch consideration. Only titles having reviews can be considered for branches. The head of book selection acts as an adviser in this procedure.

Reviews may be from Library Journal, the staff, or New Book Room reviews, which are edited statements from Kirkus or other sources and endorsed by New Book Room staff as suitable after study of the title in question. Controversial titles will have several reviews, sometimes three or four, from the staff. Staff reviews are required of most fiction titles. After reviews are received, the head of the book order room re-examines them and determines which titles are to be included on the weekly checklist of books approved for branch purchase.

Every Wednesday the titles listed and those assigned to "central only" are assembled for branch ordering along with the checklist. Branches examine all titles and in special cases can order "central only" titles. On a bulk order slip branch selectors indicate the number of copies needed or desired titles. Central departments which want additional copies use the same form.

Three times a year the Fall, Winter, and Spring Announcement issues of Publishers' Weekly are reviewed by a committee of branch and central staff under the chairmanship of the head of book selection. At these meetings a list of titles expected to be in demand is prepared for direct bulk ordering without waiting for the titles to be examined. Philadelphia, the home of the Greenaway Plan, has contracts with sixteen publishers to receive their trade items prior to publication. These are coordinated into the book selection routines described above.

Quite obviously the ultimate solution to many of the problems of book selection has not been found. Each institution has been forced to adopt procedures acceptable to the various units involved in the selection process, and most indicate reasonable satisfaction with their own solution.
From this observation point a suggestion might be in order: would the use of cards, similar to those published by Library Journal, as the publication form for trade bibliography and reviewing media aimed at the library and book trade be a big step forward? In working on this paper I was impressed by the amount of copying which is done from journals for institutional distribution. Some publishers are already issuing cards and some libraries are experimenting with photographing entries in American Book Publishing Record for cataloging purposes, perhaps even for selection procedures although none indicated this practice in the material sent to me.
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THE MECHANICS OF BOOK ORDERING

Harold Sander

The tasks which the ordering agency of a library performs and the methods used in performing these tasks are determined by the functions and responsibilities assigned to that agency, the place of the agency in the library's organization structure, and the legal restrictions which it must observe. Translated into more specific terms, the activities and procedures of the ordering agency will be dictated by its relations to the book selection processes of the library, its part in budget control, the laws of the state or municipality which affect its purchasing procedures, and the reports which it is required to make to the library's governing board, to the library administrator, and to other library agencies.

With the purpose of expediting the work of ordering and receiving library materials, the function of the Order Division of the Indianapolis Public Library has been limited to that of a purchasing agency for the library, responsible in addition for making certain reports, for processing materials received, and for financial records related to these materials.

Book Selection and Bibliographical Data

As the Indianapolis Public Library is organized, the responsibility for book selection, for the preparation of bibliographical data, and for checking to ascertain that the book is in print and is not already in the library's collection resides with the agency administrators and the Coordinators of Adult and Children's Services. Many acquisitions departments, however, especially among academic libraries, are responsible for such bibliographical work and, to varying extents, for the library's book collection. A survey published several years ago, based upon a questionnaire answered by 31 American university libraries, showed that in only four of these institutions does the acquisitions department have no part in the selection process. Those acquisitions departments which have such responsibilities also maintain, of necessity, desiderata files, consisting of titles unobtainable immediately because they are out of print and those which cannot be purchased because they are too expensive and/or which the librarian hopes to obtain through gifts or exchanges. In such libraries the acquisitions librarian is responsible for watching dealers' catalogs, for submitting
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want lists of out-of-print titles, and for maintaining the lists, records, and correspondence involved in exchanges. In the Indianapolis Public Library, however, where desiderata files are not extensive, the responsibility for maintaining them and for checking dealers' catalogs rests with the individual agencies.

Budget Control

As a consequence of the policy of relieving the Order Division of any book selection responsibility, that of budget control is also placed upon the agency administrators, the Coordinators of Adult and Children's Services, and the Supervisors of Central, Extension, and School Services. At the beginning of the fiscal year, each agency is assigned a materials budget and an estimated discount based upon the record of discounts during the previous year. The Order Division reports monthly to each agency an estimate of the amount of its budget which has been obligated to date and the approximate balance, taking into account the estimated discount allotted to the agency.

Some libraries, among them the Chicago Public Library and the Enoch Pratt Free Library, keep a record of and report the actual cost of materials. At Pratt, where the cost of materials charged to each agency is recorded on ledger cards, the Underwood Model C bookkeeping machine is employed to make all the computations and notations directly onto the cards. The entry for each agency shows the sum charged against the agency account and the accumulated amount charged since the last report. A monthly report is made to the agency. In the Chicago Public Library each agency is given a semimonthly authorization card showing the amount of money authorized to be spent during the next semimonthly period and the average discount to be used by the agency. After the books have been received and processed, the order cards are attached to the invoice and routed to the bookkeeping unit of the department. Here the actual cost of each item appearing on the invoice is distributed on tally sheets and charged to the appropriate agency. Once a month a report is made showing the cost of materials charged to each agency during the month and the total to date.

Among those libraries which employ the "unit" system of budget allocation are the Free Library of Philadelphia and the Circulation Department of the New York Public Library. In this system each agency is assigned a designated number of "units," each equal to an approximate amount in dollars and cents; the records of expenditures kept by each agency and reported monthly by the order department are in terms of "units." Presumably the libraries using this method feel that an estimated account is sufficient and that an estimated account is more easily kept when expressed in units than in dollars and cents. (Something of the same method is used in the Indianapolis Public Library in binding budget allocations, where each agency is
allotted a certain number of volumes rather than a stated amount of money.)

The Cleveland Public Library\(^4\) employs an interesting procedural variant in its book of quota sheets which is issued quarterly to each agency. Each sheet consists of identical halves, separated by a perforation. The agency is responsible for recording on both halves the information concerning the total quota, the amount already expended, the amount obligated by the current order, and the present balance. One half of the quota sheet accompanies the order, while the other remains in the book as the agency record.

Choice of Vendor

The Indianapolis Public Library places the major portion of its book orders (for the year 1962-63 approximately $90,000 of a materials budget of $190,000) with a jobber, for several reasons, most of which are recognized by public libraries doing a large volume of business: a jobber usually gives discounts as good as, or better than, those offered by publishers; the placing of orders with one vendor instead of several simplifies ordering procedures and reduces the amount of paper work necessary; a reliable jobber is often more efficient and prompt in filling orders than are publishers. Furthermore, since this library operates under the jurisdiction of the Indianapolis Board of School Commissioners, purchases of $500 or more must, according to state law, be submitted to competitive bidding. To avoid, therefore, the necessity of curtailing the library’s book orders to amounts less than $500 or, alternatively, of submitting each purchase of $500 or more for bids, the Board of School Commissioners advertises annually for bids on a contract to supply the greatest portion of the book requirements at a given discount for certain classes of books.

Besides the major contract, the Board also has a contract with one publishing firm and its affiliates guaranteeing a given discount on all books, including reprints, issued by these companies. In addition to the orders placed under these contracts, the Board reserves the right to place orders with publishers offering better discounts than does the jobber and to order direct from the publisher materials not falling under the terms of the contracts and/or not available from these two sources. Among the materials ordered directly are pamphlets, continuations, films, and phonodiscs. An annual periodical subscription list is submitted for bids by periodicals brokers. In addition, the Board has contracts with several publishers under the “Preview” or “Greenaway” plan and a $12,000 annual contract with a book lending company for the rental of current titles.

According to a survey made by Fleming Bennett\(^5\) of 25 public libraries and 42 college and university libraries, it is the more usual practice of both public and academic libraries to place the major portion of their book orders with jobbers. The survey shows, however,
that academic libraries as a rule place a much larger percentage of their orders with publishers than do public libraries, no doubt because they purchase a greater proportion of materials not ordinarily handled by jobbers.

The extent to which books are purchased from local bookstores is determined by various factors. A major consideration is the easy accessibility of a bookstore with a large and varied book stock. As the Indianapolis Public Library learned in the past in dealing with a local bookstore, not many have the stock available to supply the orders of large public libraries requiring multiple copies of many of the titles requested. Such libraries usually prefer placing their entire order with a jobber rather than filling it partially at a local source and then sending the remainder to the jobber. Another consideration, as Bennett points out, is the location of the library in relation to book distribution centers. He notes particularly that libraries in the Southwest are impelled by their distance from dealers to buy more from local sources than they might otherwise choose to do.

An interesting experiment in purchasing from local bookstores has been reported by two universities in California. Dorothy Keller, of the University of California at Berkeley, reports the results of several weeks' trial of bookstores situated conveniently near the library. Each week a list of in-print British and American titles wanted by the library was taken to each of a group of five bookstores situated in a relatively small area. Those not in stock at the first bookstore were submitted to the second store on the list, and so on. Since each title had been previously assigned an order number, those titles procurable in this manner could be billed and sent immediately. She reports that 50 to 70 per cent of titles were thus obtained in the local area and were received by the library in two to five days after being ordered. The initial procurement cost per title was 67 cents, later reduced to 53 cents, as compared to 28 cents per title when ordering was done in the conventional way. The greater cost, she felt, was justified by the promptness of delivery and the reduction in the order department's work of keeping records, making claims, etc.

A similar experiment, inspired by the University of California experience, was made by A. S. Pickett of the San Francisco State College. Previously, he reports, the library had been using about 800 vendors to procure its books. The principal suppliers had been a local branch of a national textbook wholesaler which offered good discounts but slow service, and a branch store of a textbook jobber which gave satisfactory service but had a limited book stock and offered small discounts. Although this library discontinued the experiment after 15 weeks, Pickett reports that the trial enabled the library to select as suppliers two or three bookstores which maintained good stocks and offered good discounts.
Preparing the Order

Under the system followed in the Indianapolis Public Library, requisitions forwarded to the Order Division from the offices of the Coordinators of Adult and Children's Services show the combined requests of all agencies and, when necessary, the special fund to which the item is to be charged. The first step which the Order Division takes is to sort the requisitions, grouping those which are to be charged to appropriated tax funds, gift funds, or trust funds. Those items which fall into the last two classifications are handled separately, since they must be ordered and billed separately.

The requisitions for titles to be charged to tax funds are then sorted according to the sources from which they will be ordered: the principal jobber with whom the Board of School Commissioners has a contract; the publisher with whom the Board has a contract; firms selling prebound copies of juvenile titles; government documents for which coupons will be sent; pamphlet material priced under one dollar which will be ordered from their individual sources and paid for in stamps; films and phonodiscs, which will be ordered direct from their source or distributor; and nontrade items amounting to less than five dollars, which will be ordered direct from their source and paid for by check by the library business office before the bill is forwarded to the Board of School Commissioners.

After this preliminary sorting, the Order Division follows the procedures enumerated below. (Although the processes described are those followed in preparing an order for the jobber, they are carried out with only minor modifications for orders from all sources.)

1. The total list price of items in the order is tabulated for each requisitioning agency.
2. The total list price of the order is determined.
3. The order is typed on multiple order forms.

On each order form is indicated the number of copies desired by each agency requisitioning the title. When the order has been typed, the requisitions, stamped with the date and the word "Ordered," are returned to the original authority agencies (those authorized to requisition first copies); no notification is sent to the duplicate authority agencies (those restricted to requisitioning added copies of titles requisitioned by original authority agencies) whose orders are combined on the requisitions from the original authority agencies. Single requisitions from duplicate authority agencies for titles already in the library collection are similarly stamped and returned to the requesting agency.

Order Forms

The order form used by the Indianapolis Public Library is a multiple copy order form commercially printed according to the
library's specifications. On each, in addition to the necessary bibliographical information, the Order Division records all agencies requisitioning the title, the total number of copies desired, the name of the vendor, and the purchase order number. Like other city agencies, the library must submit its orders on a purchase order form prescribed by the state; we are, however, permitted to attach our order slips to the purchase order, instead of listing the titles directly on that form. Spaces are provided for the Order Division to enter the invoice number and the date upon which the title is released to the Catalog Division.

The Indianapolis Library's multiple order form consists of four copies: the original, to be retained in the outstanding order file; the vendor's copy; the process copy, which accompanies the item to the Catalog Division; and the "pack slip," which with the corresponding copies of the entire order is retained in the "pack file" until such time as all the titles in that order have been either received or finally canceled.

In many libraries additional copies of the multiple order form are used, often as many as nine or ten. Two university libraries, for example, have been reported as using copies for ordering Library of Congress cards as a temporary card in the public catalog, as a temporary shelf list card, as a second copy to the vendor to be returned with the book, as a record for department accounting in the order department, and as a notification to the individual requesting the book of its arrival.

Since each copy of the order forms means added cost both in the purchase price and in the expense of maintaining an added routine or another file, each library must balance these costs against the convenience or operational efficiency afforded by these added files or routines. These gains will not all be found in the order department itself, but in other departments of the library as well; in addition to the obvious correlation between the procedures of the order and the processing departments, the efficiency of the staff dealing with library users may be enhanced and the convenience of the patrons served by routines which entail added costs in time, materials, and personnel in the order department.

The Indianapolis Public Library, for example, does not use LC cards and therefore has no need for an extra copy of the order form to be used in the process of ordering LC cards. Because the Order Division finds it convenient to check in books with the invoice, it does not send to the vendor a second copy of the order form to be returned with the book. Since each agency files a copy of requisitions submitted and since the Order Division places orders as soon as it receives the requisitions, the agency has a record of what has been (or in the immediate future will be) ordered. Though no doubt both staff and library users would find it convenient to have on file in each
agency, as well as at the Information Desk or in the public catalog, a record of the exact date upon which orders have been placed, or of the receipt of materials by the Order Division, this added convenience has not been judged sufficiently urgent to warrant the addition of the processes necessary to perform such routines of notification.

In the effort to improve the speed and accuracy of their ordering and book budget accounting routines, some libraries make use of data processing equipment. When this equipment is employed, a "unit card" for each item is prepared by a keypunch operator. On this card are recorded the bibliographical data, vendor, list number, and agency. If known and readily obtainable, classification number and subject heading are added; otherwise, they are added after receipt and examination of the material.

Cards are duplicated, arranged as agreed upon by the vendor and the library, and listed. One set of cards and the list is forwarded to the vendor for his use; the cards are returned to the library by the vendor in each item which the vendor furnishes. In the meantime, the other set of cards is posted to the agency budget allocations in order to encumber the funds. Upon receipt of the items, the vendor's invoice, and the returned "unit card," the cost price is punched into the latter card. Agency budgets are debited or credited as necessary to reflect expenditures. These "unit cards" are then matched with the duplicate copy on hand and both are made identical. One accompanies the item through processing and becomes the main entry card for bibliographical control. The other is retained in the data processing or order department for additional manipulation as desired (e.g., the number of items, the unit cost and total cost by publisher, cost and/or items by class number). As noted by Wulfekoetter,11 the public libraries of Boston and of Montclair, New Jersey, where IBM cards are used, employ the "unit cards" in the preparation of information pertinent to budget planning, departmental allocation of funds, purchases for adults and children, and additions to special collections.

Some users acquire and control all periodical subscriptions on data processing equipment. In these cases each card indicates title, list price, vendor, length of subscription, expiration date, number of copies, and agency. Lists submitted to jobbers may be accompanied by a duplicate set of cards if useful to the jobber. Also, the cards are used to encumber budgets and show expenditures in a manner similar to the procedure in book acquisition.

The use of such equipment in the acquisition procedures is strongly advocated by Catherine MacQuarrie of the Los Angeles Public Library, who urges: "Some business methods can be applied to books as well as groceries. Then the many files and cross files now kept in order departments could be eliminated and machines used ... Can book ordering be systematized so that machines can be used? Can record keeping in order departments be reduced to tabulating cards so
that lists ... can be made without the endless typing that now goes on in order work? Can invoices, bill payments, and the clearing of records be reduced to machine processes? Can order librarians and vendors solve their mutual problems if they consult more?"12

As long ago as 1953 the Milwaukee Public Library13 was using machine punched cards, in combination with a multiple order form, in the acquisition procedures, as well as in their shelflisting, circulation, registration, and other routines. Of the information to be obtained from punched cards, the Chief of Processing and the Head of the Tabulating Division wrote: "These studies give a basis of facts so we can improve purchasing techniques, know better the character ... of acquisitions, get the most for our money, and smooth the peaks and valleys of our incoming orders, so that we can better organize the continuous flow of work. The necessity for the use of off-hand judgments is minimized." Of the role assumed by the Tabulating Division in the handling of payment for materials, they wrote: "Formerly our office kept four ledger books, but we now need only two typings and one of these is a punched card with many uses; ... and the number of checks issued is being reduced more than 50 per cent."

The University of California Library at Berkeley employs machine punched cards, in combination with multiple order forms and a hectograph master form, to supply necessary order, notification, and cataloging forms for both books and serials and for punched cards to be used for bookkeeping procedures in the acquisitions department.14

The cost of data processing equipment, Wulfekoetter15 points out, has prevented its general adoption by libraries. Those libraries which have adopted it are those which are connected with a larger institution or governmental unit which already possesses the necessary equipment or whose operations are large enough to justify economically the installation of such equipment, and/or which, like the Milwaukee and the Decatur,16 Illinois, Public Libraries, are able to exploit fully its possibilities throughout the library system. In order to keep to the minimum investment, some libraries have begun with only the card punching machine by means of which the essential order information can be transferred to punched cards. In such cases, Wulfekoetter suggests, the punched cards can be taken to the manufacturer's service bureau to be run through the sorting machine for a fixed charge, or possibly a machine in a conveniently located office may be shared.

Some libraries have used marginal punched cards, such as Key-sort, which require no expensive punching or sorting equipment. To eliminate the necessity of typing multiple order forms from the punched cards, marginal punched cards especially designed for acquisition work have been included as part of the multiple order form. If the punched card is carefully planned, Wulfekoetter claims, this "combination can give the library data to be obtained from IBM
cards plus multiple forms without the need of any machine or copying from one form to another."17 Over 30 classifications which can be coded on this type of card are listed by McGaw.18

In their efforts to reduce the amount of typing necessary, a number of libraries utilize Addressograph plates and Multigraph or Multilith stencils in the preparation of orders and other order and catalog records.19 Using these devices effectively means that before the orders are prepared the full cataloging information should be acquired and the decision as to how the book will be cataloged must be made. Further considerations relative to the adoption of the Addressograph for this purpose are that the typing of metal plates is a noisy operation and that the limited size of the Addressograph plate permits only simple cataloging.

Some libraries, for various reasons of internal economy, have preferred to retain the use of order blanks instead of replacing them with multiple order forms.20 Some are not permitted to discontinue the use of order blanks because of the requirements of the institution or the governmental unit with which they are connected. However, that the regulations imposed by such governing bodies may be modified to allow the use of multiple order forms is evidenced by the practice of the Indianapolis Public Library. This library has worked out procedures by which the Order Division transmits to the governing body, the Board of School Commissioners, the purchase order required by law, upon which are entered the name of the vendor, the number of items ordered, and the price, without the necessity of listing each separate item.

Whereas the procedures described in the foregoing pages have consisted of the adaptation of forms and equipment for the purpose of accelerating acquisition routines, those employed by W. B. Ready,21 of the Libraries of Marquette University, and recommended by him as potentially profitable and timesaving for any library, aim at elimination of many of the files and processes considered normal in an acquisitions department. Using the seasonal publishing lists of Publishers' Weekly, he checks forthcoming titles to be ordered. Three duplicate copies are then checked, one to be sent to the book dealer, one to remain in the acquisitions department, and one to be sent to the catalog department, where it will be used to order LC cards. Books are shipped by the dealer accompanied by an invoice, and once a month a bill is presented for payment.

In recommending this method of ordering, Ready writes: "The process of ordering can become exceedingly intricate and expensive, it would seem, of its own volition. When that volition is added to the proper tendency of order librarians to keep control of their expenditures, a very complicated enterprise can result. The more complicated does that enterprise grow, the more it
tends to become tedious and time-consuming . . . any means that can overcome that malaise in the technical processes needs to be prosecuted.”

As he indicates, although in extremely passing fashion, this method of ordering would not be readily acceptable in a library desiring to maintain a strict and accurate accounting of funds committed and funds expended. Furthermore, in libraries such as the Indianapolis Public Library, where each agency requisitions its own materials and is responsible for remaining within its budget, the adoption of this plan would be difficult. However, it is conceivable that if order routines become unbearably burdensome, libraries may seek some simplification such as Ready suggests even though it would entail radical changes in procedures.

Another expedient by which the preparation of book orders might be accelerated is proposed by Harrer and Ladenson.23 Pointing out that all articles in a Sears and Roebuck catalog may be ordered by number, and further, that many publishers already use for their own convenience code numbers for their own books, they recommend that a system be evolved by which each publisher in the United States be assigned a code number and that each book brought out by these publishers be assigned such a number—the two numbers used together serving to identify volume and publisher for both the library and the vendor. Such a system, the authors believe, would not only lessen the clerical work of the library and simplify the work of the vendor, but would also prevent confusion about editions and publication dates.

Hard-to-Get and Out-of-Print Books; Foreign Language Books

For many libraries, especially academic, materials in the above categories constitute a major problem. For the Indianapolis Public Library, however, where the larger portion of book purchases are current titles, the relatively few out-of-print and foreign language books which we purchase are acquired through checking dealers’ catalogs and by ordering direct from the dealer. To the acquisitions department requiring many out-of-print titles, J. E. Skipper 24 suggests that want lists be sent to such periodicals as the Antiquarian Bookman, which circulates to a large number of dealers, or that a mimeographed list be placed with a group of several dealers, asking that they report on the items in stock. Either method will allow the acquisitions librarian to compare prices on some of the items. Skipper further suggests that if both these methods fail to bring all desired items, the library may then place a list of the remaining titles exclusively with one dealer for a given period of time; at the end of that period those titles not produced may be placed with another dealer. If the dealer is known to be dependable, he may be commissioned to send any titles
priced under a certain amount, and thus eliminate the time and paper work involved in correspondence about them.

A service offered to libraries wanting both out-of-print titles and in-print items not handled by the conventional jobber is that of Superbooks (White Plains, N.Y.), which, according to the Library Journal, is used with satisfaction by many libraries, including the New York Public Library. This service offers to locate out-of-print books and to supply those advertised at reasonable prices and to quote, before supplying, those which appear at questionably high prices. In-print titles not handled by the library's regular jobber will be ordered direct from their sources. According to the Library Journal, Superbooks pays directly to the source for the items ordered and bills the library monthly; thus the jobber assumes much of the burden of correspondence and paper work involved in this type of work and is often able to obtain a much greater discount than could the library. The jobber's charge for this service is 20 per cent of the wholesale price plus postage, or a minimum of 75 cents per item.

Checking-in Books

The contract made by the Indianapolis Board of School Commissioners with vendors specifies that each shipment of books be accompanied, or immediately followed, by an invoice in duplicate. Upon the arrival of the invoice, the order forms for items listed on it are matched with the invoice and the books received. After the books have been examined for their physical condition, the order and process forms for those items which have checked out satisfactorily are dated, the process forms are attached to the books, and the books are forwarded to the Catalog Division. Any adjustments necessary because of price changes are made in the estimated record; and the original order forms are filed in the received file, where they are retained for approximately one month, chiefly as a source of information concerning items about which requisitioning agencies may inquire.

Reports, Cancellations, and Claims

Under terms of our contract, the vendor is required to report in writing any title in the order which is temporarily out of stock, which is issued by a publisher whose books he cannot handle, which is not yet published, or which is out of print and therefore unavailable. The vendor will order books temporarily out of stock, will hold orders for titles not yet published, and will cancel orders for books which he cannot furnish or which are out of print. Cancellation of orders for items not obtainable either from the jobber or from the publisher is recorded on the process copy of the order form, the form is forwarded to the Coordinator of Adult or Children's Services as notification, and the necessary amount is credited to the agency's account in the
estimated record. The original copy of the order form is filed in the cancellation file.

The extent to which forms are employed by any library to communicate with the vendor concerning reports, cancellations, necessary adjustments, and other unfinished business is determined by the frequency and number of such inquiries. These factors, in turn, are determined by the volume of materials purchased by the library and the percentage of materials ordered which it is difficult to procure or which must be ordered from vendors unaccustomed to dealing with libraries. The Indianapolis Public Library has not found it necessary to prepare forms for such communications. Many acquisitions departments, however, have found it useful to employ added copies of the multiple order form and/or form letters for this purpose.26

Payment of Bills
When all corrections and adjustments in the invoice have been satisfactorily made, the next step is to present them for payment. In the Indianapolis Public Library, those bills which are under five dollars are forwarded to the library business office, where they are paid by check from the petty cash account. Bills of five dollars or more must be forwarded to the Board of School Commissioners for payment. Since by law these bills must be accompanied by an affidavit signed by the vendor, each order of five dollars or more, when sent, is accompanied by an affidavit, or a "Vendor's Invoice Claim Blank," with the request that the vendor supply the information requested on the form: the date of the invoice, the vendor's invoice number, and the amount of the invoice. This certificate of nonpayment of money due is returned with the invoice, checked with the invoice by the Order Librarian, and approved by the Director. Twice a month a bill list is made up and forwarded to the Board for payment, accompanied by one copy of each invoice and by the certified affidavits. The duplicate and triplicate copies of the bill list are filed in the Order Division and in the library business office.

