

Occasional Papers

No. 214

April 2008

“TO ADVANCE THE BOUNDARIES OF
KNOWLEDGE”:
THE 1927 *UNION LIST OF SERIALS* AND THE
PROVISION OF RESOURCES FOR RESEARCH

By

William A. McHugh

Graduate School of Library and Information Science
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

©2008 The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois

Manufactured in the United States of America

Printed on acid-free paper

ISSN 0276 1769

ISBN 0-87845-124-2

OCCASIONAL PAPERS deal with varied aspects of librarianship and consist of papers that generally are too long or detailed for publication in a periodical, or are of a specialized or contemporary interest. Papers in this series are issued irregularly, and no more often than monthly. Manuscripts for inclusion in this series are invited and should be sent to: OCCASIONAL PAPERS, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, The Publications Office, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 501 E. Daniel Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820-6211.

D. W. Krummel, Series Editor
Marlo Welshons, Managing Editor
Jody Boles, Composition

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE
Dan Schiller, W. Boyd Rayward, John Unsworth, Marlo Welshons

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would very much like to thank the several individuals who took the time to read this manuscript and whose suggestions and thoughts have made it a much stronger work than it otherwise would have been, especially Kenneth Carpenter, Roger Schonfeld, Robert Buerglener, Jean Alexander, and Harriet Lightman. Mr. Carpenter's comments in particular helped me frame my argument at several key points. I would also like to thank the Northwestern University Library and the Alice Berline Kaplan Center for the Humanities at Northwestern for time and support in pursuing this project, and Natalie Pelster, Denise Shorey, Robert Michaelson, Kevin McClure, and Harriet Lightman for help with the final editing and proofreading.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
I. CONTEXTS	3
Development of a Research Community	3
Development of Library Resources for Research	6
Development of Academic Librarianship as a Profession	10
Structures for Shared Resources: Interlibrary Loan Arrangements	13
Structures for Shared Resources: “Centralizing Institutions”	16
“Centralizing Institutions”: The Case of H. W. Wilson	18
II. PROGRAMS	23
Early ALA Initiatives	23
Wilson and the North Central List	27
The First World War and its Aftermath	30
Wilson’s 1921 Initiative and the Organization of a Plan	34
Initial Considerations of Scope	40
The Campaign for Subscriptions	43
Group Subscriptions	46
The Library of Congress, Harvard, and the Commencement of Work	48
Expanding the Circle of Cooperating Libraries	51
Pursuing Harvard	54
Further Decisions of Size and Scope	59
The Conclusion of Work and Quarrels with Wilson	62
III. RESULTS	68
The Final Success	68
Wilson and the ALA during the 1930s, and Beyond	75
The Achievement of the Union List	78
Notes	81
Works Cited	94
Correspondents and Authors	104
Abbreviations	105
Appendix	106



“TO ADVANCE THE BOUNDARIES
OF KNOWLEDGE”:
THE 1927 *Union List of Serials*
AND THE PROVISION OF RESOURCES FOR RESEARCH
William A. McHugh

Until one considers what it was like to conduct research before the publication of the first *Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada*,¹ the appearance of this austere volume in 1927 may not seem particularly remarkable. But with its publication, researchers, for the first time, were able to turn to a source which would list virtually every periodical to be found in the United States, and learn which volumes were held in what library. Contemporaries described it in superlatives: “the greatest single piece of library machinery yet started,” and “