At the end of the month all expenditures for materials are entered on the cash record showing the amount actually spent for each of the adult Central agencies and the totals for the juvenile agencies, the adult extension agencies, and the School Services Department. Since the cash record is one of the tools used to determine the average discount received on materials purchased for each agency, the list price of materials as well as the actual cost is recorded here.

Conclusion
While each library has its own procedures, based upon its own needs, obligations, and resources, a backward glance over this paper serves to remind library administrators that equipment and procedures may be altered in the interests of economy and efficiency; that no
library has, as yet, discovered the only possible nor probably the best possible procedures, forms, and division of work to accomplish the task of ordering and receiving library materials; and that the library's decision concerning the investment of funds in labor-and time-saving equipment and forms will have to be based upon an exact knowledge of the balance between these costs and those of employing a larger work force needed when these items are not acquired—plus an assessment of the availability to the library of qualified employees. Certainly it is to be expected that the present trend among libraries to set up regional centers and to foster cooperation among individual libraries in their buying and cataloging, by increasing the volume of order work to be done in any one center, may make more economically sound the use of bookkeeping and data processing equipment and various preprinted forms for ordering, claiming, listing, and notification.

The vagaries, however, of libraries' individualistic purchasing practices in relation to vendors and their effect upon the cost of procuring materials need to be considered carefully. Publishers and dealers complain of the lack of uniform practices among libraries and point to the special processing which these variations require as an important cost factor. Daniel Melcher,27 in discussing the proposal of the R. R. Bowker Company to add a charge of one dollar to every order processed which requires the processing of an affidavit, or voucher, of nonpayment, points out that this one extra routine adds to the publisher's or dealer's cost in filling the library's order and so ultimately to that of filling all orders. Other special demands by some libraries—that extra copies of invoices be furnished or that all back-ordered titles in any one order be filled before payment is made for any of the books included in that order—have made service slower and costs higher.

Most of the special requirements cited in the foregoing paragraph are those imposed upon libraries by the purchasing regulations of the institutions, governmental units, or other authorities under which they operate. What effect the rigid application of such regulations may have upon the ordering procedures of a library is pointed up by the case history of an industrial library reported in Special Libraries.28 This library, among other absurdities, was required by central purchasing office regulations to submit the requisition for each item on a separate purchase order. As a result, the cost of processing one purchase request was estimated to be seven dollars.

To libraries bound to rigid adherence to purchasing procedures unsuitable to library materials purchasing operations, Melcher says, "In many public institutions it has been necessary to do no more than discuss with the city financial fathers the important distinction between procedures set up for procuring carloads of coal and those more suitable for procuring books. Often it has been easy to agree on special procedures for books . . . to the considerable advantage both
of the city and the library."29 That it is possible to secure modification of such regulations is borne out by the experience of at least one university library, as reported by S. E. Matthews.30

H. R. Galvin,31 a librarian turned vendor when his library became distributor for a local history of the county which the library serves, submits the following complaints concerning special requirements of libraries: requests to submit invoices in duplicate, triplicate, quadruplicate, and quintuplicate; requests to enclose specified color of order slip in book with shipment; stating that labels and packing must bear purchase order number; asking that invoices be submitted to one address and books shipped to another; special invoice forms for supplier to complete; special affidavits supplied for vendor to sign and supply with invoice; notices that orders are automatically canceled if shipment is not received by specified date (often a date in advance of the announced date of publication); and a variety of demands about shipping charges.

Both Melcher and Galvin suggest that studies be made which would result in the establishment of standards of desirable ordering procedures. Such standards, established with the backing of the American Library Association, would encourage libraries to examine their own practices and would assist those handicapped by legal or institutional requirements to bring pressure to have these requirements modified in the interests of economy and efficiency. As Galvin writes, "Even laws are written by men . . ."32
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BLANKET BOOK ORDERING

Lewis C. Coffin

"Most of the great rarities in this huge treasure room are here because of the conquests of my country's armies over a period of several centuries," explained a European national librarian as he guided me through his collections. I am certain that neither that librarian nor anyone here would advocate this technique for blanket book acquisitions, but what blanket ordering techniques are we using and what do some of the critics think of these procedures for obtaining the current publications that our readers and research workers require?

Obviously, with the multiplicity of existing plans, it will be impossible for me to touch upon more than a few. I have chosen, therefore, to explore the blanket order system of the Library of Congress, its All-the-Books Plan, the LC PL-480 Program and the Farmington Plan, the Greenaway Plan, and the University Press Plan.

Library of Congress Blanket Order System

In 1951 a review of Library of Congress' recommending and ordering procedures for the purchase of books published abroad revealed that there were great delays between the receipt of bibliographies and the eventual placing of orders for current materials. Many of the titles requested were in short supply and just not available by the time the Library's orders reached the dealers. A means for alleviating this situation without adding to the recommending and processing staff was needed immediately. The Library's experience with one or two modified blanket orders with foreign dealers had been good, and it was suggested that a limited expansion of these arrangements might be beneficial.

It was believed that the Library's acquisitions policy might lend itself very well to the blanket order technique since the Library has for many years attempted to collect extensively the current publications of the world in most fields of knowledge with two notable exceptions: clinical medicine and technical agriculture (unless the medical and agricultural publications are issued by national governments). Traditionally, the Library of Congress has attempted to collect through exchange arrangements the official publications at the national level.

Lewis C. Coffin is Associate Director, Processing Department, Library of Congress.
of foreign governments regardless of subject content. Technical agriculture and clinical medicine are usually excepted because of the comprehensive acquisitions programs of the Library's sister institutions, the National Agricultural Library and the National Library of Medicine, whose specialized and extensive collections the Library of Congress does not wish to duplicate.

In addition to the medical and agricultural exceptions, the Library is selective in its acquisition of currently published textbooks, reprints, extracts, and separates. The last three are excluded when the Library's collections contain the serial or other publications in which the material originally appeared.

At the outset, the Library expanded its blanket order acquisitions to cover the current monographs published in 11 Western European countries. At the present time it has 206 such orders, approximately half of which are for legal materials. Each blanket order specifies that the holder of the order, who may be a dealer, a university, a U.S. official at a foreign post, or some other agent of the Library of Congress, is authorized either to purchase and send current publications in all fields of knowledge with the exceptions which I have mentioned and certain other exceptions which may be peculiar to the area, or to purchase and forward current publications in specific subject fields. In countries where national bibliographies are issued currently the agent is instructed to send by airmail two copies of the current issues one of which he marks to indicate those titles which are being sent, those titles which he plans to send, and those about which he has questions. When the marked bibliography is received, it is checked by the Library's recommending officers for titles which in their opinion should not have been selected by the blanket order holder and for recommendation of additional titles. This bibliography is then reviewed in the Order Division for compliance with the terms of the blanket order, for compliance with the Library's acquisitions policies, and for search of the additional recommendations. Appropriate orders are then placed with the dealer, and he is advised periodically on his compliance.

During the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1962, the Library received slightly over 30,000 dealer-selected monographs through its foreign blanket orders. Of this number 7,508 were from countries in which the blanket order dealers used the bibliographies to check their sendings; the remainder came from areas which either do not have national bibliographies or whose bibliographies are issued too late to be useful for checking purposes. Upon review of the checked, airmailed bibliographies, the Library's recommending officers recommended the purchase of 19,300 additional listed titles. To complete the picture for the year, the recommending officers also had purchase orders placed, outside the blanket order system, for some 22,000 current monographs published abroad.
Subscriptions for serials are placed on an individual title basis, not under the blanket order system but every blanket order holder is requested to send a sample copy of each new serial appearing in his area or subject field.

The blanket order system has proved to be especially advantageous in acquiring important foreign books automatically and quickly after publication. It has the advantage, too, of insuring receipt of commercial publications which are issued in small editions. The problems incidental to inaccurate bibliographical description have decreased considerably, since the blanket order dealer determines by inspection whether the materials conform to the Library's specifications. Probably the strongest point in favor of the blanket order system is that persons familiar with the book output of a country and its languages make the initial selections.

The blanket order system works best in those areas where the book trade is well organized and in which up-to-date catalogs or national bibliographies are currently published. The in-between area can be productive, but when both of these circumstances are lacking, the system can be characterized only as "better than nothing."

Those persons who are responsible for the administration of acquisitions and who are familiar with the former ordering procedures feel that the advantages of prompt receipt of new works, the improved coverage, and the relative ease of administration and operation of the blanket order system far outweigh some of the recognized disadvantages such as training book dealers to supply items wanted.

All-The-Books Plan

One of the great sources for the acquisition of American publications at the Library of Congress is the system of copyright deposits. Many persons assume that the copyright coverage is complete and that receipt of the materials is timely. Neither assumption is correct. A great many of the publications issued in the United States are not subject to copyright registration and many claimants whose works are registerable may not file applications for periods ranging from several months to several years after publication date. These weaknesses in the copyright deposit system made it necessary for the Library to make special arrangements for the acquisition of books, not only for the Library's collections but also those needed for cataloging purposes so that printed card orders from American libraries could be filled promptly.

As a result of the Library's efforts to make available printed catalog cards for new American trade books by the time the books are released for sale at the bookstores, the Library received from 3,200 American publishers in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, nearly 17,000 review copies--most of which came to the Library from
several days to several weeks before publication date. Following their cataloging, the books were held in locked cases until the publication date arrived.

This program had its beginnings in 1952 when the Library appointed Alan L. Heyneman as its New York representative to seek the cooperation of publishing houses, publishers' associations, and trade journals, and, with their advice, to develop procedures under which the plan would operate.

By the fall of 1959, it was found that although the program was increasingly successful, it did not provide copies of all the new books needed for cataloging. At that time, the Library entered into supplementary arrangements with the R. R. Bowker Company to borrow for cataloging purposes titles received by Publishers' Weekly and the Library Journal which had not come to the Library either through its Copyright Office or from the publishers. In return, the Library supplies full cataloging information, including subject headings and Dewey decimal numbers, for listing in Publishers' Weekly and in the American Book Publishing Record.

The arrangement with the R. R. Bowker Company aids the Library's acquisition program by providing an opportunity for examination of the books and selection of those titles which must be ordered for the Library's collections.

In order to complete the bibliographical control picture, it should be mentioned that twenty American publishers and book distributors are now cooperating with the Library by making sets of Library of Congress catalog cards available with the books they sell to libraries.

The Library of Congress PL-480 Program

The Library of Congress PL-480 Program is made possible by funds appropriated by Congress under the terms of the Agricultural Trade, Development, and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 83-480) as amended by Public Law 85-931. The amendment to Title I (Section 104 (n)) authorizes the Librarian of Congress, in consultation with the National Science Foundation and other interested agencies, to use foreign currencies, within such appropriations as are made by Congress, for the purchase of foreign publications; for cataloging, indexing, abstracting and related activities; and for deposit of such materials in libraries and research centers in the United States specializing in the areas to which they relate.

Although the amendment was signed into law in September 1958, the first appropriation of funds to implement it became available on August 10, 1961. The report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations noted that the sum provided would be used for the acquisition of foreign library materials available from the United Arab Republic, India, and Pakistan, for the support of salaries and other expenses. 
incidental to maintaining offices in these countries and for the salary of the Coordinator in Washington. It was contemplated that the appropriation ($400,000 including 36,500 hard dollars) would defray the costs of establishing the program and of operating it on a project basis for six months.

Less than two months after the first appropriation bill was signed by the President, the Library had a survey team visiting India and Pakistan. A few weeks later a second team was exploring program arrangements in the United Arab Republic. Within a remarkably brief time, these survey teams were able to locate and rent suitable office space, procure necessary equipment, select and hire key personnel, and locate suitable acquisitions sources.

During the period of exploration and survey, invitations to participate in the program were sent to a list of American research libraries selected with the aid of a subcommittee of the Librarian's Advisory Committee on Public Law 480.

By late December 1961, the following institutions, in addition to Library of Congress, had accepted invitations to participate in the program:

**INDIA/PAKISTAN**

University of California (Berkeley)
University of Chicago
Cornell University
Duke University
University of Hawaii
University of Minnesota
University of Pennsylvania
University of Texas
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin
Yale University

**THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC**

University of California (Los Angeles)
Columbia University
Hartford Seminary Foundation (sharing its set with Portland State College)
Harvard University
Indiana University
University of Michigan
New York Public Library
Princeton University
University of Utah
University of Virginia
Following the appropriation of funds for the current fiscal year ($678,000 including 48,000 hard dollars), six additional libraries were invited to participate in the India/Pakistan Project and eight in the UAR Project. As this paper was written, acceptances had not been received from all those invited.

Each of the participating institutions has contributed $500 toward the dollar support of the program and has agreed to report receipts to the National Union Catalog and to make materials acquired available to other libraries either by interlibrary loan or in photographic copies.

At present, the program is limited to the acquisition of currently published issuances, but within this limitation the scope in all three areas is virtually all embracing. Trade publications, government documents at both the state and national level, periodicals, newspapers, and the publications of societies, associations, and academic institutions are all included in the shipments from the PL 480 offices. In addition to Egyptian publications, the project office in Cairo attempts to acquire current publications issued in other countries of the Arab world available in the United Arab Republic.

By September 30, 1962, nearly 700,000 publications had been acquired and shipped or were awaiting shipment. Of this number over half a million had been acquired in India, nearly 75,000 in Pakistan, and over 110,000 from the UAR. It is anticipated that during the next calendar year approximately 1.5 million pieces will be acquired.

The Farmington Plan

The Farmington Plan for the cooperative acquisition of foreign publications was born in a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Librarians' Council (a group of librarians and others informally convened to advise the Library of Congress on national programs) in Farmington, Connecticut, on October 9, 1942. The urgency behind the proposal was the war-born need for foreign publications. Attention had been called to the fact that almost every research library in the United States purchased foreign books, but each library bought the "best books" for its purpose. It was found that there were in this country many copies of the "best books," a few copies of the better books, and great gaps in the entire list of informative books.

The Plan was designed, therefore, to assure that there should be in some collection in the country at least one copy of every current foreign publication of research value. This was the primary objective of the Plan. A secondary objective was to reduce the burdens upon library budgets by dividing the work of foreign acquisitions. Still a third objective was to make it possible for the worker in any subject area to know instantly where to turn for the books in that field.

Although during and just after the war years there were several actions designed to set the Plan into operation, actual functioning was
delayed until January 1, 1948, following completion of the Library of Congress mission in Europe (a project which made available to libraries in the United States foreign books of research value published during World War II).

By the time the Farmington Plan was put into operation, each of the participating libraries, selected upon the basis of their holdings and research in specific fields, had been assigned a priority to receive and pay for, and had agreed to make available for use, one copy of each book of research value (within the acquisitions limits of the Plan) on subjects assigned to them, published in the countries then covered by the Plan. In each of the selected countries an agent, either a library or a bookseller of proven reputation, was chosen to be responsible for subject coverage among the current publications of the country. During 1948, the material chosen was sent to libraries in the United States through the offices of the Plan, then at the New York Public Library when in 1949 arrangements were made to have dealers ship the publications directly to the various libraries, the dealers or agents thus became responsible not only for the selection but also for the distribution.

The revised and abridged edition of the Farmington Plan Handbook notes that two different patterns have been followed under the Plan:

(1) Subject responsibilities have been the basis for allocation of the publications of Western European nations and a few others ... (while beginning in 1952)
(2) Country responsibilities have been accepted for many countries, particularly those having languages that few American libraries are prepared to handle and those in which the book trade is poorly organized.¹

Under the subject responsibility procedure, a dealer in each country attempts to obtain a copy of each new book published in his country that falls within the scope of the Plan and sends it to the library responsible for the subject it treats. The subject allocations are based upon the Library of Congress classification. Under the country responsibility procedure, a single American library assumes responsibility for all publications of a country and makes its own arrangements for acquisitions.

There are 28 classes of material which the dealers are not to supply to libraries under the subject responsibility procedure. These range from almanacs, annuals, and bibles, through maps, medicine and music scores, to textbooks, theology, theses, and translations from a modern language, with United Nations publications on the end of the list. The UN publications are regarded as official documents.

Not all of these exclusions apply to the country responsibility libraries.
They are expected to acquire "periodicals, documents of research value, and, at least in some cases, representative newspapers."

Since 1944 the Farmington Plan has been administered by the Association of Research Libraries. In 1953 the Association issued the Farmington Plan Handbook, which contains an extensive bibliography; the revised and abridged edition mentioned above appeared in 1961, with a supplementary bibliography.

The most exhaustive evaluation of the Plan is the Farmington Plan Survey, prepared for the Association of Research Libraries under the direction of Robert Vosper and Robert L. Talmadge and published in 1959. The surveyors found that, while the Farmington Plan's objective had been worldwide in scope from the beginning, it had tended to become identified with acquisitions from western Europe and with the system of allocations by subject that had been developed for that area. Meanwhile several other organizations had become active with a variety of committees and acquisitions objectives. As a result of this finding, the Farmington Plan Committee was reconstituted, and to its existing specialized area resources committees (Far Eastern, Middle Eastern, and Slavic and East European) were added four others: African, Latin American, South Asian, and Western European.

The survey also indicated that the Farmington Plan machinery was not nearly achieving uniform coverage of the publications it was supposed to bring to the United States. As a group, American research libraries were acquiring 96 per cent of French works on economics listed in two journals in the field, but 33 per cent of these works were not supplied on the Farmington Plan. There were similar shortcomings in both Scandinavian and Spanish literatures, although in both cases the Farmington Plan library was receiving a substantial number of books acquired by no other American collection.

Prior to the survey, there had been growing doubts of the need for continuing the Farmington Plan in western Europe; it was supposed that normal research library acquisitions might have increased during the preceding decade to such an extent that, without any plan, they would bring to the United States at least one copy of everything that was worth having. Studies made in the course of the survey did not support this theory. A random sampling of Farmington Plan receipts indicated that 38.5 per cent were held only by the library to which they had come under the Plan; an additional 14.5 per cent were held only by this library and the Library of Congress. Of the unique items, moreover, it was ascertained that nearly two-thirds would probably not have been acquired if the Plan were not in operation. Finally, more than half of this group (12.5 per cent of all receipts) were appraised as desirable items. On the debit side, 9 per cent of the total were of dubious value.2
At the present time 64 libraries are participating in the Farmington Plan, and its coverage has been extended to 146 countries, large and small. From 16 countries, 12 of which are in western Europe, Farmington Plan libraries in 1961 received 17,951 volumes at an average cost of $3.86 per volume. Statistics are available only for those countries in which an agent supplies publications in accordance with subject responsibilities and sends copies of bills to the Farmington Plan Office. Libraries have not found it practicable to supply statistics of receipts from countries that are assigned to a single library because exchange and various other channels of procurement are also used.

Despite its shortcomings, much is being accomplished by the Farmington Plan. It continues to grow, and there is reason to hope that eventually its geographic coverage may become worldwide and its category exclusions considerably reduced.

With the appointment of Dr. James E. Skipper as Executive Secretary of the Association of Research Libraries and the prospective opening of the ARL office in Washington next January, it is anticipated that the Farmington Plan Office will be absorbed by it and that much more assistance will be available to the Farmington Plan Committee than heretofore.

The Greenaway Plan

Emerson Greenaway, Director of the Free Library of Philadelphia and the originator of the "contract plan" that bears his name, arranged in 1958 with the J. B. Lippincott Company to receive before publication date one copy of each trade title which it published. The "contract plan" is designed: (1) to put new publications into the library for review and selection purposes as far ahead of publication date as possible, (2) to enable the library to place bulk orders for duplicates before publication date, (3) to permit cataloging and duplication of catalog cards before receipt of the bulk shipment, (4) to expedite the processing of duplicate copies as they arrive, (5) to reduce paper work, (6) to develop a less costly arrangement than the one used formerly, and (7) to put new publications in the hands of readers at the earliest possible moment. The publisher charges a service fee based upon his average per-title costs. Since 1958 the Free Library has entered into similar agreements with a number of other publishers.

Public libraries for years have attempted to secure review copies of books prior to publication date, but with closer printing schedules this practice has become increasingly difficult to follow. Under the contract plan, one copy of each new trade title is mailed in the same mailing with copies which are sent to the reviewing journals. This is an automatic procedure on the part of the publisher and
ensures the library a copy of the new title as soon as anyone else gets it. The staff immediately review the book, and there is less reliance upon published reviews. Titles rejected are ultimately discarded.

The contract plan is advantageous to publishers only when a library can purchase multiple copies of a given title. The bulk order for these copies is sent to a book jobber who supplies them as soon as they come in from the publisher. The reduction of clerical routines (only one invoice each year) and the fact that there are no returns or adjustments save money for the publisher. The greater discount received enables the library to select those titles which it wishes to keep, discard those titles not wanted, and still not have the contract plan more costly than the older arrangement.

The test of the plan is whether or not new titles are being made available to the public more rapidly. The Free Library finds that it is receiving most titles prior to publication, many as far as four weeks in advance. Under the old system the reader had to wait from a week to a month or more before finding a newly-published book on the library's shelves.3

J. A. McKaughan, Vice President and Head of Distribution of the J. B. Lippincott Company, reported that his firm had offered the contract plan to the large library systems of the country whose book purchase budgets were large enough to justify the expense. As of June 1, 1960, 24 library systems had accepted the offer. Lippincott hopes, in time, to refine the plan so that smaller library systems may participate in it on a modified basis. Mr. McKaughan emphasized that this plan is just the opposite of acquisition en bloc; it affords additional time for the library staff to evaluate all the new books: "We believe librarians prefer to know what is in a book before it is placed in circulation, and to supply this knowledge there is no substitute for the book itself."4

Harold L. Roth, writing as the librarian of a medium-sized public library (East Orange, N.J.) agrees with the above. He adds that the plan enables a library selection staff to examine some books which would never receive journal reviews. The success of the program in East Orange Public Library is attributed to the fact that sufficient staff is available to cope with the large number of books coming in. Mr. Roth believes that a library with only one or two professional staff members could not spare the time to have them review new titles under a broad coverage unless they cooperated with the staffs of other nearby libraries.5

John R. Banister, Director of Libraries, W. C. Bradley Memorial Library, Columbus, Ga., writes:

We in this public library system have been carrying out in a rather informal way the purchasing of advance copies of books as suggested by Emerson Greenaway. Our theory is not only to receive
the book for advance reviewing, but to actually have at least one
copy of the book ready and available when the major reviews break.

We now have a working arrangement with some 44 major publishers
--either direct with the publishers or his representative--to re-
ceive one advance copy each of all adult titles as published.6

The editor of the Library Journal commented upon the Plan as
follows:

The Greenaway Plan is admirable in its motives, and again we see
no objection to it as applied by the larger public libraries and the
larger publishers. If we have any lingering doubt, it is that per-
haps all libraries participating are not using it as a method to
help them review books themselves before publication, but merely
as a way of getting one copy of everything put out by cooperating
publishers cheaply as well as quickly. How many of these libraries
face up to the decision to discard books for which they have al-
ready paid, but which they would otherwise not have placed on
their shelves?

We have some doubts too about the application of an amended or
abbreviated version of this plan for medium-sized or smaller
libraries. This implies a degree of pre-selection by publishers
which should be undesirable in the eyes of professional librarians.

With this reservation we get near to the fundamental objection of
those who have dismissed these book-buying practices as 'get-'em-
all' methods. Librarians, say the objectors, by employing these
methods, are abrogating their prime professional responsibility
for book selection. If this were so, we should have to line up with
the objectors, for the librarian's responsibility for, and ability in,
book selection is surely his raison d'être, the factor which places
him apart and makes him a professional. But is it so? We think
not. To select when it is unnecessary is as wasteful and as stupid
as the performance of any other superfluous task. There is al-
ways the danger that something holy can easily become a sacred
cow. Those who wage indiscriminate war on behalf of the sanctity
of book selection are in danger of precipitating this process.

The Greenaway Plan, says its originator, "is a method to ensure
an early receipt of books and should not be confused with book
selection." 7

The University Press Plan

In his 1957-1958 report as director of the libraries of Ohio State
University, Lewis C. Branscomb wrote: "During the year a blanket
order was established whereby the Libraries receive before
publication date the offerings of forty-seven university presses, thereby making these books available more promptly and securing higher discounts." 8 Within a year LeRoy C. Merritt commented upon Mr. Branscomb's report, asking whether or not it was really possible to maintain that all of the books acquired under the plan were appropriate and necessary additions to the Ohio State University Libraries, whether or not books found to be inappropriate were ever thrown away, and whether or not the costs of cataloging possibly unnecessary books were being added to the cheaper acquisitions cost. 9

Two former staff members of the Ohio State University Libraries replied by pointing out that

... a long and careful survey of individual orders as recommended by the faculty for university press publications revealed that the library ordered more than 90 per cent of the total output from 47 university presses. ... the other ten per cent were easily ruled out by establishing ground rules to the effect that the presses were to supply no reprints, paperbacks, serials, sets, annuals, yearbooks, syllabi, laboratory manuals and purely teaching aids .... further ... a measure of selection occurs in that presses can be dropped from the plan and new ones added as experience dictates. 10

Rolland E. Stevens, Associate Director, Technical Services, Ohio State University Libraries, added the following information:

... The blanket orders for publications of major university presses in this country were placed with a single dealer. Through this arrangement, we: a) receive books within a few days after publication; b) receive wanted books we might otherwise have overlooked; c) receive a slightly better discount than by ordering selectively; and d) cut through a large part of the paper work of ordering selectively. Not the least advantage is having the book cataloged for use before, rather than weeks after a need for the book is made known. The appreciation of the faculty for this kind of service on a number of different occasions sold us on the plan. 11

Messrs. Jacob and Salisbury of the Michigan State University Library described the processes and results of their investigations in this field, concluding that university or large college libraries with annual book budgets of more than $100,000 can justifiably buy all, or nearly all, of the annual output of the leading university presses of the country. Their study, based upon the results of a questionnaire sent to 35 presses (all but two or three answered) and a comparison of costs between placing direct orders with each press (with greater discounts) and a single blanket order through a jobber (with lesser discounts but fewer invoices), persuaded them that although the latter
arrangement cost them $300 a year in discounts, it had the very important advantage of eliminating the catalog checking, verification, and ordering of all order card requests for university press publications.12

Conclusion

The plans which we have explored have been activated since World War II in an effort to cope with the ever-increasing product of the world’s presses. It is evident that administrators of large and medium-sized libraries are very much aware of the need to cut their costs of selection and acquisition and to improve the coverage in and service of their collections of both domestic and foreign publications.

None of the plans works perfectly, but all of them contribute to these objectives.
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COOPERATIVE BOOK SELECTION AND BOOK ORDERING

Henry T. Drennan

Here we will consider cooperative book selection and cooperative book ordering. These topics commonly related by function are also related in this paper by mode of organization—cooperation.

Book selection and book ordering are sequential parts of the acquisition function. The American Library Association Glossary defines book selection as "The process of choosing books for library collections."¹ We find in the glossary no definition for "book ordering," but we may propose that book ordering is the administrative and clerical procedures conducted to obtain material by purchase, gift, or exchange. We will treat later the cooperative organization of the acquisitions function, but first let us consider the word cooperation. Cooperation, with us, is a value word—good to librarians, good in our society. We read in a history of freedom that "man rose in the world primarily by cooperating, not struggling with his fellows."² The word and the idea of cooperation are woven, as well, into the literature and practice of librarianship. The standards for public library service say:

Libraries working together, sharing their services and materials, can meet the full needs of their users. This cooperative approach on the part of libraries is the most important single recommendation of the document. Without joint action, most American libraries probably will never be able to come up to the standard necessary to meet the needs of their constituencies.³

There are historical, social, and technical reasons for this view of the importance of cooperation. The book as an object lends itself to cooperative organization, for its intrinsic worth is not consumed by use. Too, there is Benjamin Franklin's historical precedent for the cooperative organization of libraries in his circulating library scheme. We may sometimes wonder if some of Poor Richard's well advertised frugality has not persisted even to the present library scene.

The Difficulties of Defining “Cooperation”

Although librarians have practiced and written of cooperation, their lively interest, expressed in print, has presented some problems of definition. Indeed, the word cooperation has been a coin of such common currency that it has lost its precise denotation—it now lacks exact definition. Ralph Esterquest has proposed that cooperation is “any manifestation of a conscious endeavor among librarians to increase or improve library services through joint action involving two or more libraries or institutions not part of a simple administrative organization.”

One mode of defining cooperation might simply be to list all the objectives which librarians have assigned to cooperation and to treat them with whatever emphasis seems appropriate. In 1941 Herbert Kellar listed three principal cooperative objectives: (1) a minimum national standard of at least one copy somewhere in the country of every book that might conceivably be consulted, (2) location control—a national catalog, and (3) improving and expanding library machinery for lending, copying, exchanging, giving, and purchasing desired titles. To Kellar’s objectives for cooperation, Esterquest has added another: increased collection resources by area agreements for specialization. These are tasks worthy of joint efforts, and if the cooperative approach had been limited solely to these, we could not be accused of making small plans.

When speaking of cooperation librarians seem to mean three things by the word: co-working, reciprocity, and simple agreement. For example, librarians have worked together to produce a union list of serials; they have reciprocated in lending privileges and rules for interlibrary lending. But under common agreement they have conducted the greatest share of what they mean by “cooperation.” Although the ALA Glossary includes no definition per se of cooperation, its definition of “Cooperating Library,” uses the term “common plan,” which, we believe, is the operative sense in which the word is generally used and the sense in which it will be used in this discussion.

The Literature of Cooperation

Although the literature of cooperation is substantial, it offers some difficulties as a record. The major difficulty is in sorting what is being contemplated from what is being achieved. Related to this problem is the near impossibility of determining the fate of cooperative projects.

Since 1935, 198 articles have been indexed in Library Literature under the rubric “Cooperation” alone. This total does not exhaust the subject—a larger count would be achieved if the various subheadings on cooperation were considered. Recently the literature on cooperation has increased: 37 per cent of all articles on cooperation published in the last 27 years appeared in 1956-1958. If there is a
correlation between publication and practice, cooperative activities have increased sharply in the decade of the 1950's and the first years of the 1960's.

The table below presents the frequency of appearance of articles on "Cooperation" listed in Library Literature:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To this writer there is no doubt of a general interest in cooperation among librarians; yet the greater frequency with which academic librarians express themselves in print should give them the edge, numerically, in their authorship of articles on cooperation written from 1935 to 1961. However, a count of the authorship of articles gives the lead to public librarians:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic librarians</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special librarians</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsigned</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public librarians</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty library schools</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presentation above does not reflect the continuing nature of the academic librarians' interest. Their articles have appeared regularly over the years while 30 of the public library articles appeared in one year--1956.

Two major publications reporting library cooperation have appeared since 1956. The PLD Reporter for November 1956 was devoted to the "Cooperative Practices of Public Libraries." The issue, as the editors noted, was concerned with "particular fact situations." It was graced, too, by a fine theoretical article by the late Robert D.
Leigh, "The Background of Inter-library Cooperation" reprinted from the California Librarian. Perhaps the most useful value of the entire issue is its accurate portrayal of the nature of public library cooperation at that time. One should not assume that the picture is now accurate, for change has occurred rapidly since the inauguration of the Library Services Act in 1957.

Two years after the appearance of the PLD Reporter issue, Library Trends devoted an issue to cooperation. The issue, "Building Library Resources through Cooperation," edited by Ralph Esterquest, paid more attention to the cooperative practices of academic libraries than it did public libraries.

The Bibliography of Cooperation

In 1955 John Carson Rather wrote an excellent bibliographical essay on cooperation for the California State Library.7 The Rather essay was followed in 1958 by Dorothy Bendix's paper, "Regional Processing for Public Libraries."8 The subject of Miss Bendix's article, more limited than its predecessor, concerned itself with the main trust of public library cooperative interest after 1957--technical services. In 1961, Evelyn Day Mullen published her report "Regional Processing for Public Libraries." Miss Mullen noted the continuing interest for and growth of centralized processing in public libraries and hoped that

... the next 18 months to 2 years will see some articles on processing centers which include well-documented information on costs, both capital outlay and operating, staffing and work loads. Also greatly needed are evaluations of the machines used by the various centers ... 9

The essays by Bendix and Mullen are more limited in scope on the subject area of cooperation than Rather's paper; yet they all agree to the need of a better focus on the record of cooperation. One can join in the hope that a more informative body of literature be developed and that librarians will develop a more nearly complete research record of cooperative activities. The case-study technique could be one method of providing usable information upon present cooperative practices.

Library Organization and Consumer Cooperatives

In the 1930's cooperation was not merely a traditional way of performing tasks in America--it was being re-examined as an approach that would soften the rigors of a severe economic depression. In 1933 consumer cooperatives grew to their largest number, 11,000. Ernest Lindley, writing of California, explained their increase in terms that referred to a past agrarian husbandry and a bleak present:
Cooperatives seem to be the offspring of such thoroughly American customs as the quilting bee, the cornhusking, the ladies aid society, the church fair and the rummage sale—not to mention such traditions of boyhood as the swapping of tops and jack knives. It was a method by which a large number of individuals and self-reliant people, many of whom had been brought up in small towns in the Middle West sought to provide for themselves some of the essentials which the established economic system suddenly denied them.10

The cooperative practices of librarians, like the husking bee, long antedated the consumer cooperative of the 1930's. In the nineteenth century Charles Jewett had dreamed from the brick battlemented Smithsonian Institution of a National Library and catalog. The Library Bureau and the Library Journal, too, were to some degree early cooperative efforts.

Along with other institutions libraries suffered the harsh deterrence of the severe economic depression of the 1930's. Public library book budgets decreased in almost inverse ratio to increasing public library use by the idle. Many librarians responded by exploring cooperative practices. Helen Wessells tells of the pooling of book funds in 1936 by four branch libraries on Staten Island to provide a circulating collection of "less popular fiction and non-fiction."11 There must have been many such beginnings that went unrecorded.

More significant for our present subject of "Cooperative Book Ordering and Book Selection" was the library profession's brief association with the national cooperative movement. This involved the Cooperative Book Club, a consumer's cooperative formed to give Americans a better, cheaper form of book distribution in an era of social ferment. The library interest was to be expressed (and did operate briefly) through the formation of the affiliated Library Book Club, which was intended to provide better discounts for libraries and to assert the library's interest in American letters. This move, I believe, is one of the profession's few ventures into utopian thinking. An article on the Book Club in the Wilson Library Bulletin, reported that libraries purchased $20,980,000 worth of books in 1938, but these purchases were dispersed among 22,000 libraries.12 The articles insisted that the libraries' influence without common bargaining power was minimal and the profession's influence upon writing practically nil. The Library Book Club would organize bargaining power and express the professional interest in literature through the formation of a selection committee of librarians and critics to choose books submitted by publishers. The Club would obtain books in advance of publication and deliver the books with catalog cards by day of publication. Contracting libraries would automatically receive the books chosen by the selection committee. The plan, it was argued, would
assure substantial savings on books, expedite delivery, and guarantee the circulation of books of high standards. All but one of these features have been adopted by commercial book clubs despite the opposition of publishers at the time. As far as we know, some 20 years after the proposal was made, no librarians serve upon any of the selection committees of present book clubs. Somehow, the proposal seems more utopian today than it must have in 1938; yet it represented a thought-out response to the times.

In the 24 years since 1938 American libraries have dealt with insufficient financial resources, a great world war, and a postwar period marked by continuing dislocations engendered by the conflict, population growth and shift, and a wrenching scientific-technological revolution. To meet these sharp problems libraries have adopted cooperation as one mode of organization through which they can act effectively. If one can simplify starkly, the cooperative approach has been employed, mainly by academic libraries and to a lesser degree by public libraries, to bring first the tools that make books accessible and then later the books themselves. Union catalogs and bibliographic centers were created in the period of the depression and the war years to spread both bibliographic information and the availability of books themselves. Contributing to the creation of these centers was the availability of WPA assistance and some foundation funds. Generally the bibliographic centers were conceived in larger terms than the union catalogs, and the union catalogs were established for a wider use than a mere locating device. R. B. Downs argues that the potentiality of union catalogs for the coordination of acquisition work has yet to be exhausted. He feels that for checking of duplication of titles, determining scarcity of titles, supplying bibliographic details, and saving of time and correspondence, they have no satisfactory substitute in library order work.13

Five larger union catalogs had been established from 1938 to 1958: the Union Library Catalog of the Philadelphia Metropolitan Area, the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center, the Union Catalog of Western Reserve, the Bibliographic Center for Research at Denver, and the Union Catalog of the Library of Congress. The communities, the regions, and the nation have profited from these tools. However, it seems unlikely that any large union catalog in card form will be established in the future. The growing importance of the National Union Catalog has to some degree weakened the concept of the regional union catalog, but it is the realization of coming technological change greatly modifying their physical nature which will probably inhibit the further establishment of any major installations in card form. The Library of Congress is now making feasibility studies of placing its catalog in electronic memory chambers. These devices, perhaps ten years away, would contain not only the Library of Congress catalog but also regional catalogs and catalogs of special interest.
Union catalogs combined with an interlibrary loan division have made available to patrons of public libraries, special libraries, and smaller academic libraries the collections of larger libraries and research libraries. In a cooperative complex such as this, which relates so many discrete and disparate units, there are bound to be inequities. However, despite the inequities, which can, after all, be adjusted, one can only marvel at the construction of these cooperative devices. Their organization is one that librarians can put forth as an achievement in any profession. The union catalog and the bibliographic center have not only provided a service, contributed to general education, and established an ideal of regional organization, but they have also set up a standard of collaboration that has erased the boundaries of ignorance and the cramping limits of political jurisdiction.

Somewhat later than the interest in union catalogs, the library profession turned its attention to the actual provision of scarce material and the attempt to overcome the scarcity of materials. Both public libraries and academic libraries have considered and instituted agreements which would allow for specialization of subject material or which would allocate the field of collecting to specified libraries. In a sense, these activities can be considered cooperative book selection. College and university libraries have most frequently endeavored to initiate such projects, although special libraries have joined where their doing so was feasible. In Chicago, the John Crerar Library, the Newberry Library, and the Chicago Public Library have had a long-time agreement upon the division of fields. An example of such activity in academic libraries is the Duke-North Carolina agreement upon the collection of Latin-American material.

Such agreements are a favorite first step for cooperation. Although more favored by academic libraries than either special or public libraries, the institutional place of the academic library creates some difficulty in its administration. William Carlson has written:

Many efforts toward specialization among college and university libraries have lacked validity and strength because a corollarily to extensive specialization among libraries of this kind must be a corresponding specialization of curricula and research interest and activities. To date no really important higher educational agreements of this kind have been reached.14

William Harbold, a political scientist, in his essay on policy making in college and university libraries makes a similar point:

Irrespective of standards developed by the library profession it is, after all, from the teaching and research activities of the faculty that the criteria of library adequacy flow.15

Although librarians have blamed human nature or the acquisitive nature of their fellows for the problems of implementing specialization
agreements, the reasons cited above probably obtain more strongly. To convince a university president or the faculty members of a library committee that it will be advantageous for the library to assign one of its research areas, in terms, of materials, to another institution for the benefit of all may be a difficult task.

The depository or storage library is a more recent example of cooperative agreement among university and college libraries. These depositories are devised to cope with the priority of needs for materials. The Hampshire Inter-Library Center and the Midwest Inter-Library Center are examples of the trend.

The success of these installations, indeed of all cooperative activities, is dependent upon a number of functions. Although the will to cooperate is essential, it must be accompanied by a program that includes these points: a well-thought out plan allowing for adequate staffing for the cooperative activities, and a financial schedule that accounts for the interest of all members—no cooperating library, whether large or small, should be treated inequitably because of its size, and where possible positive agreements are to be preferred to negative agreements. Other considerations would include the proximity of cooperating units. But the most important prerequisite to success is sufficient financing. Too many good cooperative projects have been delayed or have failed to come into existence because of the impossibility of "scraping together" funds for new ventures out of taut operating budgets. A review of the literature of cooperation records the success of cooperative ventures where some outside funds are available: federal, state or foundation. This principle of "seed money" applies not only to the cooperative organizations commented upon above but also directly to the cooperative plans of public libraries. We will refer to these shortly. I may paraphrase a remark of one state librarian, who said that good cooperative plans have been conceived and available for years, but not until the advent of federal funds could they be initiated.

The Federal Government and Library Cooperation

The appearance of the federal government upon the library scene is probably setting the present stage for cooperation—cooperation between individual libraries, the states, and federal agencies. The demands of the new scientific community of a better educated nation and a world without peace are now reflected in the cooperative library relationship.

The National Science Foundation has reported that during the summer of 1962 it established 11 regional report centers (for unclassified technical reports being issued on federally supported research and development) in selected university libraries scattered across the nation.16 We understand that NSF not only makes the
documents available, but that they also assist in funding the staffing for handling the materials.

With the Library of Congress, the Foundation is now establishing a National Science and Technology Referral Center at the Library of Congress which will serve as a directory for the sources of such information. The Library of Congress is responsible, too, for the Documents Expediting Project, a procurement unit, which originated in the activities of the Joint Committee on Government Documents, a group representing major library associations. Prior to 1945 the concern of the Committee was the improvement of the depository system and the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications. Since then the establishment of the Project has provided a centralized service to its subscribers in the acquisitions of nondepository U. S. Government publications which are not available for purchase either from the Government Printing Office or the issuing agency.

Another agency involved in cooperative book ordering is the United States Book Exchange. The exchange, originally housed in the Library of Congress, now has independent housing. This nonprofit cooperative corporation stocks between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 periodical issues (in 30,000 titles) and between 40,000 and 50,000 books. The exchange is financed by the fees for service that its members pay and by an AID contract. Its annual item flow is about 1.5 million pieces.

The Cooperative Acquisitions Project, initiated by the Library of Congress and now completed, is an example of a large acquisitions project planned to rectify the war-time gap in the collections of American research libraries. The project distributed, a total of 2,000,000 items, about one-quarter of which were confiscated materials and a more substantial share purchased. Participating libraries and the Library of Congress spent $250,000 up to 1947.

One of the stimuli in the area of cooperative book ordering, probably the most important for the public libraries, has been the advent of the Library Services Act, which has made available up to $7.5 million annually to state plans for local library development. We can assume that the Act was one of the factors that impelled the sharply increased interest in "cooperation" in the mid 1950's. Public libraries have always been interested to some degree in cooperative arrangements for book purchasing. In 1938, several rural libraries in Canada were coming together for the joint purchase of books. In the state of Oregon since 1914 one form of county library organization has been an arrangement that is almost identical with the "federations" that are appearing today.

When one reviews cooperative book ordering and cooperative book selection in public libraries today he is struck by the fact that it is almost impossible to separate these acquisition functions from the larger issue of public library organization. Public library leaders
are meeting the problem of organization by using the centralization of technical processes as a device to bring public libraries into larger units of service. What appears to be happening is that state library agencies (administering federal and state funds) are selecting certain technical functions of libraries and centralizing these, while leaving other functions at the local control level and local service level. As we have said, this practice is not new, but it is a response to the need to organize the numerous public library units in the United States into larger service units. In 1960 there were 8,190 public libraries in the nation of which 10 per cent served 65 per cent of the population with legal library service available. This 10 per cent of the public libraries expended an estimated 80-85 per cent of all public library expenditures in 1960.

To meet this problem many state library agencies and library leaders seem to have adopted an implicit agenda in their construction of library service centers. Robert D. Leigh has advocated it most fully:

What I am suggesting is the vigorous promotion of a program of interlibrary cooperation. It means breaking down into its elements the processes and operations of a consolidated public library system and of selecting those parts or processes of the whole system that can be put into operation by voluntary agreements. Insofar as detailed, piecemeal agreements can be made, they will become functional equivalents of consolidation and they save legal autonomies intact . . . .

The sturdy protagonists of over-all cooperation may well feel that piecemeal, voluntary, partial interlibrary cooperation such as this is more frustrating and ineffective than the head-on attack to overcome the barriers to general consolidation. But it may be that accumulation of experience in interlibrary cooperation constitutes a necessary educational step toward the acceptance of units adequate for modern library service . . . .

Leigh's scheme for the construction of larger units of service by specializing and centralizing nonsensitive functions has been widely adopted. Mary Lee Bundy reports the existence in 1961 of 50 processing centers. Nearly all of these centers were initiated with Library Services Act funds and established by state library agency planning. A considerable number are units of state library agencies. An outstanding characteristic of these processing centers is the numerous small units which they have integrated through this cooperative approach. The following table shows that 78 per cent of the participating libraries had incomes of less than $25,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - $ 4,999</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 24,999</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 99,999</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and above</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total volumes processed in the 28 centers ranged from 650 to 392,000 volumes. The median number of books processed is 17,586 volumes. Seventy-nine per cent of the centers order books for the participating libraries. Miss Bundy reports that the centers almost completely utilize book jobbers and have standing agreements with the jobbers on discounts ranging from 33 to 42 per cent. Only a few of the centers reported that the discounts had been worked out on the basis of volume of purchase. Most of the centers forwarded the bill for the books directly to the purchasing library—they did not perform disbursement for their patrons. Although centralized processing centers, whether operated by the state or at a regional level, do not commonly perform cooperative book selection, their activities are bound to have an effect upon book selection because the book orders of numerous small units come under the scrutiny of persons with professional skills in selection. Generally, when centralized processing agreements are made, the responsibility for selection of materials by the local unit is stressed. Yet once the central agency begins to see the type of materials being purchased, instead of directly questioning a library’s order, it may suggest a visit to the local contracting library of a person offering assistance in book selection. This practice follows Leigh’s theory of forming inter-relationships by involvement.

A number of other benefits have flowed to member libraries cooperating in centralized technical services. The collections of many smaller libraries are being cataloged for the first time. Miss Bundy reports that 8 per cent of member libraries noted that their collections were uncataloged. Another 8 per cent had joined because they anticipated increased book collections. The centralized services would allow them to acquire the material without a long local processing delay. Too, in the writer’s experience, the purchasing agreements, which are generally part of these plans, have given the member libraries the benefit of a better discount. The discounts that smaller public libraries receive range from zero to 33 per cent. Center
discounts commonly exceed this range. One can conservatively speculate that on the purchase of the 530,841 books ordered through centers in 1961, there was a total saving of $113,200 through more advantageous discounts.19

But the most important benefit to the local libraries participating in cooperative centralized technical services may be the availability of "released time" derived from the transfer of processing duties to a central agency. It is the presence of this "new" time that has allowed the exercise of Leigh's concept of developing inter-relationships by involvement: local libraries, state library agencies, and the consultative staff of LSA can now work toward the creation of cooperative mechanisms, the regional library, the federation, and the specialized service center that will increasingly up-grade local services through a multiplicity of devices. Consultative visits, workshops, attendance at professional meetings, all of these cooperative inter-relationships are aimed at a professional dialogue, essentially educative in nature, that is aimed at the creation of a network, a library complex, that reflects both the diversity of community patterns and the steady ideal of better public library service through collaboration.

We cannot present here an inventory of the many diverse and interesting new forms of organization. They are too numerous, but we do hope to inventory them and to give some report upon the cooperative activities of public libraries and the magnitude of their financial commitment in our 1962 general survey. In terms of geographical coverage, New York public libraries, utilizing both state and federal financial assistance, have effectively covered the state with a system of 22 library "federations." Among their many services the systems provide centralized technical services, inter-library loan, pooled use of collections, film circuits, and consultative assistance.20

The spread of services available and the comprehensiveness of their coverage in New York are an excellent example of tri-level cooperation: local, state, and federal. We should reinforce here our earlier remarks upon the absolute necessity of the availability of funds beyond the taut operating budgets of local libraries to set in motion cooperative projects. New York state provides the largest amount of state aid, $9.5 million, for local public library service. It is one of the 29 states giving effective grants-in-aid to localities.

With LSA funds North Carolina, another example of the results of cumulative cooperation, operates a centralized processing center at the state library which services 51 local libraries. Other

20. Illustrative of the services available through cooperative book ordering is the recent memorandum of the Westchester Library System, New York, to member libraries. The system notes the availability of a group purchase rate for encyclopedias that will save $25 to participants.
inter-relationships conducted by the state library in its integrating function are participation in the interlibrary center at the Duke-North Carolina university libraries through teletype connection, a continuing in-service training program jointly sponsored by the North Carolina State Library Association and the state library, and participation financially in the film circuit by contract with the University of North Carolina. As part of this participation the state library sponsors regional film selection meetings where local librarians and state library consultants choose titles. The state library administers the establishment of special interlibrary loan collections. Fifteen of these are now in North Carolina public libraries with specialties including architecture, art, business and industry, and textiles. The basic grant of $700 for these special local collections is supplemented by continuing financial assistance based upon need and use.

One example of the type of complete cooperative organization that Dr. Leigh envisioned is the North Bay Cooperative Library System in California. Fourteen libraries were charter members of this group, and two have subsequently joined. These libraries are in six California counties north of San Francisco with a total population served of 459,000 persons. Because of legal difficulties, no single library operates all of the joint projects; instead they are allocated to the various members. The project was initiated with $115,000 from Library Services Act funds. How long it will continue to receive funds depends upon federal and state plans. The originators of the system did not anticipate that the system would ever be able to finance its own needs locally.

The largest activity of the cooperative is the processing center, where ten persons are employed. Before acquisitions the center compiles and distributes review cards for all adult books to member libraries. The center reports that this procedure not only saves much time in book selection but also results in coordination which creates more efficient ordering and card production techniques. It might be added that the use of review cards is a degree of cooperative book selection. Attached to the processing center is a truck which delivers processed books to individual libraries twice a week. With this visit it exchanges interlibrary loans, distributes films from the film collection, picks up book orders, carries messages, and even delivers mail.

The member libraries are integrated by a private line teletype-writer joining the ten larger libraries and the state library at Sacramento. The smaller libraries tie into the system through telephones to the nearest library station from which their order is relayed by teletype. The teletype, which has proved most effective in assisting with the locating of titles within the system, negates the need for a union catalog. Moreover, the service call gives not only the location of a book but also its availability, something union catalogs cannot do.
The members of the system hope to increase their meager book-stock by a plan of specialization which they have adopted. Their first step has been the purchase of reference materials deposited in the larger libraries in accordance with their specialities.

The cooperative is governed by a council of official representatives from each agency that meets monthly. At present the coordinating librarian is the Santa Rosa Public librarian. One organizational problem to be solved, it would seem to me, is the fact that the coordinating librarian has a double assignment, both as a unit librarian and as coordinator.

I have not been able to cite or identify any particular examples of cooperative book selection, although the specialization agreements often entered into by academic libraries and sometimes public libraries approach such procedures. The group selection meetings that some public libraries hold with visiting librarians from other libraries could be considered cooperative book selection. However, where the visitors usually have a spectator role, I would prefer not to consider this "operational" cooperation.

There are few examples of cooperative book ordering and selection in the schools. The frequency of this practice is limited because public schools have tended to develop consolidated systems. In Vancouver, British Columbia, the public library acts as the purchasing agent for the public schools and conducts all order procedures (but not the selection procedures). The Weld County (Colorado) Public Library performs centralized technical services for the school district on a contractual basis. The Paulists Fathers in the United States have recently begun a new library service for Catholic elementary schools. As announced, the service offers professionally selected and completely processed basic libraries for parochial schools. We can say that centralized processing used cooperatively is now being promoted in the public library field as part of a grand design that will create larger units of service.

Perspectives of Library Cooperation

Librarians have sometimes been discouraged with the progress of cooperation, which as a mode or organization has often suffered from ad hoc treatment. But most frequently it has suffered from an absence of outside funds. Where it has had sufficient "seed money," it has made exciting advances. Although librarians may sometimes be critical of the success of cooperative endeavours, we might ask ourselves what other professions have achieved in like situations. The breaking away from jurisdictional patterns is a most difficult task, as political scientists (and the voters) have repeatedly pointed out. Libraries have, however, been able to create various devices to allow them to collaborate across political and institutional boundaries.
The future of cooperation in public libraries in terms of creating larger units of service is the first item on the agenda. That cooperative arrangements can bring service organizations into existence has now been proved. The next task requires that these units draw closer together. The federation idea based upon a core of centralized services has been in existence for many years, although not identified as such. Now many places backed with federal and state establishment grants can go on from centralized services to the development of important tasks in the field of staff competence and improvement.

Certainly the contractual provision of services by specialized units is a phenomenon of extended government. Public, special, and academic libraries should explore this concept more fully.

On the academic and the research library scene there are intimations through the activities of the federal government of the establishment of a national system of libraries. Present indicators of this trend are the newly created national science and technology referral center at the Library of Congress and the regional document depositories sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

We can expect librarians to continue to employ cooperation as a useful tool with which to perform their tasks. However, cooperation should not be assigned impossible tasks; it should not be embraced as a ready substitute for direct operation or consolidation. When utilized, it should receive careful consideration for financing, staffing, and programming.
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THE SELECTION, ORDERING, AND HANDLING OF SERIALS

Robert W. Orr

In agreeing to discuss the selection, ordering, and handling of serials up to the point of cataloging or other forms of processing for use, I accepted an assignment to talk about the category of publications which has formed and still constitutes the core of the Iowa State University Library's book collections, notably scientific and technical periodicals and other serials in the basic and applied fields of the physical and biological sciences.

Existing definitions of what constitutes a periodical as well as a serial are, in my opinion, so well known and generally accepted that they need not be repeated here. Such serials as government publications, including the large variety and volume of research and development reports, will not be mentioned specifically because other papers on the program for this Institute deal with them.

At Iowa State we have lived comfortably, and effectively, I believe, for over 40 years with an acquisitions program which has from the start strongly stressed the importance of serial publications, thanks to the early, energetic, and sustained efforts of my worthy predecessor, the late Charles Harvey Brown. In retrospect, however, it seems to me that our procedures for the selection, ordering, and handling of serials have changed little, if any, during the past four decades, except in the matter of staff organization, a subject which I shall touch upon shortly. Those of us who are concerned today with these procedures are cognizant of the trends of the times involving the use of computers or other automation equipment of various types and designs.

I elected to base this paper not upon the existing literature but upon the returns from a questionnaire which was mailed to 76 medium and large academic libraries. The libraries selected to receive this questionnaire were chosen from those listed in Groups I and II in "College and University Library Statistics, 1958/59." All libraries recorded as receiving more than 2,400 periodicals were sent a copy of the questionnaire. The response to this mailing was, to me, friendly, cooperative, and overwhelming. As a matter of fact, 66 of the questionnaires out of a total of 76, or nearly 87 per cent, were filled out and returned in time for me to make use of their contents. Frankly, the
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preparation of this paper, based upon practices now being followed in the 66 libraries and at Iowa State, rather than upon theoretical matters, has provided a welcome and needed opportunity for serious review at home. Even a casual perusal of the returns reveals that procedures relating to the selection, ordering, and handling of serials are in many aspects so different and varied from one institution to another as to defy the identification of any discernible major present practice or of trends for the future.

Varying so much in nature and complexity, the reported procedures indicate to me the need for much experimentation and, moreover, that the attainment of the ideal in this important work must still be a long way off. Needless to say, however, the future will see the development and utilization of much automation equipment, whether it be IBM punched cards or tape, magnetic tape, or other devices. Clearly evident in the returns to the questionnaire is the ground swell of interest and activity on the part of librarians in the early adoption of automation equipment, notably in the area of fiscal controls.

The first of the four sections of the questionnaire relates to the organization of the serials staff. The three questions in this section constitute an attempt in each instance to ascertain whether or not the library has a separate serials department, how it functions, and whether or not the library administration is satisfied with its present serials organization. A tabulation of the returns reveals that 32 libraries have separate serials departments and that 34 have serials sections which are part of the acquisitions division or, in rare instances, of other units of the library. Of the 32 which have separate serials departments, 11 performed all of the functions of the selection, ordering, and handling of serials, while 21 did not. The variations of the 21 libraries which handled less than this scope of activity are so numerous that a full description of their practices is not possible within the limits of this paper.

The most common variance concerns the procedure involved in the selection of serials. This is a topic specifically covered in the second section of the questionnaire. Faculty members and administrative officers of the institutions concerned are commonly involved, and rightly so, in my opinion, in this activity. In a number of instances the serials department is also responsible for the cataloging of serials.

Of the 65 libraries responding to the question of whether or not they are satisfied with their present serials organization, 39 replied in the affirmative and 26 in the negative. Possibly it would be of interest to break these figures down according to form of organization. Replies from libraries which have separate serials departments indicated that two out of every three libraries are satisfied. Those without separate serials departments reported in this manner: 14 are satisfied, and 19 are not.
Of those reporting dissatisfaction, the reasons can be summarized as follows: trained librarians are needed to direct the serials program, separate serials departments are being planned, IBM systems or other automation programs of fiscal controls are needed, central serials records are needed, and changes are planned pending the availability of new physical facilities. According to the answers to the questionnaires, central serials records seem to mean several things, ranging from central serials checking files to central notation of serials holdings for public and library staff use. It is my judgment, in the light of the replies received, that the recording of serials receipts and holdings leaves much to be desired in terms of uniformity or, indeed, of the understanding of the needs of the people who use such records. I think that much study of this entire area of library operations is in order and that it should receive the attention of librarians who are informed of the importance of handling serials in the manner best calculated to serve the needs of all persons.

Personal experience and observation over many years lead me to believe that the staff organization of the serials department, whether as a separate unit or as a major part of an acquisitions unit, depends in large measure upon the personnel available for this work. At Iowa State University the work of ordering books or serials and the handling of the exchanges program has from time to time been organized in from one to three departments, depending largely upon the number and character of the personnel available. At present it is handled by two departments, one for serials and exchanges and another for books and back sets.Personally, I place little significance upon the particular type of organization for acquisitions in any given library. Much more important, in my opinion, is the library staff's understanding of the great importance of serial publications and its ability to achieve an efficient program of acquiring, processing, and making serials available for use.

Section 2 of the questionnaire deals with the selection of serials—an extremely important responsibility. Subscriptions to serials constitute a recurring and ever-higher financial commitment. Anyone in touch with this aspect of the acquisitions program must be aware of the frantic proliferation of serials and the steady upward trend in prices. All of us are aware of the action of a well known scientific society whose abstracting journal is being increased in price per copy from $250 to $500 annually. At present Iowa State subscribes to six copies of this particular abstracting service. Next year the number of subscriptions will be reduced to four, and they will cost us more than the six we now receive. In fairness to the society, however, I should say that its financial plight is real, and it seems to me that increases in the subscription rates to various categories of subscribers is the only means by which the publication of this indispensable service can be continued.
One of the facts ascertained by means of the questionnaire was that only four libraries reported having written statements of their acquisitions policies and that a fifth has one in preparation. By and large, criteria used in determining which serials should be bought or secured by gift or exchange involve an intimate knowledge by faculty and library staff members of the present and projected programs of instruction and investigation.

To a lesser extent, the inclusion of a serial in an indexing or an abstracting journal is considered. Also, cooperative programs, whether regional or those conducted by such agencies as the Farmington Plan or the Midwest Inter-Library Center, are influential in some instances in the determination of which serials libraries will add to their collections.

It was interesting to me to note that most of the responding libraries indicated that recommendations for serial subscriptions were accepted from members of the faculty and the student body and in some instances from other readers as well. As for procedures of approval, the majority of the 66 libraries replied that the library director or the assistant director, the acquisitions chief, or the serials head shouldered this responsibility. In several instances, notably where departmental allocations are in effect, the head of the academic department appeared to have this authority. Frankly, little or no dissatisfaction was expressed with this practice, but it seems to me that the sooner such cumbersome and sometimes troublesome methods of administering library funds are eliminated in favor of centrally administered library funds, the better off all concerned will be. Moreover, in my opinion, there is a greater likelihood then of achieving a more balanced development of the book collections as a whole when funds are centrally administered.

In the course of my participation in a few library surveys, several aspects of systems of departmental allocations came to light. In the first place, it appears to me to be difficult, if not impossible, to secure equal attention and cooperation in this effort from all academic departments. Some of them spend all of their allocations early and clamor for more funds, while others have to be prodded to utilize fully the funds made available to them. Secondly, it is not uncommon for departments to adopt a proprietary attitude toward the publications purchased from their respective allocations and, therefore, to resent the use of such publications by staff members in other departments. Actually, the librarian or a knowledgeable delegate of his organization, with the active assistance of his colleagues and the faculty, is in a much more advantageous position to exercise wise control over the development of the book collections for the whole institution. Also, the bookkeeping involved in administering and reporting departmental allocations is expensive and time consuming.
Of those replying to the question about an active weeding program, 47 libraries indicated that they did not have such a program. Of the 15 which answered in the affirmative, several qualified their replies by saying that the weeding of serials was limited to trial subscriptions.

It is the opinion of the library staff at Iowa State that attempts to weed out obsolete or otherwise unneeded serials have met with almost complete failure. We have been hard put to find faculty members who show enthusiasm for the discarding of any serial or a portion of it. In the area of duplication, however, we have gone ahead with our own program without any particular reference to faculty members as to which titles to weed out of the collections. By way of an example, one such project involves the discarding of duplicate copies of back volumes of bound journals in the fields of engineering which once were shelved in the Engineering Reading Room, a facility separate from the central library. After a period of five to ten years these journals have been returned to the central library and have been placed promptly in our Library Storage Building, where they have been gathering dust.

Section 3 of the questionnaire pertains to practices and policies relating to the purchasing of serials. The bases used by reporting libraries in determining from whom they obtain serials vary quite widely. An obvious generalization is that libraries use such basic criteria as quality of service and lowest prices. For domestic serials the practice of using subscription agencies, not always found to be satisfactory, is quite common. Often non-trade publications issued by societies, academies, and other organizations are purchased directly from the publishing group. Upon occasion other types of domestic serials are purchased directly from publishers. A few libraries reported sending out lists of current serials for bids.

In the area of foreign serials many libraries prefer, whenever possible, to use dealers in the country of origin. However, domestic dealers are also used in purchasing foreign serials. Some titles are obtained directly from the publishers. No two libraries seem to have arrived at the same solution.

For back sets the common practice is to purchase on the basis of bids received from dealers and publishers. A variation of this method is to order from dealers' catalogs after comparing prices, provided that more than one listing can be found.

Libraries were also asked whether or not they placed subscriptions on an "until forbid" basis. Fifty-eight of them reported in the affirmative. Four used this basis for some of their orders, and for other titles annual renewal purchase orders are issued. Three other libraries do not use the "until forbid" basis, because of state regulations. One library reported not using this basis for orders because it wanted to conduct frequent reviews of its subscription list.
A major aspect of the acquisition of serials is an exchange program in which locally available publications are exchanged for serials, and books in some instances, which are issued by other universities as well as by other sources, such as societies, academies, and institutes. It is very important that this program be conducted on an international basis, including exchanges with agencies in Iron Curtain countries. We have found at Iowa State that some serials published in Iron Curtain countries, for example, can most readily be obtained by exchange and that, indeed, in some instances this seems to be the only method of securing them.

Thirty libraries responding to the questionnaire indicated that they have satisfactory exchange programs. Others reported exchange programs, but did not indicate whether or not they are satisfactory. Twelve libraries are not satisfied with their exchange programs, the two principal difficulties appearing to be a lack of publications available for exchange and a shortage of personnel to handle this work. The consensus was, however, that an exchange program is essential. At Iowa State we consider such a program to be indispensable and have had one in operation for decades.

Because in Iowa there has been talk of setting up a state purchasing agency, an especially interesting set of figures to me is the one which deals with the practices of other states in this regard. Libraries responding to the question of whether or not their purchases are conducted on a bid basis indicated that 56 do not do so. Of the ten libraries which are required to buy on the basis of bids, seven said that they did all or only a part of the buying in this way. Two answered in the affirmative, but said that in actual practice they did not follow this procedure. One library indicated that bids were used only occasionally.

Of greatest interest to me, and incidentally a topic upon which I have had no experience, is automation, comprising input and output data processing equipment. From the 66 libraries responding to the questionnaire, I received replies from 49 that no such devices had been put into service as yet. Nine libraries indicated that they now use IBM or other equipment for fiscal controls which, as I understand the term, includes such operations as placing subscriptions, making renewals, and entering payments of invoices. Six other libraries reported that automation equipment is not being used at present, but that plans or studies are under way which look forward to the possibility of the use of such equipment in the near future. A common type of recording device in use today, according to the returns on the questionnaire, is the edge punched card.

At Iowa State we use a visible checking file comprised of 5" x 8" cards of receipts plus other information, including a record of prices, expiration date, binding information, and destination of receipts. In addition, we are planning to develop a second record. When funds
are available, this second record will be on IBM punched cards which we will use to identify and to separate our serials information by subject, country of origin, dealer, price, date of subscription expiration, and location on campus. We feel that this record, along with the visible file checking record, will give us the information which has been badly needed for more than 40 years. I might add, further, that we have no plans or even thoughts of resorting to magnetic tape to post receipts or to post holdings of serials. Our holdings are listed on the visible checking file and in the card catalog and the shelf list. The card catalog contains a record of holdings by means of this statement: "Library has a complete set of this periodical beginning with ...." If volumes are lacking, a record of missing volumes is made.

As a result of my lack of experience with automation techniques, I can say nothing about the advantages and disadvantages of their use. I am of the opinion, however, that the adoption of automation equipment does not necessarily mean a reduction of personnel, but that it does mean the availability of more and better records, all of which are really essential to the control and utilization of serial publications. I would like to urge that library schools which have not already done so include in their curricula at the earliest possible date courses in the use of automation equipment, not only for the fiscal controls of the serials operation but of all library processes amenable to automation.

The final section of the questionnaire deals with the methods of handling serials before processing for use. I have already commented upon the great diversity of central serials records. As reported, these records include the visible checking file, the card catalog, the shelf list, and separate serials lists. These records, as a rule, exclude holdings of documents. In the organization of many libraries, documents are treated separately from other publications. At Iowa State all serials, whether documents or not, are processed and shelved together according to subject matter. All serials relating to agriculture, for example, are shelved in a single location except that some of the publications are in storage because of a lack of shelf space in the library. The first addition to the library building, opened on September 11, 1961, is so small that over 25 per cent of the bound serials in the book collections have had to be retained in storage.

The next inquiry on the questionnaire was in regard to the maintenance of a visible checking file for recording receipts. Fifty-three libraries reported that such a file was used. The amazing element, however, is the variation in the size of the card used for this purpose. Many of them, as you might expect, are edge punched cards. Sizes listed include 3" x 5", 4" x 6", 3" x 3 1/4", 4 3/4" x 6", 3 7/8" x 5 7/8", and 5" x 8". Most frequently used was the 4" x 6" card on which is recorded such information as call number, holdings, publisher or dealer and address, current receipts, current payments, and order number.
The final inquiry on the questionnaire deals with the handling of bindery preparation. This work is rather commonly done by the serials department, whether it be as a separate unit or as a part of an acquisitions unit. In many instances bindery preparation is done by the periodicals division. In other instances it is administered by those who are in charge of book collections purchased from allocated funds. Personally, I favor the work of bindery preparation being handled by the serials unit, although I can understand that in some forms of library organization this would not be the best way to do it.

In closing, and I must admit this proposal is not relevant to the topic under discussion, I want to recommend that the tercentenary of the birth of serials, which will occur on January 5, 1965, be suitably celebrated. It will then be 300 years since the French serial Journal des Scavans was started. Its instant and enthusiastic acceptance assured an important role for serials in academic and other investigative and research groups. Two months afterward, the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London made its first appearance. In my opinion, we simply must not let this important anniversary go unnoticed.
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SELECTION AND ACQUISITION OF FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS

Helen M. Welch

The special problems and prospects of the selection and acquisition of foreign publications deal with no trivial portion of world publication. UNESCO's book production figures for 1960 assign less than five per cent of the titles to U.S. publishers, leaving a whopping 95 per cent to be acquired across our customs, copyright, and censorship barriers. According to the Bureau of the Census, the United States imported over $22,000,000 worth of books and closely related materials in 1960, an increase of nearly 10 per cent over 1959 imports; and I have heard of no one who thinks this amount approached adequacy.

Reviewing library acquisition of foreign publications today, one gradually becomes aware of a sense of opening out, an expanding view. Not only in the library world, but outside as well, there is interest and strong support—not to say push—for the building of library resources in all areas of interest in all parts of the world. Forces and ferment such as these are pushing us: UNESCO's leadership in exchanges and in the production of bibliographies, the concern of the powerful Association of Research Libraries with the cooperative building of library resources, the Organization of American States pushing library development in Latin America, progress in our own bibliographic apparatus, international agreement upon cataloging principles, the focusing of national attention upon these and related problems by the Bryant-Library of Congress interchange, and over it all the strong awareness that the building of adequate library resources is in the national interest.

If, as I do, you believe that the building up of library resources is a worthwhile contribution to the well-being of humanity, that the collections we build will survive in spite of insects and climate, and that the leaders of the powerful nations of the world are too sensible to call for the shot which will mean suicide for our civilization, then it's a wonderful time to be concerned with foreign book procurement.

Selection

The problem of acquiring foreign publications can be reduced to its elements of what to get, how to get it, and, in some cases, how to accomplish its delivery. What to get involves the day-by-day
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translation of an institution's acquisition policy. In the setting up of policies, the need for cooperation and specialization among libraries becomes evident. The pressure of today's increasing world production of books and periodicals is matched only by the urgency for our scholars, scientists, and public servants to see and assimilate the content of that production. In the past the problems of foreign book procurement have belonged in the main to the large research libraries. It takes no crystal ball to predict that foreign book purchasing will increase in smaller libraries. More foreign language training, more foreign travel and commerce, more foreign visitors to all parts of the United States, and most of all, more concern with what is happening in other countries increase the needs and curiosity about foreign publications among library patrons.

A single library in this country can cover pretty adequately the current production in this country, and indeed some libraries do. But to cover world production, which brings in the complications of non-Roman alphabets, political barriers, the lack of bibliographical aids, and sheer magnitude, is indeed impossible.

In his introduction to The Intimate Henry Miller, Lawrence Clark Powell, the librarian about whom nobody is neutral, tells of supplying Henry Miller with books from the UCLA library. He says, "Either we had them or we got them for him, which is what a librarian is supposed to do." If by "got" Mr. Powell means having the book on the shelf, obtaining a microfilm of it, or borrowing it, we can agree with him. Selection policy, then, is a statement of what each library shall try to obtain and what it shall rely upon others to have. In the area of foreign acquisitions the Farmington Plan is of immense value to policy makers. Its early years established the assumption of cooperative responsibility to procure and record the publications of most of the non-English, Roman-alphabet world. After the Vosper-Talmadge stock-taking at the end of its first decade, it sturdily took on most of the rest of the world. Since this is a plan involving the good will of more than half a hundred independent organizations, each with its complex of autocratic-democratic administrative controls, the Plan's qualified success is both astonishing and heartening.

Bibliographic Aids in Selection

The librarian seeking bibliographic help in any area of the world will begin with Winchell and her 37-page, annotated list of national and trade bibliographies, continued by the three supplements to the seventh edition and the semiannual lists in the January and July issues of College and Research Libraries. Another compact and useful handbook is Robert L. Collison's Bibliographical Services Throughout the World, 1950-59. This is number nine of UNESCO's Bibliographical Handbooks, published in 1961, and a tribute to the growing success of UNESCO's preoccupation with the development of national biblio-
Collison includes a listing of the bibliographic activities of international organizations and a table which shows at a glance the present state of bibliographic activity in each country. You may find rather interesting, as I did, the five pages devoted to the state of bibliography in our own country, where he mentions our "frequent conferences and working parties."

Keeping up with current developments in publishing and the book trade of foreign countries can be accomplished only by following the various journals associated with the local antiquarian and current book trade, catalogs and lists put out by foreign booksellers, the occasional articles on foreign trade in the Publishers' Weekly, Stechert-Hafner Book News, the Antiquarian Bookman, library journals, and the UNESCO Bulletin for Libraries.

Conditions for the procurement of foreign publications are better than they have been since the beginning of World War II, perhaps the best they have ever been. If UNESCO has its way, they will continue to improve.

American vs. Foreign Agents

The first decision to be made in ordering foreign publications is whether to employ an American importer or a foreign bookseller. Smaller libraries, with a minimum of orders, will find it advantageous to use an American firm and thus to obtain the advantages of placing a single order for books published in several countries and to employ simpler procedures in the handling of invoices, payments, returns, and claims. Libraries ordering a substantial number of foreign publications will probably want to employ agents in the country of publication, in order to secure the advantages of faster delivery and cheaper prices.

I have no formula for fixing the point at which a library turns from an importer to a foreign agent. Small libraries may want to employ one or two foreign agents for the experience. However, this aspect coincides somewhat with Mr. Weller's views on matrimony, to wit, "Wen you're a married man, Samiwel, you'll understand a good many things as you don't understand now; but vether it's worth while goin' through so much to learn so little . . . is a matter o' taste." And the first time a librarian has a shipment held up in customs and must employ a customs broker at some expense, he may well decide that it's not to his taste.

There are many able American dealers in foreign books. They know the foreign book trade well, are familiar with the appropriate languages, are accustomed to handling importation requirements, and can often be seen at library meetings for consultations; some of them have foreign offices on the spot ready to solve special problems.
The selection of such an agent is relatively simple. There are a number of good general importers and a number of importers who specialize in certain languages or countries. The librarian can first try an agent recommended by other librarians and can then judge whether or not the particular agent suits his particular needs. As you know, no single agent is the best agent for all libraries.

The same procedure can be followed in the selection of a foreign agent. A number of large libraries have issued lists of dealers whom they have found serviceable, e.g., the New York Public Library's Technical Order 57-14 of February 1, 1957, "Major Dealers for Current Materials"; the "List of Book Dealers Outside the United States," offered in 1950 by the Acquisition Unit of the United Nations Library; and the Library of Congress Order Division's "List of Book Dealer Sources for Currently Issued Foreign Publications," 1958. (There may be later editions of any or all of these.) Useful printed lists include the Publishers' International Yearbook, London, and the International Directory of Antiquarian Booksellers, published in 1958 by the International League of Antiquarian Booksellers. Lists of publishers and booksellers are published in countries with well established book trades, and more foreign bookdealers than American bookdealers supply both current and antiquarian books. For areas with really difficult procurement problems the most practical approach is to seek advice from librarians who have going programs in the areas or the chairman of the Farmington Plan subcommittee which deals with the area in question.

Mechanics of Procurement

The procurement of publications from abroad, whether by purchase, exchange, or gift, can be complicated by customs regulations, censorship, and currency problems. The latter problem is least annoying for libraries in this country since we buy with hard currency. American libraries find little use for UNESCO international book coupons which were introduced in 1948 to help institutions and individuals in soft currency countries. Libraries wishing to pass on an occasional UNESCO coupon which may have been received in payment for a microfilm or similar service may do so quite easily by sending it to one of their agents who carries on export activities.

Censorship barriers to the acquisition of foreign publications may be erected in the country of publication or in this country. Censorship by this government may be for moral or political reasons. The most recent instance of the latter is the Cunningham Amendment to the Postage Revision Act of 1962 (HR 7927). C. B. Grannis, in the February 19, 1962, Publishers' Weekly characterized the situation succinctly in the title of his editorial, "How to Impose Ignorance by Law." The Cunningham Amendment was designed to prohibit the carriage under both domestic and international rates of material deemed
by the Attorney General to be Communist propaganda, and thus pre-
vented the receipt of important research and informational materials
by libraries. As finally passed, the Act exempts from the provisions
of the amendment "mail matter addressed to any United States Govern-
ment agency, or any public library, or to any college, university, grad-
uate school, or scientific or professional institution for advanced
studies, or any official thereof."1

The Customs Simplification Act of 1953 permits informal entry of
library materials without regard to the value of the shipment or the
way in which shipment is made, that is, by mail or otherwise. In spite
of these favorable regulations, libraries still have to submit to ex-
pensive formalities to clear express and freight shipments. The so-
called Florence Agreement, more properly designated the Agreement
on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials,
was drawn up by a UNESCO Conference in Florence in 1950. It became
effective when ratified by 10 countries, the tenth being Sweden in 1952.
Ratification by the United States was delayed in order to observe first
the effects of adherence to the Universal Copyright Convention. Ac-
cording to Dana Pratt of the American Book Publishers' Council,
American publishers were not demanding such protection: "American
publishers do not regard our present low tariff on books as being of
any real economic significance and would like to see the whole world
thrown open to free and unrestricted trade in books."2 The United
States signed the Florence Agreement in 1959, and the Senate ratified
it in 1960. However, the separate bill making the required tariff
changes has not yet been passed by Congress. Such a bill was intro-
duced into the House in August of 1962, but I can find no evidence that
it was passed before adjournment on October 13. Once the enabling
bills are passed, libraries will pay no additional costs for tariffs
levied on domestic importers of foreign books, and library patrons
will themselves be freed of impediments to the purchase of foreign
publications.

UNESCO's Trade Barriers to Knowledge, revised in 1955, is a
useful manual presenting the tariff and trade regulations affecting the
movement of library materials from one country to another. The
regulations are listed by country, and a tabulated summary is given.
Current developments in this field can be watched through the UNESCO
Bulletin for Libraries and, for actions of our own government, through
the ALA Washington Newsletter. Government restrictions on imports
from Red China and from Cuba make it necessary for libraries which
want to acquire publications directly from these two countries to ob-
tain an import license from the Foreign Assets Control Division of
the U. S. Treasury Department. This license must be renewed each
year, and the assigned license number should appear on the address
label of all Chinese and Cuban materials, even those posted from
other foreign countries such as Hong Kong or Japan.
Out-of-print Publications

The acquiring of out-of-print foreign publications presents problems different from those of acquiring current imprints. Xerox and inexpensive reprinting have made our quest for out-of-print material more rational. If an item is needed immediately, we can get a tailor-made copy printed on both sides of the page and suitable for binding for about ten cents a page. Of course, no budget can absorb an unlimited amount of this sort of acquisition, but it does eliminate the necessity for expensive and emergency searching by dealers or expensive, cumbersome photostat or print copies.

In general, needed items in Western languages will be searched for efficiently and adequately by the well organized book trade of Western Europe. Several years ago the Acquisitions Section of ALA sponsored an attempt to set up a TAAB-like service for out-of-print books in French, Italian, and Spanish. Frank Schick had suggested that searching for titles in these languages was not too well organized, and the Foreign Desiderata Project was the result. Mr. Melcher of R. R. Bowker Company undertook to experiment with a listing of items desired by libraries, the list to be paid for by subscribing foreign book dealers. The free service was good from the library point of view, but Bowker withdrew after losing a considerable amount on its two trial lists. Sam Hitt and the University of Missouri cooperated in that project, but only to be cooperative. Both Missouri and California at Berkeley find their IBM systems quite efficient in following through on out-of-print orders.

Budgeting

Budgeting for foreign acquisitions tends to be based on past experience and patron demand. So far there is little information on cost increases such as is available for U. S. books and periodicals. The ALA Cost of Library Materials Index Committee plans to collect information on foreign book prices and make it available through library periodicals. Already LRTS is offering an article on “Trends in Book Prices in West Germany, 1954-60” by Marietta Chicorel. Bill Kurth has promised to bring his index figures on Mexican books up to date and publish them, and indexes for the Danish book trade are expected. In the meantime, if your budgeting officer or committee isn’t too persnickety, you can apply the index figures for American publications to your total budget and come out with a fair estimate.

Photoreproductions

Photoreproductions continue to be an important part of a foreign acquisitions program. Contrary to a rumor Dean Downs has been spreading, microfilm is not just for those allergic to book dust. It can supply the text of unavailable items urgently needed; and microprint
projects, cooperatively financed, have made available important segments of both current and retrospective foreign literature.

When librarians wish to secure a title which is not needed on an emergency basis, they should consider reprinting possibilities. A full-size reprint is usually more acceptable to library patrons, and present-day techniques make reprinting less expensive and more prevalent. If the library can wait for a title, it should be recommended to the Reprint Expediting Service maintained by the Reprinting Committee of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division Acquisitions Section, or to one of a number of commercial reprinters, some of whom have special areas of interest. RES will investigate possibilities, and the chances that a reasonably-priced volume will eventually be available are good. Bringing needed titles to the attention of reprinting firms is a service to librarians and scholars as well as to the firm.

Exchanges

Acquisition through exchange is particularly important in the procurement of foreign publications. Purchasing exactly what a library wants is still the most direct and satisfactory method of acquisition. However, some books do not appear in trade at all, and others are difficult for book stores to obtain. Consider, for example, publications of the Soviet Union. UNESCO reports that 76,064 monographic titles were published in the USSR in 1960, of which 43,367 were placed on the market. An official of Mezhdounarodnaia Kniga told one of our staff members recently that his firm receives only 15 to 20,000 titles annually for export purposes. How are the important titles of the remaining body of publications to be acquired?

In general, institutions have three types of material for exchange: their own publications, surplus duplicates, and commercially published American books which can be used for priced exchange programs. The latter group is used only when publications can be obtained in no other way, since it involves two procedures to obtain one publication. Its widest use has been in exchanges with Eastern European countries, where many books are difficult to acquire and where there seems to be a great desire for American publications.

The most reasonable and economically defensible exchanges are those set up through the use of an institution's own serial publications. The economy of duplicates exchange is open to serious question. Experience at Illinois has convinced me that, considering the high cost of personnel and the difficulty of obtaining an adequate number of staff positions to handle basic library functions, duplicates can best be disposed of by offering them to dealers for whatever credit can be obtained. Occasionally a group of duplicates in a single subject field can be placed with mutual advantage in some other library, but a miscellaneous collection can be given to the Asian Foundation—
which will pay transportation costs—or to the United States Book Exchange with no twinge of conscience.

There is a psychological hazard in setting up exchanges. If the same rigorous standards for selection which apply to purchased items are not followed, libraries may find that they are paying for the handling and maintenance of serial sets which would not otherwise be on their shelves. Materials on exchange are so available and seemingly inexpensive that there is a temptation to take too much of what is offered.

UNESCO offers excellent aid in setting up exchanges with foreign institutions. The second edition of its Handbook on the International Exchange of Publications is now somewhat out of date (it was published in 1956), but a third edition is promised soon. The Handbook offers much general information about exchanges, such as the advantages and disadvantages of exchanging directly with institutions as opposed to working through national exchange centers (speed versus economy), gives the text of exchange conventions, lists information on transport and customs, and most usefully, gives a geographical list of agencies interested in exchanges and the titles which they offer. Both the general information and the lists of institutions are kept up to date by the UNESCO Bulletin for Libraries.

The exchange program of the Library of Congress is truly a magnificent one. In 1867 Congress approved an arrangement whereby the Smithsonian Institution sends out sets of U. S. official documents to foreign depositories and by which the Library of Congress receives the official documents of foreign nations in return. Today the Library’s objective is to secure all the official publications of all the countries of the world. In view of this, it is not surprising that a survey by Donald Wisdom, sponsored by the Farmington Plan Committee, showed that “current holdings of foreign government publications in American research libraries are inadequate, and that there is a universal dependence on the Library of Congress for the comprehensive collecting of foreign government publications.”

Newly Developing Areas

So far I have been dealing for the most part with the acquisition of foreign publications in the bibliographically accessible parts of the world. Acquisitions from the newly developing and politically restricted areas present special problems. Each area is worth a separate Allerton Park Institute, and I can only nod at each of them in this paper.

The large and varying body of publications from these areas is discouraging to libraries with their staff and budget restrictions. The size of the acquisition problem which they present and the importance of their availability in the world situation are unanswerable arguments for cooperation in the building of library resources and teach us the
necessity of depending upon each other. In the huge task of building foreign publications resources, librarians can be grateful for the expanded Farmington Plan, which gives at least a framework for exploring cooperation with interested nonlibrary groups in the areas represented by the Farmington Plan subcommittees.

In these language-problem areas of the world, it is more important than ever that acquisitions be thought of broadly, so that consideration is given to the total cost of acquiring a publication and preparing it for the public shelves. There are decided advantages to a close relationship between those who acquire and those who catalog such items. When such a program is getting under way and the library technical service staff is small, one person may handle all aspects of the program. As the operation increases and the staff increases, a close liaison between acquisitions and cataloging, purchase and exchange, monographs and serials can effect operational savings. Since it is easy to recognize and isolate non-Western language publications, these portions of the total technical services can return to the small library staff situation, in which the administrative paraphernalia of large operations can be eliminated with consequent savings.

Cooperation throughout the full technical process is excitingly present under the Public Law 480 program. Libraries taking advantage of this arrangement, by which current publications of India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic can be acquired, are also paying for cooperative cataloging of the materials. Publications are thus delivered to the member libraries very nearly ready to be placed on the shelves.

I shall not try to sketch even briefly the particular problems of the various critical areas around the world. Instead, I shall refer you to the Winter 1963 issue of Library Resources and Technical Services, which features acquisitions and includes the six talks presented by the Acquisitions Section of ALA in Miami. The topic of the meeting was "Acquisitions from Newly Developing Areas," and the speakers and their areas were as follows: Latin America, by Stanley West; the Middle East, by Philip McNiff; Southeast Asia, by Felix Reichmann; East Europe, by Dorothy Keller; Africa, by Hans Panofsky; and East Asia, by Warren Tsuneshi. Except for Eastern Europe and Japan, all of these areas have little bibliographic control and lack booksellers who operate according to Western practices. All, except Latin America, publish mostly in languages in non-Roman alphabets for which there are far too few experts among U. S. librarians.

Procurement Agents

Buying trips abroad by both librarians and patrons have always been a rich source of acquisitions. A recent development is the employment by libraries of professional procurement agents. When the
Library of Congress found that it could not meet government needs through purchase and exchange, a plan was established during World War II for full-time publications procurement officers to be attached to diplomatic posts in bibliographically difficult areas. Long before this plan went into effect it had been urged that the exchange of government documents between our nation and others be enlarged to place at least one more set of public documents in this country, perhaps assigned to research libraries on a subject basis. With the new procurement program for nongovernment publications came suggestions that the same agents might be used to obtain publications for research libraries, since the growth of such libraries is in the national interest. The PL 480 program has been hailed as an opening wedge in this direction, since federal funds are being used to purchase current publications for research libraries, and the Library of Congress has assumed leadership in carrying out the project. Under a program begun earlier LC assumed responsibility for the selection, purchasing, and shipping of three identical sets of Indian documents to three research libraries in this country with funds provided under PL 48. The Bryant Memorandum states that the federal government should participate in the programs of research libraries, and the Librarian of Congress has agreed in principle. A beginning has been made to broaden the scope of the original Library Services Act in order to extend government aid to college and university libraries. Taken together, these activities suggest that the federal government is ready to accept a broader share of responsibility for providing adequate library resources in this country.

An independent venture in the procurement agent approach, a venture of which LC and a book firm are members, is LACAP, the Latin American Cooperative Acquisitions Project. LACAP sent its first procurement agent to South America in 1960. So far, all concerned speak highly of it, and indeed Stanley West reports that discussion at last summer’s Seventh Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials established the fact that LACAP had been able to send more publications to the United States than had been supplied by South American dealers under the Farmington Plan. LACAP has now opened a permanent office in Bogotá, Colombia, and will try to supply books from all countries of South America except Brazil.

An attempt to make LC Latin American duplicates available on a first priority basis to those libraries responsible for various countries under the Farmington Plan has been set up by the Farmington Plan Subcommittee on Latin America. The United States Book Exchange has agreed to list the duplicates and offer them first to the library having responsibility for each country.

As more and more libraries join the few pioneers in each of the bibliographically backward areas of the world, there would seem to
be three activities which should be attacked cooperatively: the employment of procurement agents in strategic places, arrangements for easy circulation of duplicates, and cooperative cataloging. Each of these has been tried on a limited scale in at least one of the projects described above. Each has had an encouraging degree of success. The view ahead is a widening one.
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RESEARCH REPORTS IN UNIVERSITY AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Walter A. Kee

An attempt to present a thorough discussion of the selection and acquisition of research reports reminds me of a slogan printed on my teen-age daughter’s jacket: “Do you have a minute? Tell me all you know.” I am reminded of this slogan for two reasons: (1) the subject is a complex, many-faceted, rapidly changing one and a topic about which nobody, I suppose, has all the facts, and (2) I certainly lay no claim to being an expert, even though I am more than 100 miles from home.

Within the limits of my knowledge, I will present a brief outline of the recent growth of research, some effects of this growth upon the body of report literature, some problems of the government which inhibit reporting on research, efforts of the government to improve the flow of information, and a generalized discussion of the selection and acquisition of reports. I should state at this point that in my paper I will discuss primarily scientific and technical reports resulting from government-sponsored research and development. I have limited myself to this topic because it is one about which I have a modicum of knowledge.

All of you have been exposed to a surfeit of reading matter on the growth of research and on the information deluge. Almost every type of publication, from a scientific journal to a library journal to Readers’ Digest, seems to come up regularly with a hash, rehash, or re-rehash of one or both topics. At the risk of boring you, however, I shall present a few brief statistics on the growth of research since 1940. My purpose is to place in context some remarks concerning the report literature which will be discussed later in this paper.

This growth is summarized in a paper written by Dwight Gray of the National Science Foundation, in which the author notes, “Whereas just prior to World War II, U. S. expenditures for pure and applied science totaled less than $300 million, in Fiscal 1961 the amount was some $14 billion. It is estimated that the nation’s R&D (research and development) bill in Fiscal 1963 will be in the neighborhood of $18 billion, of which roughly two-thirds will come directly or indirectly from federal funds.”¹ In 1962, total federal R&D funds were estimated at $9.5 billion; and of this amount, educational institutions were to

receive 11 per cent, or a little over $1 billion. In terms of basic and applied research, the amount spent in 1939-40 was $27 million, a figure which rose 2600 per cent to $734 million in 1957-58. The total governmental expenditure for basic and applied research in 1962 was estimated to be almost $2.3 billion, which represents a growth of 3700 per cent over the amount spent in 1939-40. Of this amount, based upon the actual 1961 statistics, the educational institutions were to receive 44 per cent, or slightly over $1 billion. It seems apparent, if my arithmetic is correct, that almost all of the funds available to educational institutions were spent for basic and applied research.

Unfortunately, no comparable figures exist for the expenditure of R&D funds by industry, nor for the portion of such funds made available to universities. A statement by Fred R. Cagle, however, clearly delineates the current situation:

Although the prosperity of much American industry is based upon knowledge produced by university-initiated research, corporations contribute relatively little to the support of scholarship in the university. In fact, much that they ‘contribute’ is provided in the form of rigidly defined research contracts that require specific services. Industry may not only specify narrowly limited research, but frequently expects the university to contribute substantially toward the costs.

What does the future trend in R&D seem to be? The report Federal Research Projects and the Southern University, by Mr. Cagle, contains a number of interesting comments on this topic:

Based on changes to date, it seems reasonable that the future pattern of research support could include these developments:

1. Funds for research and training in science (including social science) and technology (available to universities) will be increased at least ten fold.
2. The social sciences will be provided an increased proportion of total research and training funds.
3. The international programs of universities, especially in science and technology, will be better financed.
4. Funds for university-associated research centers (or institutes) in many fields will be provided.
5. Institutional grants providing as much as 25 per cent of total project support will be made.
6. The project system will be continued and expanded to provide research support for university scholars in all fields.
7. Grants and contracts will pay the full cost of research as identified by the institutions.
8. Federal funds will be made more generally available for the purchase of equipment. The requirement of matching funds will be abandoned.
9. Funds for capital facilities will be provided by either loans or direct grants.

10. Funds will be provided for information centers in the universities.\(^4\)

Immediately afterwards, however, he adds this note of warning: "The government will move in these directions only if the leaders of higher education present their problems clearly and emphatically, demand changes, and make politically feasible the actions required of Congress."\(^5\)

What are the prospects for additional support from industry? Lloyd Berkner has stated that

\[\ldots\] a great growth of industrial support must be generated. Industry stands to benefit directly from the ideas emergent from fundamental research. I think it is not too much to expect that ultimately something like 1 per cent of the gross output of American industry should be made available to the universities and related academic activities for their pure research as distinguished from the educational effort.\(^6\)

It is evident from the foregoing data that funds for R\&D have been increasing at a tremendous rate and will continue to increase rapidly for some years. No librarian needs to have explained to him what this increase has meant and will mean in terms of an increase in the report literature. As Dwight Gray has stated the problem,

Then came the deluge—of federal funds to support R\&D, of the R\&D these funds spawned, and of the information this R\&D has generated. Most floods abate after a while; this threefold one hasn’t. On the contrary these ‘waters,’ far from receding, have continued to rise.\(^7\)

—and I might add, will continue to rise.

What direct financial help have university and research libraries received to support the acquisition and organization of this flood of literature? In his paper Mr. Gray states the thesis that since

\[\ldots\] every research project uses information as an essential raw material \[\ldots\] [and] \[\ldots\] information is an important product of research, \[\ldots\] the processing and dissemination of the results of research—that is, of scientific information—is [sic] as integral a part of the total research sequence as experimentation is.\(^8\)

But he goes on to say:

In neither case—fundamental or applied research—has the dissemination of the results of experimentation really been treated as an integral element in the research process. Thus, the system has had the basic defect that variations in the magnitude of the effort in the experimental phases of research are not accompanied
automatically by corresponding changes in the information handling and dissemination capabilities.\(^9\)

Mr. Cagle has this to say:

No provisions were made in any university for the diversion of income from project funds to support the libraries. Research budgets often included funds for the purchase of reference books, but these were not ordinarily placed in the university libraries.\(^10\)

A similar situation pertains, I am sure, relative to the acquisition of research reports. As the result of his contract a scientist receives reports on distribution, but few such reports, I suspect, ever find their way into the library collection. This statement is supported by numerous comments in Mr. Cagle’s report to the effect that most universities have no central administrative control over research projects. They do not control the acceptance of contracts, the funding, or the administration. Therefore, it is safe to assume that, in general, universities have not established any centralized unit to receive and control incoming reports sent for project use or the reports generated by these projects. Mr. Cagle suggests that central control over research projects should be established and that

The federal agencies should adopt a policy that permits the individual applying for research funds to include the cost of library services as a direct cost. Ideally, perhaps such budgeted funds should automatically be diverted for support of the library.\(^11\)

While this policy has not been adopted, Public Law 87-638 does provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development. The law states

That hereafter provision may be made in cost-type research and development contracts (including grants) with universities, colleges, or other educational institutions for payment of reimbursable indirect costs on the basis of predetermined fixed-percentage rates applied to the total, or an element thereof, of the reimbursable direct costs incurred.\(^12\)

Application of these principles would provide more adequate funding for libraries, would permit the hiring of sufficient staff to handle the reports collection, and would enable the university to establish centralized control over its report program: a central record of incoming documents and of reports generated on site.

Before going into a specific discussion of the selection and acquisition procedures for reports, I should mention a few problems, internal to the federal government, which make the selection and acquisition of reports by university and research libraries more difficult:
1. The wording of the contract clauses which discuss reporting requirements is indefinite and vague. As a result, contractors may report in an inadequate fashion, may issue only administrative reports (no scientific or technical ones), or perhaps may publish no reports at all.

2. Some agencies have no statutory requirement to disseminate information. For instance, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) do have; the Department of Defense (DOD) and numerous other agencies do not. As a result, agencies which do not have such a requirement tend to think only of their own internal needs. They usually publish in small print runs, probably provide limited distribution, and may or may not send copies to the Office of Technical Services (OTS).

3. Prime contracts may not include a requirement for the submission of subcontractors' reports to the sponsoring agency. Senator Humphrey, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, states in a memorandum to Congressman George H. Mahon: "ASTIA [Armed Services Technological Information Agency] receives practically no technical reports from the D.O.D.'s estimated 300,000 sub and lower tier subcontracts." The same situation holds true, to a greater or lesser degree, with the other agencies.

4. A substantial number of reports are never processed into any centralized report dissemination system. After one reads a recent report by John I. Thompson and Company, it is apparent that some agencies have no policy governing the distribution of reports and that some have antiquated policies, while in some the established policies are not being carried out. I would like to quote some figures from a memorandum of Senator Humphrey about the ASTIA situation. ASTIA is used as an example solely because this is the only agency which has assembled any reliable data: "ASTIA receives less than 19% (27,000 technical reports per year) of the total reports produced by D.O.D. prime contractors and associate contractors." I suspect that data from other agencies, if they were assembled, would not indicate a very spectacular record for these agencies either.

5. The declassification program of some agencies leaves much to be desired. There are no programs for a regular review of the classified publications and for downgrading that information which no longer endangers the national security. In addition to the security classifications, certain agencies assign "Official Use Only" and "For Military Use Only" markings to a substantial number of documents. A look at the titles of some reports with such markings makes one wonder what is so official about
them or how proprietary rights could be involved. An associated problem is that unnecessary fragments of classified or proprietary information are included in reports which might otherwise have been issued as unclassified, readily accessible reports. Unfortunately, it is much easier to stamp a restrictive marking on the report originally than it is to remove it later.

6. Insufficient monetary and administrative support of some of the federal information programs is another factor. As Senator Humphrey stated, "Despite its significant service its [ASTIA's] role has been construed by higher authority as a relatively limited one; its manpower, space and other resources have been consequently restricted." The same comments can be made about numerous other agencies. Dwight Gray has attempted to provide some estimate of the adequacy of the monetary support of information programs. He states that identified information funds in the government total 1 per cent with perhaps 1 per cent of unidentified funds:

making total federal expenditures for scientific information of the order of 2 per cent, plus of the [federal] R&D budget . . . . Allowing for the present inadequacies of both public and private scientific information systems, one might estimate 4 to 5 per cent as a minimum order-of-magnitude portion of R&D funds that could justifiably and effectively be devoted to the control and dissemination of the results of research.

7. Lack of appreciation by scientists and management in government (and, indeed, in general) of the importance of information is another contributing factor. Dwight Gray states that

whereas this kinship [information and research] actually is a blood-relation kind, information has been treated by the overall research and development community as a slightly suspect in-law or a cousin several times removed.

8. Research and development is oriented within an agency, as it should be, primarily towards the agency's mission. Unfortunately, in some instances, the information generated from such R&D is considered to be of interest only to the sponsoring agency. To quote from a recent report prepared by John I. Thompson and Company under a contract with the National Science Foundation (NSF):

There is no coordinated, Government-wide policy for the dissemination of scientific information . . . . In the absence of overall standards or guidelines for research reporting, such department or agency establishes its own policy. The differences in interpretation, among these various agencies,
of what constitutes technical reporting results in failures to reproduce and distribute certain categories of reports. Nonavailability or delay of such information can cause serious delay in the advancement of other current research projects.18

So far, I have presented a brief description of the growth of research, the growth of the report literature, and some problems within the government which militate against report dissemination. Let us now take a look at the current announcement and acquisition situation. About 90 per cent of the reports generated as the result of government-sponsored research and development are issued by DOD, NASA, and AEC. The remaining 10 per cent of the reports are issued by a relatively large number of agencies. The DOD announces some 27,000 unclassified, unlimited distribution reports annually, covering the areas of physical sciences, engineering, technology, and social sciences, in the Technical Abstract Bulletin (TAB) issued by ASTIA. One of the difficulties in using TAB is that ASTIA also announces classified reports with unclassified titles and limited distribution reports in addition to unclassified ones in this publication. Care must be taken during the selection process not to select such material unless a university has contracts which will permit the acquisition of classified reports.

Each issue of TAB contains descriptor (subject), source (corporate author), and report number indexes. Beginning with January 1963, these indexes will be cumulated quarterly, semiannually, and annually. The public availability information is given with the abstract in the unclassified (white) portion of TAB. In July 1962, ASTIA began the reissuance of its classified TAB. This journal will follow the same indexing pattern as the unclassified version. The classified edition is available only to government agencies and their contractors who have a "need to know."

However, as stated previously, ASTIA receives only about 20 per cent of the unclassified reports issued within the DOD, so that if ASTIA received all of the reports, the total would be some 135,000 a year. Some estimates place the figure for unclassified, classified, and limited distribution reports as high as 300,000. A special task force has been set up within the DOD by the Secretary of Defense to study the total information system. It appears that, as a result of this study, directives will be issued to ensure the receipt of reports by ASTIA, and efforts will be made to improve the position of ASTIA within the management hierarchy, to provide additional space, and to provide additional manpower. ASTIA has had some additional positions allotted to it in Fiscal 1963.

NASA, of course, is still developing its information program, although in many aspects it will resemble that of the AEC. It has
established a centralized information system through which all NASA laboratory and NASA-contractor reports as well as pertinent non-NASA reports of the United States and other countries are announced in Technical Publications Announcements. It was estimated that 15,000 to 20,000 reports would be announced during 1962, and it is projected that some 25,000 will be announced during 1963 since NASA is developing procedures to ensure the receipt of contractor reports and to establish exchange programs with foreign countries.

In January 1963, NASA began to support the publication of International Aerospace Abstracts, which is published by the Institute of Aerospace Sciences. This journal will cover the published literature and will complement the Technical Publications Announcements. NASA will produce the indexes for both publications by computer so that complete indexes will be included in every issue of both journals with quarterly, semiannual, and annual cumulative indexes. The public availability information for reports will continue to be included with the abstracts in Technical Publications Announcements. These two journals will provide rather comprehensive coverage of this body of literature.

NASA also issues a publication which announces classified publications, Confidential Technical Publications Announcements. After January 1963, it will be issued in the same pattern as the unclassified journal. The classified version is available only to government agencies and their contractors who need this information and who have justified this need through the proper channels.

The AEC announces the major portion of its unclassified reports in Nuclear Science Abstracts (NSA). NASA includes the reports of the Commission and its contractors, other government agencies and their contractors, foreign government agencies, and nongovernmental organizations both in the United States and abroad. Currently, NSA is announcing some 6,000 unclassified reports but eventually may announce 8,000 to 9,000 a year. This growth will result partly from improved programs ensuring the receipt of all AEC generated reports, but to a large extent from an active exchange program under which the AEC receives reports of other atomic energy agencies throughout the world.

Each issue of NSA contains a subject, corporate author, personal author, and report number index. This latter index contains information on public availability, including sales price from OTS and availability at AEC depositories. These indexes are cumulated quarterly, semiannually, annually, and quinquennially. The cumulative report number index, published annually, contains a listing of reports announced in all volumes of NSA and its predecessor Abstracts of Declassified Reports. The AEC also publishes, irregularly, Research and Development Abstracts, which announces publications that describe
AEC-sponsored R&D which does not fall within the scope of NSA. The indexing pattern is identical to that of NSA.

Classified and limited distribution reports are announced in Abstracts of Classified Reports. This journal is available only to the AEC and its contractors and to those other government agencies and their contractors who can justify an official "need to know." The AEC also issues special lists of bibliographies and translations, a bibliography of bibliographies, a bibliography of translations, and other publications that are useful in the selection process.

The remaining 10 per cent of reports are issued by a large number of government agencies. Some of these reports are announced in the Monthly Catalog of U. S. Government Documents, others in U. S. Government Research Reports, some only in publications issued by the sponsoring agency, and some are not announced publicly in any manner.

There are a number of problems involved in using the announcement services listed above for selection purposes.

1. The reports are announced in broad subject categories which, in theory, should simplify the selection process. However, each report is listed only in its primary category even though it may also contain information belonging in other categories. Therefore, to be sure one is selecting all pertinent information on a subject, he cannot rely solely upon scanning a category but must search the subject index.

2. There is no standardization of categories or subject headings among the services. The user must become familiar with the format of each publication. A start on standardization has been made, however, through the request of ASTIA for interagency assistance in preparing the new edition of its Thesaurus, due in December 1962. Also the Datatrol Corporation recently issued a report entitled, Experimental Study of Convertability between Large Technical Indexing Vocabularies, which was prepared under a contract with NSF. Additional studies and programs along this line undoubtedly will be forthcoming. Recommendations for a government-wide announcement system based upon a standard thesaurus were made in the recent report published by Thompson:

A more practical solution, therefore, would be the establishment of one central announcement system which would cover all new reports generated through Government research and which would furnish announcements to Government R&D activities, their contractors and their grantees .... Further the announcement service should be made available to the general public under a payment-for-service plan.
3. The announcement and retrospective searching functions are combined into one publication. In my opinion, in order to be most effective, each of these two functions requires a different style of presenting the information. Additionally, the preparation of the abstracts and indexes delays the announcement of new reports since a longer publication cycle is required for this type of journal. A separate announcement publication can be issued promptly.

4. The large number of announcement publications makes it almost an impossible task to scan them all.

5. With the anticipated growth in the number of reports being issued, the selection process will become increasingly difficult.

Some progress has been made in establishing a government-wide announcement system. Beginning in July 1961 the U. S. Government Research Reports (USGRR) began to announce all unclassified NASA and AEC reports, unclassified, unlimited distribution ASTIA reports, and reports of other agencies. Efforts are being made to include all reports of government-sponsored research and development in this publication.

Unfortunately, at present, USGRR consists of one listing which includes older military, AEC, and NASA reports and a second listing which is a reproduction of the unclassified portion of TAB. This arrangement requires two separate report number indexes and two subject indexes in each issue. At present, the Office of Technical Services is issuing only a semiannual cumulative index to USGRR. In order for one to obtain a consolidated index to USGRR, it will be necessary for ASTIA, NASA, and the AEC to establish a standard or convertible system of subject headings or descriptors. To issue such an index promptly, it probably will be necessary for these agencies to provide duplicate computer tapes or decks of IBM cards to OTS.

A more recent publication to be issued by OTS is its Keywords Index, a permuted title index, the first issue of which was published in June 1962. Since the indexing for this semimonthly journal is prepared on a computer directly from the titles, it is possible to merge all reports into one consolidated listing. This publication, however, is not particularly useful as a selection device. The reports are not arranged in subject categories but are scattered throughout the publication under many keywords.

An OTS publication which may be useful in identifying translations of foreign reports is Translations Monthly, which announces translations of government agencies, industry, universities, and commercial firms of the United States and abroad and those acquired by overseas translation centers. Each issue contains author, subject, journal, and number indexes, which are cumulated annually.

In part, this listing duplicates the announcement of reports covered by the other services, including some translations. However, it is necessary to check the Catalog if a library wishes to be thorough in its searching for new reports.

Under the "Depository Library Act of 1962" each component of the government is required to submit to the Superintendent of Documents a monthly list of all documents issued, except those required for official use only, those required for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value, and those which are classified. The Superintendent of Documents may select any titles from these lists for distribution to the depositories.

At the request of the Public Printer an interagency committee has been established to work out the details for implementing this program. Numerous problems exist: (1) Shall only the publications issued by field and departmental printing plants be included, in addition to those printed by GPO, or shall those published by contractors of governmental agencies also be included? (2) Will reports be included as part of the GPO depository collections and, if so, will agencies, such as the AEC, have to supply full-size copies of those reports they now issue only in microform? It seems evident that in the future the Catalog will announce many more publications than it is currently announcing. It may or may not announce reports, depending upon the definition by the Public Printer of what constitutes a public document.

The services just discussed, of course, are the primary announcement publications which cover the major portion of government-sponsored research and development reports. However, the balance of the reports are announced in annual bibliographies, accessions lists, announcements, journal publications, press releases, and a variety of other media. Additionally, industry, universities, and private institutions throughout the world also use a variety of media for announcing their reports. In my opinion, it is utterly hopeless and fruitless for any university or research library to attempt to scan all of the possible announcement sources. My recommendation is one which all of you follow, I am sure, that is, for a library to decide precisely in what subject areas it will support educational and research programs and then to search only the major announcement publications which list reports in the pertinent areas. With the greatly expanded coverage one may expect from the government abstracting services over the next few years, these publications should announce most of the reports resulting from government-sponsored research. In addition to these services, the library should identify a few major non-governmental organizations which do research in the selected subject areas and obtain their announcement publications. Beyond this clearly delineated selection program, the library should rely upon specific requests to determine the other reports it needs.
Now we come to the crux of the matter, how to obtain reports once a library has made a selection. There are, of course, numerous channels through which a university or research library can obtain reports. Let us take a look at a few of these.

One channel through which a university can obtain unclassified and/or classified reports is as the result of having government or industrial research contracts. The sponsoring agency generally will provide reports needed to support such research. For Department of Defense contracts, the sponsoring agency may provide some reports directly and can arrange for the university to receive reports from ASTIA by having it submit a Field of Interest Register through the cognizant military contracting officer. Both classified and unclassified ASTIA reports are distributed in accordance with a category arrangement. NASA reports can also be obtained as the result of having a contract. It is possible to be placed on the distribution for all unclassified reports, all classified and unclassified reports, or on special distribution for specific categories. Currently only NASA "in house" reports are being distributed, but it is planned to add contractor reports, many of them of them on 5" x 8" microfiche, to the distribution system. It will be possible, however, for official requestors to obtain full-size copy of reports originally supplied in microfiche. Nonprofit organizations can be placed on the distribution for unclassified NASA reports even though they have no contracts. At the present time, contractor reports will not be distributed to such organizations, although they may be able to borrow a copy from NASA Headquarters in Washington. Requests for loans of foreign reports or translations also may be addressed to Headquarters.

The AEC distributes both its classified and unclassified reports by a category distribution system. Contractors can be placed on distribution by submitting a request through the appropriate operations office. The AEC distributes about 25 per cent of its reports in full-size copy and 75 per cent on microcards. New reports are evaluated, and those considered to be more important are printed in full-size. However, a contractor can obtain a full-size copy of a report, available in its collection only on microcard, by submitting a request to the Division of Technical Information Extension. As part of the distribution, a contractor receives Nuclear Science Abstracts, Abstracts of Classified Reports, if appropriate, other bibliographic publications, reports received from abroad, and translations.

Other government agencies have a variety of systems for distributing their reports. A review of the Thompson report clearly points up this fact. Some make a distribution "in house" only, some distribute "in house" and to certain other government agencies, some have special distribution lists for each report or series of reports, and some make no distribution outside the local issuing component.
Additionally, some agencies, such as the National Institute of Health (NIH), issue no reports but the results of all their research are published as journal articles.

The universities can help themselves in accumulating a collection of reports received through such research contracts. There are at least two do-it-yourself projects. The first is for each university to establish a contract administrator. As Mr. Cagle stated in his report,

Few institutions have assigned responsibility to a single position in the university for maintaining an overall view of the sponsored programs and their interaction with the established, continuing university programs.

Such officials could arrange with the agencies to have all incoming reports sent to the library and all reports generated on campus distributed by the library. Probably this practice would require the establishment of a reports center and additional manpower.

This brings us to the second self-help project. The universities can, by acting in concert, convince the government agencies that a portion of research funds should be allocated to library support. Thus, funds would be available to procure additional reports, to obtain needed equipment, and to provide the additional manpower.

A second method of obtaining reports, of course, is by procurement. The Office of Technical Services currently makes available all unclassified, unlimited distribution ASTIA reports since it receives these reports on 35mm microfilm, all full-size unclassified NASA “in house” reports. OTS is negotiating to receive all contractor reports on microfilm, all AEC unclassified reports either in full-size or on microfilm, and certain reports from various other agencies. Additionally, OTS makes every effort to obtain older ASTIA reports which were not released publicly. In general, reports must be ordered individually, but a standing order may be placed for all AEC reports or those in any subject category. All purchases can be charged to an institution’s GPO deposit account.

The storage of all reports in reproducible microcopy enables OTS to keep all reports in print. With the reproduction facilities available at OTS, requestors now can choose to receive either microfilm or full-size copy of reports in the OTS files.

The unclassified AEC reports also are available on microcards from Microcard Editions, Inc. It is possible either to place a subscription for all reports issued every month or to purchase individual reports. Full sets of reports issued to date are also available.

Of course, reports available from the Superintendent of Documents can also be purchased on a GPO deposit account. Under the new depository library program, it is possible that additional reports may be announced in the Monthly Catalog. Copies of such reports will
have been obtained for distribution to the GPO depository libraries and, I suppose, some extra copies will be procured for sale. To express a personal opinion which has no official status, I sincerely hope that arrangements can be worked out to keep the report sales and depository system separated from the GPO sales and depository program. That is, any reports identified by GPO (from the lists) will be turned over to OTS for inclusion in its sales and depository system. In addition to establishing more comprehensive reports collections in the Regional Technical Reports Centers, this procedure will establish one sales agent for reports and will keep reports "in print" since OTS has microfilming facilities and GPO does not.

This statement leads us to a discussion of the next method of obtaining reports. That is the depository library system, or I should say systems, since each agency has established its own system independently of any other.

At the present time, there are 604 GPO depository libraries, but under the new depository act the total eventually could become about 1,200. A number of these new depositories undoubtedly will be established in universities. A particularly interesting feature of the new Act is one that provides for regional depositories to be designated in each state. Such libraries will have to retain all documents permanently either in full size or in microcopy while regular depositories can dispose of documents after retaining them for 5 years. This arrangement will enable the regular depositories to stabilize the size of their GPO collections and to rely upon the regional depository for the interlibrary loan of documents not in their collections.

The Regional Technical Report Center program is a relatively new development established under the programmatic management of OTS. Each of the 12 centers will receive 35mm real microfilm of ASTIA reports, full-size and 5" x 8" microfiche (sheet microfilm) of NASA reports, full-size and microcards of AEC reports, and full-size of 35mm reel microfilm of the reports of other agencies. It is obvious from the above statement that a lack of standardization exists in the type of microcopy, but not as obvious is the fact that there is no standardization in reduction ratio. These centers are required to provide reference service and interlibrary loan service and either to reproduce copy, as required, or to obtain such copy from which universities can obtain needed reports.

ASTIA has no depository library system of its own, but as has been stated previously, NASA will distribute all of its unclassified reports, or only those in certain categories, to universities which need this information.

The AEC has operated a depository library system for some years. Presently there are 87 depositories in the United States (12 of which are also Regional Technical Report Centers) and 88 depositories overseas in some 63 countries. Each depository receives a
collection of reports consisting of about 25 per cent full-size copies and 75 per cent on microcard. A depository is expected to provide reference service and to loan the full-size copy and microcards. For loan purposes each depository can obtain full-size copy of reports available in its collection only on microcards.

Although the emphasis of this Institute is upon procedures, I want to state what, in my opinion, should be the basic philosophy of university and research libraries with regard to report selection and acquisitions. It is this: libraries should exercise more care in selecting and acquiring reports than any other type of literature and should maintain a continuous program of weeding. What are my reasons for making this statement?

1. The number of available reports is expanding rapidly. The present production is estimated at 100,000 a year but may soon total 150,000 to 300,000. Various programs within the government will make a much larger percentage of this production available to the public.

2. The reports will continue to remain available. The microfilming program at the Office of Technical Services will keep reports "in print." The Government Printing Office regional depositories and Regional Technical Reports Centers will provide a continuing source of interlibrary loans.

3. Reports in general are relatively ephemeral. Numerous studies have shown that about five years after issuance most reports have little reference value. The information has been superseded or incorporated into some more permanent form of publication. Reports are neither literary masterpieces nor rare books and should not be treated as collector's items.

First, libraries should use prudent judgment and select and acquire reports in only those subject areas needed to support the research efforts of their organizations. Second, even within these subject areas an attempt should be made to acquire reports on a selective basis. To state it another way, academic libraries should not try to be comprehensive in their acquisition of reports from all sources within the subject areas. Rather, they should establish a basic collection of reports and place greater reliance upon procuring other reports as needed or upon obtaining them through interlibrary loan.

The handling of reports, once received, should be as simple as possible. Almost all of the reports will have been brought under bibliographic control by U. S. Government Research Reports, Nuclear Science Abstracts, Monthly Catalog of U. S. Government Documents, Technical Publications Announcements, Technical Abstract Bulletin, and Technical Translations. In my opinion, it is just as unthinkable to consider cataloging all reports as it is to consider cataloging all journal articles. The report indexes should be used for searching the
report literature just as journal indexes are used to search the journal literature. I should explain that, whatever they are, reports are not serials. They will not arrive in nice, neat numerical sequence as serials do. There are a number of reasons for this situation: all reports--classified, unclassified, or limited distribution--are issued in one numerical sequence; some reports are delayed in being issued; numbers are assigned to certain reports which are never published; and reports originally issued as classified may be declassified and made publicly available at a much later date. Therefore, gaps will appear in the number sequence of any report series, particularly in a collection of unclassified reports. It is not recommended that reports be bound in volumes like journals or other serial sets. All that one needs, at most, is a simple record of holdings. For reports some libraries are using check-in cards similar to those being used for serial records. A card is prepared for each series of reports; for example, AD, ANL, ORNL, NASA. Other libraries prepare a shelf-list card, containing only the report number, title, and date for each report. These records can be prepared by the receiving group (acquisitions, serial, or document unit), and the reports can be placed directly onto the shelves without processing them through the cataloging unit.

Cataloging may be worthwhile for certain special items received as part of report collections, such as proceedings of conferences or symposia and translations of complete books or complete volumes of journals. These publications have more permanent reference value and undoubtedly will receive more extensive use if they are fully cataloged. Some libraries procure a second copy of such reports for cataloging rather than to remove any reports from the report collection. Others catalog the original copies and place a notation of the call number on the appropriate cards in the shelf list for reports.

In summary, the research and development effort is continually expanding, and as a result the accumulation of report literature is growing rapidly. Certain programs in the government will make a much larger percentage of the reports available and thus additionally increase the body of report literature. Congressional pressure and agency action give promise of better bibliographic control of this literature, better and continuing availability of reports for purchase, and systems of regional depositories from which reports can be borrowed. In the light of these developments, university and research libraries would be well advised to carefully assay their need for reports. The collection should be limited to those subject areas and in that depth needed to support the on-going educational and research efforts. Since reports are, to a substantial degree, relatively ephemeral and are being brought under increasingly better bibliographic control, they should not be given full cataloging treatment. As in the case of
journals, searching should be performed by using the appropriate abstracting and indexing services.
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THE STATE OF THE RARE BOOK MARKET TODAY

John Parker

I hope that no one will read a defensive tone into these remarks, for the rare book librarian is at first startled at the thought of bringing a discussion of the rare book trade into a symposium on "the practical operations of libraries in [acquisitions] functions." We have become weary in the struggle to establish our belief that rare books are a fit subject for discussion among other "practical" aspects of librarianship. I happily substitute gratitude for defensiveness, noting that rare bookmen here are accepted as practical librarians, interested in and capable of discussing the broader aspects of building library collections.

In our emphasis upon the older books, we are not unmindful of the fact that we seek financial support from budgets that are heavily committed to the necessary acquisition of next year's latest journals and monographs in a variety of subject fields. We do not resent the truth of Shakespeare's observation

"That all with one consent praise new-born gawds,
Though they are made and moulded of things past,
And give to dust that is a little gilt,
More laud than gilt o'er dusted."

There is nothing about life among original boards and vellum that makes modern books any less interesting to contemplate. Rather, we feel that we have an important contribution to make toward a proper understanding of the latest publications.

An educated man, according to the contemporary Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset, is one "who understands and appreciates the cultural tradition which produced him, and who is willing to spend himself in his own lifetime in order that that valuable heritage might be preserved, protected, perfected, and extended for the benefit of future generations." Books are the repositories of much of this heritage, and as keepers of them we are confident of our contribution to education. In making that contribution, we too have acquisition problems, but they are not those of mass purchases and mountainous paper work which trouble order departments. Rather, they are problems of an historical nature, growing out of our position as an emerging part of
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the book world long dominated by booksellers and private collectors. We bring narrow budgets and the trappings of bureaucracy into a trade where ample means and a close personal relationship between the merchant and his client are an ancient and warm tradition.

There is little that needs saying about the technical processes involved in buying rare books. Every rare bookman will see to it that orders are speedily placed, that the books are properly protected in their migration through processing departments, and that approval for payment is given quickly. We sometimes wish that the bookseller were more understanding of the bureaucracy that is necessary to the buying of rare books in a public institution. But he has a right to a definite order or rejection within two months of a book sent out on approval, and he has a right to expect prompt payment for a book that has been purchased. This is not rare bookmanship; this is simple efficiency and human courtesy. But what needs more discussion, I believe, are the means by which rare book acquisition programs originating in institutional libraries can be made to bear a stronger influence in the rare book trade. I would plead that the selection of rare books and the impact of selection policy upon the budget are well within the meaning of "practical operation" as called for in the program of this institute.

You have asked me a question, "What is the state of the rare book market today?" When Dr. Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt asked "What is happening in the rare book trade today?" in the April 1961 issue of Library Trends, he prefaced the answers that he and his fellow contributors gave with the remark that it would be difficult to find a more challenging question about the world of books. The question is still challenging to the rare book librarian, especially if he feels that today he and his colleagues have the possibility of exerting an influence that will, to an important degree, determine what is to happen in the antiquarian book trade tomorrow. In my discussion of the problem, my intention is to look at the rare book business as a part of it, although I am a librarian. Members of our profession have too long looked upon booksellers as "the trade" and themselves as its victims. Any trade requires a buyer and a seller, and if both are to be successful, there must be a feeling of equality between the two parties to the sale.

I do not say that the lack of confidence that has sometimes hindered an understanding relationship between librarian and bookseller is entirely unjustified. The traditions of and education for modern librarianship have not been oriented toward the long out-of-print book. And the rare book trade was not established to serve institutional libraries. It was not the desiderata of Oxford and Cambridge libraries that gave rise to the rare book trade in the English-speaking world. It was the private collector, and although he may have had a university library in mind as he bought, the personal relationship was still
between the collector and the bookseller. The traditions of dealer-collector relationships came to America in the nineteenth century, flowered in the period between Reconstruction and Depression, and it is with such notable collectors as Morgan, Huntington, Clements, Folger, and Brown that the beginnings of the institutional collection are to be found. These libraries, although institutionalized, had deep roots in the private collector traditions. They bore the marks of the eighteenth century in which prime condition was the watchword; yet they were dominated by the nineteenth-century spirit with its emphasis upon incunabula, first editions of outstanding authors, and its vigorous concern for the early books relating to the history of the Americas.

The monuments to the love of history and literature which these men built in our country did their work too well. They helped establish certain books and types of books as the required holdings or desiderata of a respectable rare book collection. Author bibliographies and subject lists were created to provide guides for the aspiring bibliophile. By 1921 Seymour de Ricci had prepared a strait jacket for collectors in his The Book Collector's Guide. Here he recorded "the two or three thousand British and American books which fashion has decided are the most desirable for the up-to-date collector." Following the list with a large purse brought forth a fine library, but the acquisition of it was a singularly uncreative activity. There were other lists that one could follow, such as Wagner's The Plains and the Rockies, 1921, and the catalogs of the Church and John Carter Brown libraries. Many a bookbuyer became a follower of lists rather than a creator of a library, whereby he helped to solidify the demand for certain books and bypassed the unlisted as if they were things unclean.

The bookseller quite naturally kept a close account of which collectors were following which lists and supplied their desiderata as it became possible to do so—also a rather uncreative activity, but immensely safe. Thus, a conservatism settled in upon us that took little account of many potential areas for collecting. Prices were revised steadily—usually upward—but the rest of the bookseller's description was little tampered with in his well tended files. The bibliographical remarks of Sabin, Muller, Palau, or Harrisse were (and still are) quoted as gospel, while in most other fields of learning, revision was the very stuff of scholarship.

Into these traditions of collecting and bookselling the American institutional library emerged as a vigorous participant after 1945. Very often its earliest participation resulted from the financial assistance and advice of a private collector, and this fact may have been responsible for the adoption of the standard fields for collecting as well as attitudes on the part of librarians who viewed the rare book collection as a prestige and public relations aspect of the library rather than as a part of its research holdings. It cannot be said too
often that rare books must have a function beyond prestige to justify their presence in an institutional library. Louis B. Wright said it admirably, "The unifying factor that any rare book librarian must consider is what genuine utility will be served by the material he buys."

What is the state of the rare book trade today? The most important thing I can say about it is that the trade is feeling the impact of utilitarianism. Usefulness is making demands upon an enterprise that formerly made its appeal through fashion, emotion, and beauty. The institutional buyer with Wright's words on his conscience is gradually bringing the research interests of professors into the marketplace. Antiquarian booksellers of my acquaintance have estimated that from 60 to 75 per cent of their sales are made to institutional libraries. Yet we rare book librarians have had our indoctrination in the traditions of private collecting and do not deny that the books we have read on the romance of and adventures in book collecting have not ideally suited us to be utilitarian. I find myself rejoicing over a fine calf or pigskin binding now and then, and I am willing to admit that it is much more exciting to do an exhibit of beautiful volumes than to fill cases with books that are merely important. I would by no means suggest abandoning the old traditions; particularly their concern for quality should remain with us, but we must keep utility always in mind.

How deeply are we committed to the interests and traditions of the past, and what influence is our desiderata having upon the rare book trade? To answer these questions I asked institutional rare book librarians and booksellers with institutional clients what types of books are most actively sought, and I am going to share the resulting impressions with you. They are, of course, only impressions, for this is not a subject which lends itself to scientific terminology and measurement. I doubt that those who responded to my inquiries would even agree exactly upon what a rare book is. My impressions are based upon a general view of our larger and medium-sized college, university, and public libraries, excluding, however, certain of the very large rare book collections, the extent and diversity of which made it impossible for the librarians to answer the questions I asked about current emphasis in their acquisitions policies.

The first impression I would note is the tendency for rare book collections in institutional libraries to be administered together with something generally called "special collections." Usually these are subject collections which have less stature than rare books in the mind of the librarian; yet they are receiving more and more attention because their subject emphasis gives them research potential. The booksellers repeatedly call attention to the growth in buying according to subject interests, and it is likely that some of these subject interests reflect the growth of what we are still calling "special collections."
The distinction in our minds seems to be based upon the notion that rare books do not have the same usefulness as "special collections," and nothing could be farther from the truth. I have head librarians ask of a particular library, "Is it a research library or a rare book library?"

Actually, are not both special collections and rare book collections merely specially cared-for extensions of the research holdings of the library? More than two thirds of the librarians who answered my inquiry indicated that they consider their rare book holdings closely related to the research strengths of their libraries, and of those who replied otherwise, several indicated their concern at the diversity in emphasis between the general library and the rare book collections. It seems to me that we are gradually producing a new definition of a rare book, and that definition will have something to say about the utility of that book to the library which acquires it. The segregation of books on the basis of price or class has produced situations in which valuable eighteenth-century books are to be found in the unrestricted area of the stack, because they were bought for a few dollars two decades ago, while fine manuscripts go into "special collections" as a part of the material used for exhibits, and undistinguished limited editions find their way to the rare book room because they supposedly represent fine printing. If subject buying can be accompanied by subject knowledge, we will develop within our rare book holdings "special collections" which will in fact dominate the rare book interest of the library, for what rare book does not have a subject emphasis? That emphasis rather than any other consideration must be the reason for its purchase.

The booksellers' awareness of our interest in rare books, and their estimate that from 60 to 75 per cent of their sales are made to institutions might suggest that we have achieved a position of dominance in the trade. This is not true. We probably dominate in the bread and butter type of rare book, but where the more spectacular rarities are concerned, the private collector and a very few rare book libraries still hold the high ground. Librarians informed me that 88 per cent of their rare book purchases cost less than $100, and ten per cent fell in the $100 to $500 category. We are buying a great many books, but we are not dominating the financial structure of the rare book business.

It will not be what we pay for books or how we administer them that will be the measure of our influence in the rare book trade. What we buy is the important factor, for important collections can be built with small budgets, and truly creative bibliography creates demand where none existed, giving importance and value to books that were previously but little known. An enthusiastic young assistant once suggested to his employer, one of the great booksellers of the past generation, that the firm follow a particular trend that appeared to be
gaining some momentum (it was the history of science): "We do not follow trends; we make them," the bookseller decreed. I doubt if this statement of the origin of trends is quite as valid today as it was then, and surely we librarians ought not to accept the trends established by booksellers unless they are trends of value to us. Each of us has the traditional strengths of our libraries to keep in mind, regardless of trends, and our budgets rarely take into account the impact of trend-following upon prices. But even more important, the librarian is a full-time bibliographer who has no reason to wait for the bookseller for direction. He ought to be capable of deciding what historical, literary, or artistic movements are significant to his library, and then solicit the help of the bookseller in finding the materials he needs.

He will, of course, be under pressure to shift emphasis with new trends in the political, economic, and academic worlds. He will be torn between building to strength and building to novelty, hoping in the latter case to acquire the important books before they become too expensive. If he begins buying a popular new field, he will shortly find that the books of second rate importance are soon too expensive for his budget, and the really important ones that he did not get in his first surge of enthusiasm are far beyond reach. Five or six years ago I was buying seventeenth—and eighteenth—century tracts on the Commerce of West Africa for the Bell Collection at $20 apiece. Lately I was offered a collection of such items, some of which we already have, at an average price of more than $200. The Africana bandwagon is rolling. I do not recommend it for an economical ride.

But there is just as much danger in staying with those fields where our libraries have long-standing commitments, for these are often the areas in which we compete with private collectors. About one-third of the libraries answering my queries indicated that their fields of emphasis had not changed significantly in the last 30 years. Another third noted significant variations in emphasis, and the remaining third stated that they had no rare book collection 30 years ago. What then are the old collecting interests that hold our loyalties, and when we change, or when we start a rare book collection, what are the new directions we are taking?

We are held most firmly by English literature, more I believe because of the heritage (or habits) of the nineteenth century than because our scholars in English literature have a greater need for rare books in their research than do scholars in other fields. The same is true, I believe, of American literature, which is steadily growing in popularity among institutional collections. While one can surely admit some research pressure in these areas, it is unlikely that the urge to collect private press publications and books illustrating the book arts comes from any source other than the librarian who feels an obligation to make a contribution toward recording the history of the printed word. However, while the book arts rank just behind English literature
in popularity, the booksellers note again and again the decline in interest in incunabula as part of the history of printing, and the even more marked lack of interest in the finely printed books of earlier times. The history of printing is still popular among private collectors, and it is possible that the high prices to which these books have risen have forced the institutions into modern fine printing which they can afford and which still keeps them convinced that they are within the old tradition. Let us hope that the fine books of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which are essential to any good collection on the history of book arts, will eventually come to us from the private collectors, who have driven most libraries out of the market for such books.

The rise in prices and the utilitarian approach to collecting have also brought about a change in the type of Americana that is being acquired by institutional libraries. The boundlessness of the term "Americana" makes it an area into which no library can venture without first setting rigid limitations. The old "high spots" style of collecting has little validity in our type of library, and it is precisely the high spots which are well beyond the budgets of most of us. The Harrisse species of early Americana, including many items which briefly mention the New World, is not popular with rare book librarians who prefer more research content for their money. It is to be wondered if the Wagner-Camp type of Americana, which is not only replacing the discovery era in popularity but also the Colonial and Revolutionary War period, is as useful to scholars as it is exciting to the imagination. The West has a tenacious hold on our instincts for adventure and romance, and it is possible that our utilitarianism is being stretched a little as we lean away from our earlier history in the direction of the plains and the rockies.

Utilitarianism shows its influence again in the vigorous buying of Renaissance materials reported by both booksellers and librarians. The main current in buying Renaissance books has shifted from interests in book arts of the period to texts of significance to scholars. This is a field, it seems to me, that should not be entered without considerable thought. The Renaissance has more international appeal than have most other traditional collecting areas, and the near monopoly that Americans had on Renaissance material a decade ago is now being seriously challenged by a revived European interest.

English and American literature, book arts, Americana, and the Renaissance, these are the fields in which we have the strongest traditions. Local history has been strong and will remain strong, but by its nature it usually does not put one library into competition with another. State imprints are a special part of local history, and these remain strong, with more competition resulting, because libraries frequently seek imprints beyond those of their own states. The Civil War is not yet popular with institutional libraries, and I was surprised to find remarkably little interest in it.
If the utilitarian approach and restricted budgets are altering the emphasis in the areas of our greatest tradition, what are they doing to create new fields of collecting for us? I suppose we may call it utilitarian to collect history of science in this science-dominated age, although one detects some fad-following here. We might hope that it results from the scientists' search for a way back to a proper position among the philosophers and humanists, as Dr. Lehmann-Haupt suggested to me. Whatever its cause, collecting of history of science materials is here, and we are probably going to find budgets more ample in this field than in any other. Yet we would do well to set our limitations early, for science is at least as broad as Americana, and having greater international appeal, is likely to be even more expensive. An important dealer in rare scientific materials notes the beginnings of list-following among buyers of science history. Librarians come armed with the Grolier Club Classics in Science, and while no one would belittle the importance of books listed there, they are likely to go beyond our budgets long before we have all of them, and when we have all of them, we have only "high spots" which are of research value only when they are buttressed with quantities of related contemporary material. Would it not be better to collect Darwinism, the history of chemistry, or the history of radiology, with less money and some hope of having a collection sufficiently complete to be of research value?

Other new fields are claiming our attention. Medieval manuscripts without illustrations but with textual value are finding a market in institutions, as are incunabula with important texts. The eighteenth century is emerging into respectability in the eyes of rare bookmen. Fine illustrated books are being acquired, probably as exhibit material, a utilitarian justification for extravagance. There seems to be a growing interest in books on theatre and stage technique. Scholars are finding valuable uses for business records and unpublished manuscripts of all sorts. Africana is one of the fastest growing fields of international significance, and we are not getting all of it in this country by any means.

We have a tremendous assortment of subjects that are being collected; yet the hand of tradition is still too heavy upon us for our own good. We are raising prices for each other by duplicating, and it seems to me that we are not sufficiently creative in our collecting. Booksellers tell me that we are staying close to established lists of books, that we are in a great hurry to build our collections, and that we are more quantity—than quality—conscious; hence the rash of collection-buying.

I would like to dwell a moment upon list-buying and collection-buying. They are essentially the same thing: buying what someone else has assembled, whether physically or bibliographically. Both, I believe, are rather uncreative, but not necessarily unwise. In both
instances the buyer is using someone else's judgment as to the importance of what he is buying, and this practice seems to violate the principle of wise utilitarian purchasing, for even the list compiled by a great scholar and bibliographer was not made with someone else's library in mind. Unless we are firmly committed to a subject which is well covered in a list or a collection, would it not be more worthy of our calling to buy books in a field in which there is no list and then compile one? This would be truly a double contribution to scholarship, whereas list-buying is at best a single contribution. As for collection-buying, it enables a bookseller, as one bookseller put it, to sell a great many rather dull books. A collection is made up of individual titles, and it ought to be approached with attention to individual items, rather than with an awed regard for the size of the lot.

Finally, I should like to lament briefly the number of libraries which feel that their budget restrictions are such as to keep them from buying any rare books, or very few at best, and to point some directions in which they might go and in which some of the rest of us might well follow in the spirit of utility and economy. I would like to suggest that we ought to break out of the concept that only those books which have been declared rare by tradition are worth collecting as rare books. There is no reason that the buyer ought to be the passive half of the rare book business. He ought to be creative, exploring new subjects, discovering books, ascertaining and declaring their rarity, and compiling bibliographies intended to stimulage research in the field he has collected. He ought to be sending the bookseller in search of things that are not recorded and priced in the bookseller's files.

Creative bibliography offers opportunities almost without limit, even within the field of Americana. Calvin Coolidge once said "the chief business of America is business." Yet I find only one library that professed an interest in the rarities of business history in America. Although we are a nation of immigrants, no library that replied to my questionnaire indicated an interest in immigration. I should think that the immigrant press, showing the gradual assimilation of new Americans, would be at least as exciting as private presses. The most mobile people of the modern world, whose grocery stores, banks, movie theaters, and whole way of life, are geared to the automobile, we seem to be satisfied with a few private collectors of old cars. What an area for collecting, the emergence of the horseless age! Will it one day be looked back upon as the beginnings of a machine-powered mobility that literally has no end? Or the age of flight, man's liberation from the confines of the earth. Might it not one day be considered almost as important as the Renaissance? Speaking of liberation, I found only a single expression of interest in the feminist movement among libraries that replied to my inquiries. Can we think of a more profound revolution than the equalizing of the sexes? I am convinced
that in all of these subjects there is a great quantity of literature awaiting our attention.

We collect literature avidly, presumably because it gives insights into the minds of men and the times in which they wrote. But we collect songs hardly at all. Perhaps what we sing tells as much about us as what we read. Records, sheet music, song books, all are vital Americana needing the attention of rare book librarians. Until recently we were a nation of farmers, and much of our history is bound up with land and its management. Yet I found no expression of interest in rarities of agricultural history. Nor did I find any library interested in the various third-party movements which this country has known, and whatever interest there was in the history of religion in America seems to have been confined largely to the now declining New England sermons.

I am not trying to convince you that these areas of collection are more important than English and American literature, but I do believe that they and dozens of others similarly overlooked offer abundant opportunity for creative bibliography at little cost.

There are certain to be some real rarities in these subject areas, and as for utility, there have been researchers at work lately on the history of farm machinery, the Prohibitionist movement, folklore, American songs, automobile history, etc. Are these subjects not just as valid for research as the Lake Poets or Dante? George Bernard Shaw saw in genius "a man who sees the importance of things." Edwin Wolf, in speaking to the Antiquarian Booksellers Association of America on February 7, 1961, urged booksellers to look for truly important elements in American history, and he cited numerous items from a college history text. I would urge upon librarians a careful reading of a history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, not for specific titles, but for movements and historical development that both separate and join our times and those of earlier generations of Americans. You will find, I think, that the land flowed with pamphlets, the air was filled with speeches and songs, and the economic development and social attitudes of a people found expression in books and journals on steam engines and roadbuilding, diatribes for and against birth-control, God, Republicans, public schools, and almost anything else worth discussing. I commend them all to your interest.

It is time that the institutional libraries brought some new ideas to the rare book trade. New demands will turn up suppliers to meet them, and with the help of booksellers, we can discover rarities in areas that are still bibliographical jungles. "Emulation," said Shakespeare, "has a thousand sons." I ask you, is there any reason that we must be among them?
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Carper W. Buckley

There has never been a time in the history of this country when United States Government publications have been in as much demand or were being used as extensively as they are today. The fact that requests made to our Office show an increase of 300 per cent over those received twenty years ago is due in an overall sense to the greater recognition of the value which these publications have in so many of the activities involved in working and living in the modern world. Primary credit for this development must go, of course, to the government agencies which are the authors of these publications of such importance to our citizens and which cooperate with the Government Printing Office to produce a design and format both modern and attractive. We must not, however, overlook the increasingly fine job being done by librarians everywhere to foster a greater awareness of the almost limitless ways in which government publications can be utilized. Traditionally, these publications have been regarded as a sort of "ugly duckling" in relation to the library collection generally. They are, however, here to stay, and while it is well that some of the awe with which they have long been regarded is now being dispelled, it is also necessary that certain of their specialized features should be recognized in order that they can be utilized most effectively.

From the beginning of our government until 1895, all distribution of its publications was from the official supplies ordered printed by the various departments and agencies. This somewhat haphazard arrangement apparently satisfied few people, a principal disadvantage being the inability to make disposition of ever-increasing supplies of documents which were overflowing and choking committee rooms and other space in government buildings. The General Printing Act of 1895 established the position of Superintendent of Documents in the Government Printing Office and provided that, under direction of the Public Printer, he should have general supervision of the distribution of all public documents except those printed for official use of the executive departments and the two Houses of Congress. He was also authorized to sell any publication in his charge at cost determined by the Public Printer to which, by subsequent amendment, there was added a specified mark-up to cover handling expenses to insure that the sale of publications would not result in a financial loss to the government.

Under authorization of this law, the Office of the Superintendent of Documents must review each printing order placed by a government agency with the Government Printing Office to ascertain whether or not it would appear to be for a publication for which a public demand could be anticipated. If it is decided to provide copies for sale, we must then estimate how many can be sold, and upon the accuracy of this estimate rests the fateful balance of whether the sale will be self-sustaining or a loss will result. We take into consideration all known factors and rely heavily on the recommendation made by the initiating government agency, which is the best authority on the important considerations of why the publication is being issued, what it is designed to do, and among what segments of the population it is likely to find its greatest use and popularity.

All of us know that there are many types of government publications not distributed by the Superintendent of Documents. To mention only a few, this office handles no distribution of restricted material or that produced solely for administrative or operational use of the initiating agency; it does not handle patents, specifications, Geological Survey maps, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Hydrographic Office, or aeronautical charts, or publications sold by the Office of Technical Services of the Department of Commerce. Whether or not copies are also sold by the Superintendent of Documents, government agencies can frequently supply a single official copy of some of their publications to those having business with the agency, and librarians can, in some instances, be placed on mailing lists maintained by certain agencies for distribution of specialized material. All such activity is unconnected with the function of the office of the Superintendent of Documents, whose responsibilities are explicitly spelled out by law. We have no authorization to make a free distribution and can sell publications only after prepayment has been received. Only publications printed by the Government Printing Office can be placed on sale by the Superintendent of Documents, and they must not be restricted or strictly administrative in character. Within those limitations, a publication for which there is a reasonable possibility of an adequate public demand, will normally be placed on public sale and maintained for as long as the public demand warrants. In carrying out this provision of the law, we serve as the government’s bookstore, and this function is entirely separate from, and not interchangeable with, the other functions of mailing, cataloging and indexing, and depository library distribution, with which the Superintendent of Documents is also charged.

The Office of the Superintendent of Documents is not a publishing agency, but one which performs the services of a bookseller. We cannot provide a research service in any way comparable to that of either the General Reference or Legislative Reference Services of the Library of Congress. We must identify by title, number, or principal subject, and we have no research or specialist staff to determine
complex questions bearing upon the technical content of the publications which it is our function to distribute.

The statistics involved in our sales operation are impressive. An average of 25,000 letters and between 500 and 1,000 telephone requests are received every day. More than 25,000 separate titles are included in current sales stock, and last year [1961] the number of copies of publications sold exceeded 54,000,000.

Our position as a middleman, between the government agency publishers and the users of the publications, is one with which the librarian will often have concern. It is illustrated by the situation arising when the sales supply of a publication becomes depleted and its future status must remain in doubt until a decision can be made by the originating agency as to whether it is obsolete, shall be revised, or will no longer be considered necessary in carrying out the function of the agency. In the interim, we can appreciate the need for the material and the impatience with which its unavailability is often greeted, but our function cannot be performed until a publication has been printed by the Government Printing Office, and only the initiating agency can determine when the material is ready for issuance as a publication.

To review a number of general features of our service to the public, we must adhere to the provision that prepayment for government publications is required, but we provide a special invoice which state, municipal, or other public agencies may require as a basis for their drawing of the necessary funds. The discount that we can allow, which is limited by law to 25 per cent, is granted to authorized bookdealers or to any other purchaser if he buys 100 or more copies of a single publication to be mailed to one address. Payment may be made by check or money order payable to the Superintendent of Documents, cash at the risk of the sender, or special documents coupons sold in sets of twenty for $1.00. Frequent purchasers in large amounts may open a prepaid deposit account by depositing $25.00 or more for the purpose. We now have more than 40,000 such accounts.

A specialized part of our cataloging function is the issuance of 49 subject price lists, plus special lists and announcements of publications as necessary. These are in lieu of a single catalog of available publications, which would be too large for practical use. Twice each month, a list of selected new publications is compiled, and at the end of each month we publish the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications, the most comprehensive and current listing of all government publications issued during the month. There was a time not too long ago when the Monthly Catalog pleased few people. That situation was changed in 1947, when the late Jerome K. Wilcox, then head of the Library of the City College of New York, made an intensive study of the Catalog with recommendations for its improvement. Since that time there have been few complaints.
We are constantly seeking to improve this Catalog in any way that will make it more usable. We made one change in the past year with respect to the method of listing periodicals and subscription publications in the appendix. Of the three comments received about this change, two were critical and one was favorable.

Continuing efforts are made to improve the index to the Monthly Catalog. One thing which we feel has been weak, and which several librarians have brought to our attention, is the lack of title entries. So for some time now we have been stressing to our catalogers the inclusion of more title entries and the avoidance of burying titles in subject listings.

We have considered again including personal author entries in our index. All that has kept us from doing it is the cost factor. As you may have noticed, the subscription price of the Monthly Catalog has remained at $3.00 per year since 1949. Meanwhile costs have reached the point where this price no longer covers them. We are now raising the subscription price to $4.50 per year, and beginning in 1963, we will again include personal author entries in our index. We hope that this will be an improvement.

We have given some thought to the possibility of changing the Monthly Catalog from agency listing to a straight alphabetical dictionary type catalog by subject, author, and title. A survey that we made on such a proposal in 1947 showed that there were about 3 respondents to 1 in favor of no change, based upon the fewer than 10 per cent of the subscribers who replied to the survey. It is doubtful that a survey today would produce any different results. The replies I have received from persons I have talked to informally in regard to such a change have been either noncommittal or leaning to a continuation of the present format.

I recently had the opportunity to ask an eminent reference librarian of long experience for some of her observations as to practices of libraries in handling Government documents that she would recommend. I was happy indeed to learn that she regarded the Cumulative Instructions to Depository Libraries, which our Office issues, as providing worthwhile suggestions about how librarians should care for their collections. She agrees with us that there should be no ban on depository publications being used outside the library and feels that it might be helpful if, in library practice, the person responsible for depository matters would also be the one ruling on document discards. The suggestion was made, and it has occurred to me, that perhaps the libraries most anxious for greater discarding privileges are not doing all the discarding that is now permitted. Another of her interesting observations was the advantage which she has found in having the person in the library doing "technical processes" for documents also do "readers' services" for them, the benefit being that the documents can be made available for use immediately after their receipt.
As many of you know, we prescribe no regulations requiring the use of the Superintendent of Documents' classification numbers by depository or other libraries. The size of the documents collection might offer a basis for a decision as to the use of our classification numbers. Such use might be more desirable in a large collection than in one with only a few government publications. The same librarian who was kind enough to offer me her opinion about recommended practices in the handling of government publications tends to favor a separate collection of all federal documents, which she regards as easier to record adequately than a distributed one. An advantage of the Superintendent of Documents' classification that she has noted is the ease with which knowledge of it transfers from one library to another. There are, undoubtedly, a number of disadvantages to the use of our classification system which authorities have cited and which must also be weighed by libraries considering its use.

The depository library distribution program, another function with which the Superintendent of Documents is charged by law, serves to make available for consultation throughout the United States collections of government publications, including publications which are no longer in print or available from any other source. In 35 years I have seen the depository program develop from a noble effort in which one mailing a month was made to each library, if we were lucky, to the fine system we have had in recent years, whereby a mailing is made at least once a day to these depositories. It serves to put into the hands of the depository libraries in a minimum of time the most important government publications of lasting value, those produced by the Government Printing Office. Although the program is administered by our Office, the designation of the libraries is by members of Congress, and our jurisdiction is not discretionary, but here again, is explicitly defined by law.

Prior to the passage this year of the Depository Library Act of 1962, provision was made for one depository library for each congressional district, two in addition for each state at large, and all state libraries and libraries of land-grant colleges were also allowed the privilege. By special acts of Congress, the libraries of the service academies were made depositories. A library once designated retains the status for as long as it continues to meet the requirements. Redistricting has, through the years, resulted in a situation in which a number of depository libraries already in existence have found themselves in a single district, despite the fact that the law has provided for only one such library per district. Although the Superintendent of Documents has no alternative under the law but to continue administration of the program no matter how many depositories might be located in one district because of the redistricting that is mandatory, the existence of this situation has long proved to be the basis for difficulty in effecting a meeting of the minds between our office and libraries
seeking depository status but precluded from it because of an already existing designation for the district concerned.

The new depository law provides for an increase from one to two in the number of depositories that may be designated by members of the House of Representatives for each congressional district and also makes possible an additional at-large designation for each senator. There is further provision for depository designation in certain territories and in government departments and agencies. Before any additional depository shall be designated, however, the head of the library, with concurrence of every existing depository in the district or the head of the state library authority, shall justify and provide certification as to the need for the additional depository library designation.

The most sweeping change provided by the revised depository law is that which provides that all United States Government agencies must hereafter furnish the Superintendent of Documents with a sufficient number of copies for distribution to depository libraries of all unrestricted publications which they obtain from sources other than the Government Printing Office, except those issued for administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value. We must, under this provision, attempt to secure for distribution to depository libraries, the vast amount of material produced outside the Government Printing Office by all United States Government agencies throughout the world, insofar as this material can be determined to be within the general category set forth in the law. The Government Printing Office, of course, has no control over any of this printing, and the problems involved in implementing this provision are staggering, to say the least. We have begun preliminary planning in cooperation with the parent government agencies producing this printing and expect to include in our budget estimates for the next fiscal year a request for the additional resources that will be required to put this aspect of the program into full operation.

Since 1922, all depository libraries have been required by law to select those categories of government publications that they wish to receive as they are issued. For this reason it has never been possible to insure that any given library would have a particular publication in which a patron is interested. The new law provides a remedy for this by authorizing regional depository libraries in each state which will select everything made available and will undertake to serve the other depositories of the area by inter-library loan, when a publication not maintained by those libraries is needed. I am proud of the fact that this provision merely formalizes a similar voluntary arrangement in which the State Historical Society Library at Madison, Wisconsin, and the New York State Library at Albany have pioneered, with the cooperation of our Office. I am very glad to see that the favorable results of
this experiment justify the formalizing of the arrangement and have high hopes that it will contribute significantly to a better depository program.

We at the Government Printing Office welcome opportunities to discuss with those concerned some of the problems involved in carrying out the responsibilities with which we are charged. I hope that I have been able to provide something in the vast area of government publications that has been informative and of some interest to you as librarians.
THE RELATIONSHIPS OF THE ACQUISITION DEPARTMENT TO THE LIBRARY’S TOTAL PROGRAM

Rolland E. Stevens


“. . . The tea ceremony had begun.

“Every movement has a spiritual meaning, . . . One movement flowed into another to blend, as the colors of the room blended without one harsh note, in a ritualistic harmony. Kubori-san seemed to be activated by a melody I did not hear.”

I suppose that every library administrator, every director of any enterprise, for that matter, would like to see the individual components of his total operation flow together in this manner, activated by an unheard melody. Too often we fall into the error of compartmentalizing; instead of combining, we divide and separate the various duties into traditional departments. Thus, we restrict the freedom of our imagination in developing the most effective pattern of organization and the best use of our staff.

I suggest that a more fruitful approach to administrative planning is the use of an individual function, or group of related functions, as the unit of organization instead of a department with its traditional set of tasks. Several unorthodox and effective uses of library staff have been devised through the use of the function as the unit of planning. Two examples that come immediately to mind are the use of divisional librarians by Frank Lundy in subject cataloging, and the use of a professional core of bibliographers by Ralph Parker for aspects of both acquisition and cataloging.

In this paper I shall refer to “the acquisition staff” or “the acquisition department,” to mean that group of librarians and clerks whose duties include (1) the identification and procurement of the books, periodicals, microfilms, and other recorded materials needed in the library, (2) the payment of invoices for these materials, and (3) the maintenance of records necessary for these functions. The effective performance of these functions requires a staff having certain knowledge and skills, and I hope to suggest a number of additional functions
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which might best be performed by this same staff by reason of its special knowledge and skill.

Perhaps the most important qualification of the librarian involved in acquisition work is a thorough knowledge of bibliographies and reference works by which books and the other forms of recorded information can be accurately identified. These range from Publishers' Weekly and the Cumulative Book Index to Novye Knigi and the manuscript catalogs of the Vatican Library, and their use requires some ability in reading a number of modern and classical languages, as well as familiarity with the various methods of arrangement and indexing. A second essential qualification for people in this division of library work is a complete and up-to-date knowledge of the book trade and of sources of gifts and exchanges in the United States and in other countries. Since libraries also collect phonograph recordings, maps, visual materials, microforms, and xerographic reproductions, and increasingly in the near future, magnetic tapes, punched cards, and other forms of computer input, the acquisition staff must also know the sources of such materials. General acquaintance with the costs of current publications and the value of out-of-print books is also important. Knowledge of currency exchange rates in the countries from which books are acquired is necessary in the larger libraries. Further, the acquisition staff, as well as catalogers, must have a good knowledge of the library's rules of entry in order to avoid ordering titles already in the library but cataloged under a different entry than that used in the order request or dealer's catalog. Knowledge of rules of entry is also necessary in making temporary records of books on order and books acquired without prior request, so that such records will be compatible with the public catalog. Some part of the acquisition staff, at least, must have a skill in bookkeeping and in checking discounts and addition on invoices.

These are the special areas of knowledge and skill which we expect in the acquisition staff more than in the library staff as a whole, and upon the basis of this specialization, I suggest that certain necessary functions other than acquiring material can best be assigned to the acquisition staff. These functions fall under four groups: (1) responsibility for building, weeding, and evaluating the library collection, (2) assistance in the technical processes other than acquisition, (3) assistance to the public, and (4) assistance to the library administration.

Of the several functions of libraries, the collecting of recorded materials must be conceded to be the earliest, historically as well as logically. And in spite of the current emphasis upon the public services, many of us consider the building of the collection to be the most important professional duty of the librarian. Yet if libraries exhibit a variety of organizational patterns for the performance of day-to-day book selection, as has been described, how much less standardized
practice there has been for the development and implementation of a
detailed, written collection policy! In fact, there seems not to be any
general agreement that such a written policy can be meaningful.

In using the term "collection policy" rather than "selection poli-
cy," I have in mind a statement of what subject areas are to be col-
lected, and in what depth, rather than a statement of the principles of
selection. The chief arguments against the development of a detailed
collection policy (besides the fact that it is a difficult job) are that it
can never anticipate all future needs, can never provide for all future
decisions, and furthermore is obsolete before it can be mimeographed
and distributed. Upon the immensity and difficulty of the task there
is general agreement. To the other arguments, however, it may be
answered that a detailed memory of past decisions is possessed by
those who have been doing book selection and that present selection
is based largely upon this memory. In other words, the totality of
these past decisions actually constitutes a kind of policy, and the
charge that a written policy cannot be appropriate to future needs must
apply equally to the memory method of book selection. But the un-
written policy lacks order and consistency until it has been written
down, collected, and edited. Furthermore, it is difficult to pass an un-
written policy on to new members of the staff who must participate in
selection and even to older members who do not select books but who
catalog, weed, and perform other functions which can be done intelli-
gently only with detailed knowledge of the book collection policy.

Once the decision is made to codify the collection policy, certain
details have to be settled. Will the document cover the whole spectrum
of knowledge, working from one end of a classification scheme to the
other, or will it be built up, subject by subject, as the need arises?
Will it be only a broad outline, or will it specify in detail the various
topics and subtopics, even the authors, to be collected in depth? And
who will spend the many hours necessary for the formulation of the
policy? On the one hand, a collection policy is so fundamental to the
raison d'être of the library that it must be the responsibility of the
top administrative officer and his governing board. On the other hand,
the formulation of a complete, detailed policy is too time-consuming a
task for one to expect the librarian and board of trustees or faculty
council to spend the many hours necessary for its completion. At best,
the board could draft a collection policy only in very broad outline.

I am reminded of a librarian with whom I once discussed the
difficulty of writing out a collection policy. His experience lay wholly
in public services and in the administration of small college libraries.
He agreed upon the importance of a policy, but failed to see any prob-
lem. "The policy would simply state," he said, obviously recalling his
lecture notes from library school, "that the book collection should sup-
port the instructional needs of the college." This, of course, is not
the kind of policy statement we are considering. Wheeler and Goldhor
suggest that in the public library the selection policy be written out in
detailed form by the library staff and approved by the board. In the
college or university, the library council is usually advisory to the
librarian, and its approval of the policy is not necessary, but it is still
desirable. Indeed, the faculty of the college or university must be
called upon for assistance and advice in formulating the detailed policy.

But which members of the library staff are best able to work out
the collection policy in detail? A good case can be made for the refer-
ence librarian, the circulation librarian, and the branch or depart-
mental librarians, since they see the collection in use and are aware
of the daily demands upon it. It is the acquisition librarian, however,
whose attention is focused upon the building of the entire collection
and the catalog librarian who is concerned with indexing and coordinat-
ing the collection for maximum use. These members of the staff
are more likely than public service staff to see the collection as a
whole and to be aware of the interrelation of its many subject fields
and special collections. They are more likely to have a long-range
view and less likely to be distracted by the daily crises and tempo-
rary problems faced by librarians on the firing line. Furthermore,
the acquisition librarian is exceptionally conscious of the subject fields
in which there has been active purchasing in the past. He is also an
expert on the availability of different types of library material, and the
availability of out-of-print books will have a strong effect upon deci-
sions to collect in depth. To take an extreme example, I doubt that any
library in the United States will decide to concentrate upon tenth-
century Latin manuscripts or Shakespeare manuscripts, since it is
almost inconceivable that any will appear on the market. Finally, al-
though acquisition librarians will stoutly deny this, they are well suited
to work out the detailed statement, because they have more time to
devote to it. Or, to put it more tactfully, they are facing daily deci-
sions so close in nature to those required in formulating a collection
policy that they do not need as long a time as other librarians may
need to reorient their minds to this project.

The importance of a detailed and carefully formulated policy
demands, however, the attention and contribution of several of the best
minds on the staff. Although I believe that the committee attack upon
library problems is often abused, here certainly is a project requiring
team effort. If possible, it would be well to enlist the reference li-
brarian to contribute frontline experience, the acquisition librarian
to give advice concerning past collection policy and availability of ma-
terials, and the director of libraries to make final decisions and to
keep the project moving.

When the collecting policy has been set down and approved, the
acquisition librarian and his senior staff can do much to implement it.
The same reasons for calling upon the acquisition librarian to assist
in formulating the policy apply also to his ability to participate in the
selection of materials. Advertisements and announcements of new publications and dealers' catalogs of out-of-print items are received and examined by the acquisition librarian and his staff. Letters from book dealers concerning the sale of especially rare books or of private libraries are also usually addressed to the acquisition librarian. Thus, he and his staff are in a closer relation to the book market than are other librarians and, consequently, can often do most to implement the book collection policy. Decisions upon expensive purchases usually are referred to the director or chief librarian, and selection of medical, technical, and other books outside the acquisition librarian's competence are referred to an appropriate divisional librarian or, in the university library, to an appropriate faculty member. But many decisions within the framework of the collecting policy can and ought to be made by the acquisition librarian, without referral to another staff member or faculty member.

In addition to assisting with the formulation and implementation of a collecting policy, the acquisition librarian and his senior staff can, because of their special knowledge and interests, also aid in weeding the collection. Most research librarians have fervently believed that all recorded material has potential research value and is worth preserving. Although many still profess this belief, there are signs that at least a few research librarians, perhaps made thoughtful by the impending disaster of being overwhelmed by printed and manuscript records, are beginning to exercise some discrimination both as to what is added to and what is removed from their collections. A few years ago, we were shocked to learn that it costs approximately as much to catalog a book as to purchase it. Soon someone will point out, to the further dismay of budget-conscious librarians, that it costs more to weed a book than it formerly cost to add it to the collection. But let us assume that constant, intelligent weeding of the collection is necessary and desirable, not merely to save the cost of building a new wing to the library (a cost study may show that it is cheaper to build an addition than to weed the collection), but to make the collection more responsive to present and future demands, easier to use, and less frustrating to both casual and serious readers.

Too often books are withdrawn because of shabby physical condition, especially when the circulation record indicates infrequent recent use. But a book in perfect condition, although never removed from the shelf since it was cataloged, will not often arouse the killer instinct in the "good housekeeping" type of librarian. Intelligent weeding must be done in conformity with the collecting policy. It makes no sense to withdraw a little-circulated nineteenth-century county history in poor condition while county histories are being collected in depth. The volume should be replaced or repaired. On the other hand, a book in good physical condition should be withdrawn, or preferably never added, when it has no place in the library's collecting policy. Here
again the acquisition librarian can play an important ancillary role. Weeding is too risky a job to entrust to a junior member of the public service staff, guided only by circulation records and the condition of the book. The acquisition librarian, thoroughly conversant with the library's collecting policy and with the state of the book market, and freely consulting appropriate divisional librarians and faculty members, or working with them as a committee, should be able to weed the collection intelligently. The important principle to be followed is that weeding should be done, not book by book, but with the whole collection in mind.

Closely related to acquisition and weeding is collection evaluation. Dr. LeRoy C. Merritt has suggested that collection evaluation is necessary in order to test the adequacy of selection activity in producing a good collection. Unfortunately, when we give close attention to the meaning of "evaluation," we find that a method of evaluating the collection is by no means obvious. The suggestion is sometimes made that the library collection be evaluated by checking standard bibliographies against the card catalog. However, this implies that the ideal collection for every library would be one including all titles in the bibliographies, and that all libraries perfectly realizing this ideal would have identical collections. But if the same collection, namely, the books listed in The Standard Catalog for Public Libraries or in other standard bibliographies, were the ideal collection for all libraries, regardless of size, purposes, and community composition and interests, then we would be wasting much time in selecting; we could save staff time and obtain attractive discounts by subscribing to a package book purchasing plan, a "Books of the Month Club" for libraries. Of course, I am carrying the suggestion to an absurd and unintended extreme. What is intended is that bibliographies be checked only in those subjects in which the library expects to collect in depth. But my purpose is to show the inadequacy of evaluating the collection by merely checking bibliographies.

Since a library exists to meet the needs of its own community, a more appropriate method of evaluation would seem to be one based upon ability to meet those needs. One index of this ability is the number of unanswered reference questions; in evaluating the collection, of course, we are interested only in the reference questions which go unanswered because of failure of the book collection. We must somehow eliminate human failure as a cause. Another and more direct indication of ability of the collection to meet community needs is the number of titles borrowed on interlibrary loan. Another index of this ability is circulation statistics: both room and home use. We begin to run into a difficulty: since we have provided ourselves with no model, we do not know how much circulation there ought to be in our community. Evaluation is a complex, philosophical question, and interesting as it is, we cannot pursue it at greater length here, because
it has already become evident that the acquisition staff cannot play a significant role in evaluating the collection in terms of its usefulness to the community. Whoever does perform this function, the information so obtained must be fed back into the collecting policy.

Many libraries carry insurance on building and contents against fire and other damage. In such libraries, appraisal of the collection for insurance is clearly the work of the acquisition staff, with its special knowledge of book costs. After the initial appraisal has been made, it must be periodically revised to conform to changing market conditions.

The second group of functions in which the acquisition staff may assist the library's total program includes technical processing other than acquisition of materials: namely, cataloging, recording of serials, and binding. The particular function which first comes to mind is the establishment, for each book or periodical ordered, of a catalog entry conforming to American Library Association rules of entry. Since a correct entry has to be assigned when the title is cataloged, the same entry may as well be assigned when the order is prepared and then used throughout subsequent processing. Establishment of the correct entry before the title is ordered, making it compatible with the official catalog record of books already in the library, helps to ensure that a second copy is not ordered unwittingly under another entry. This procedure also aids in the ordering of Library of Congress or other catalog cards by author and eliminates entry establishment in the cataloging process. For these reasons, it is usually recommended that the correct entry be established before a title is ordered, even though it requires that bibliographers with professional library training be employed in the acquisition process. Establishing the entry requires a thorough knowledge of the American Library Association rules of entry, verification of the publication in authoritative bibliographies, and checking the entry in the cataloging authority files.

There are, however, certain disadvantages to this commonly practiced procedure. First, much of the time spent in establishing the correct entry may be lost when large numbers of books ordered are never subsequently received. Out-of-print books ordered from dealers' catalogs may be already sold, and the longer the delay in ordering caused by first having to establish and verify the entry, the greater is the risk of losing books ordered from antiquarian catalogs. Also there are always certain books announced for publication which never appear, at least not under the announced title. On a long list of desiderata there are often some titles which no amount of searching will uncover. The time spent by bibliographers in establishing catalog entries for these books is wasted.

Besides the loss of professional effort in establishing the entry for such books, a second disadvantage is that the use of the library entry on an order form may even confuse and obstruct the book dealer
from supplying the desired book. Let us distinguish between the cata-
log entry and the entry which will indicate clearly to the book agent
what book is wanted. These are not always identical. Any dealer
knows that a book by Samuel Clemens is the book which he handles
under Mark Twain. And most jobbers or antiquarian dealers must
know that libraries commonly order a book written by two or three
authors under the first name on the title page. But some of our cor-
porate entries must present problems to dealers, especially in foreign
countries, where the use of the corporate entry is not firmly estab-
lished. And until dealers became inured to the idiosyncracies of
American libraries, the following entries on orders must have ap-
peared ridiculous: Lytton, Edward George Earle Lytton Bulwer-
Lytton, baron, for Bulwer-Lytton; Bible. O. T. Psalms. English.
Paraphrases, for the Bay Psalm Book; Catholic Church. Councils,
for Mansi, Sacrorum Counciliorum Nova Collectio

The third disadvantage in establishing the full entry before or-
dering is that it is more difficult and less accurate to do so at this
time than to do it with the book in hand. Furthermore, by the time
the book is received, it is more likely to be listed in the National Union
Catalog than it was when the order was placed several weeks earlier.
And, consequently, there is a fourth disadvantage: most catalogers
will wish, and with justification, to recheck the entry assigned by the
bibliographer at the time of ordering. Thus, much of the justification
for establishing a catalog entry early in the ordering process has van-
ished. I do not say all of the justification. Bibliographic verification
of each item to be ordered and conformance of the entry to standard
library usage may prevent costly and unnecessary duplication of books
already in the collection, even if the cataloger will repeat much of the
work with the book in hand.

But can we not isolate the several cost factors in this process,
in order to determine whether to establish the library entry before
placing the order or to wait until the book has been received? We
must consider a given number of requested titles, at least several
thousand; these should include both out-of-print and currently pub-
lished books, both domestic and foreign publications, in approximately
the proportions normally acquired by the library. On the one hand,
we must total the cost of bibliographic verification, searching, and
ordering of this sample group. We should also note the number of un-
tended duplicates received in spite of careful bibliographic verifica-
tion and add the cost of these unwanted books, either their net cost if
they are kept, or the cost of returning them to the dealer and of ad-
justing the invoice. To this cost we should compare the total cost of
handling another group of requested titles, similar in quantity and
type. In this group we shall verify author and title, before ordering,
only where warranted by excessive price or difficult entry, searching
other titles under the entry as given. After books have been received,
the order entry will be examined and changed, if necessary, to conform to cataloging practice. The cost of establishing the entry at this point must be added to the cost of ordering. Again the cost of unwanted duplicates, which probably will be higher with this group, has to be added. But the cost of establishing a standard entry, after books arrive, should be lower; first, because the number of books received is somewhat fewer than the number of books ordered; second, because the task is easier, especially with a Library of Congress card number in the book. To oversimplify the case, the question of relative efficiency of these two methods will depend upon whether the added cost of bibliographic verification of all titles before ordering is substantially higher or lower than the cost of the larger number of duplicates received when some titles are ordered without bibliographic verification.

These are two extreme methods. Experience will suggest modifications to either method. At the Ohio State University Libraries (where we have not made a cost analysis), we separate order cards upon receipt in the Acquisition Department into those which need and those which do not need bibliographic verification before ordering. We verify any book costing $15 or more and those with corporate entries and difficult personal names. Of necessity, we verify any order request lacking publisher's name, although we do not insist upon knowing the exact price. Many entries are corrected or, more often, completed with a search of the dictionary catalog. But we verify in bibliographies only about one-half of the titles ordered. Other large university libraries usually (and in spite of textbook advice) follow some policy of nonverification of inexpensive publications. A medium-sized public library, on the other hand, ordering predominantly current American and English imprints, may well find it worthwhile to verify entry and all other information before placing the order.

Since the arguments in the preceding paragraph may seem heretical in some library circles, I should like to be correctly understood. I am not arguing against bibliographic verification and entry establishment for all titles before ordering. I am arguing against the continuance of these procedures in all libraries solely for the reasons that we were taught these as correct procedures in library school, or that we followed these procedures in other libraries in which we have worked, or that these procedures have always been followed in our present library. I am urging the continuing examination of our procedures in the light of circumstances in our individual situations. The proportion of a library's attempted acquisitions which are out-of-print and elusive publications will affect its procedure in preparing orders. Large university and public libraries order many titles which may subsequently not be received; small college and public libraries order predominantly current domestic publications which are easily available.
If most acquisitions are in-print publications and therefore almost certain to reach the library, there is least to lose and most to gain in doing as much of the catalog preparation as possible before placing the order. Such preparation includes not only the establishment of a catalog entry, but also the ordering of Library of Congress or other catalog cards. Again the advantage is obvious: with a set of unit cards on hand when the book arrives, cataloging is both easier and faster. But if the library orders many out-of-print books, publications of small societies, privately published items, foreign imprints, and other materials which may never be received, catalog cards cannot safely be ordered in advance. Although it would seem fairly simple to distinguish between books for which cards may safely be ordered in advance and those for which it would involve a risk, large libraries usually wait until books are received to order cards or to match books with Library of Congress proof slips. Medium-sized public libraries often order cards when they order books, although Wheeler and Goldhor point out that it may be easier and faster to catalog all books upon arrival, without waiting for printed cards. A third way in which the acquisition department may aid in the further processing of purchased books is to participate in one of the commercial or cooperative central cataloging and processing plans. These centers receive the books ordered by a member library directly from the publisher or jobber, catalog and classify, and return books to the library marked and pocketed, with book cards and sets of catalog cards. Although participant libraries are invited to accept a standard form of cataloging, they may specify certain variations at extra cost. The chief advantage of the plan is the economy effected by having a central staff of catalogers and clerks serve a number of libraries, many of which add too few books to justify employment of one full-time cataloger. Hence most of the participating libraries are small public and school libraries. Mary Lee Bundy found that only eight per cent of the 628 public libraries served by 28 cooperative centers have total incomes of $100,000 or over. Although this service is seldom used in the medium-sized and large libraries with which we are here concerned, increasing shortage of catalogers in the future may well spread this practice among larger libraries.

Still another service which the acquisition staff may perform to assist in cataloging is the maintenance of the complete and official record of serial holdings. In those libraries in which currently received journals and other serial publications are ordered, recorded, claimed, and distributed by a division of the acquisition staff, it seems an unnecessary duplication of effort to have the cataloger annually change the record of holdings in the public catalog and shelf list. At the Ohio State University Libraries and a number of other university libraries, a single, central record of serial holdings is maintained; cards in the dictionary catalog and shelf list refer to this central
record for all serial holdings. While the catalog department is responsible for descriptive and subject cataloging, assignment of entry, change of entry, classification, and designation of copy numbers, the maintenance of the record of holdings is the responsibility of the acquisition department.

The acquisition department may also serve to eliminate further processing of books in the library by having unbound volumes prebound before they are shipped by the dealer. This technique is particularly effective with paperbacks published in this country and with unbound European publications. Prebinding may also be the substitution for the publisher's binding of a strong library binding in anticipation of heavy circulation. When an agreement for prebinding is drawn up with a dealer, certain kinds of publications should be excepted: rush orders, small pamphlets, and individual replacement numbers of journals. Binding specifications must be given to the dealers from whom such books are bought, and close adherence to these specifications must be demanded. There is probably some saving in cost by having binding done abroad, before books are shipped, but care must be taken that what appears to be an economy is not actually a poor quality job. Perhaps the principal advantage, not essential in some libraries, is the relief of an overburdened binding program, and the use of book funds, rather than insufficient binding funds, to pay for some of the binding.

A third general class of functions which may be assigned to the acquisition staff is that in which assistance is given directly to the library's public. Without meaning to invade the field claimed by the reference staff, the acquisition librarian or a professional member of his staff, having special knowledge of trade and national bibliographies, may often or even regularly be called upon to aid readers in the identification of bibliographic items or in the intricacies of serial publications. But subject bibliography and lists of books by and about a given author are more appropriately handled by reference librarians or by subject specialists on the staff. As in prebinding, the assignment of certain types of reference questions to the acquisition staff may be considered as an expedient to relieve an over-worked reference staff. However, opinions on the value of old books, identification of foreign and domestic publishers and dealers, of sources of elusive publications, and of outlets for the sale of books, should always be referred to the acquisition department.

Another service to the readers that is best assigned to the acquisition staff is the sponsorship of private book collections. Contests among students are sometimes held in the college library to encourage student reading, pride in books, and interest in collecting. Dollar limits are usually included in the contest rules in order to give a fair chance to students of different economic means. Such contests or displays, with encouragement and technical advice offered by the
acquisition staff, might be held in public libraries, as well as in colleges and universities.

The fourth kind of assistance that might be assigned to the acquisition department is that in support of the overall operation of the library; specifically, in maintaining fiscal accounts. Since the department keeps a ledger of expenditures for books and periodicals, has staff trained for bookkeeping, and has equipment suitable for the purpose, it seems feasible to employ this same skill and equipment to keep accounts for supplies, equipment, and other budgeted expenditures. A centralized bookkeeping service is most appropriate to the smallest libraries we are considering, where specialized staff and equipment cannot easily be duplicated. Larger libraries can better afford to have two centers for bookkeeping: one in the acquisition department and the other in the director’s office.

Now that we have considered, and I hope in some manner justified, twelve functions in which the acquisition staff may be involved because of its specialized training and experience, it is tempting to ask whether we do not need to double this staff: one half to care for regular acquisition work, the other half to perform these added functions. The first responsibility of the department is to acquire and receive library materials swiftly and accurately. Any of these auxiliary duties should be added only to a department already performing well its basic task. Several of the functions mentioned above properly belong elsewhere in the library but may be partially assigned to the acquisition department to relieve an overburdened budget or staff elsewhere. The fun of directing a library or other enterprise, to those to whom it is fun, must be partly in the challenge of rearranging and deploying resources to meet changing needs with the maximum effectiveness. It is in this sense that I have suggested certain relationships of the acquisition department to the library’s total program.
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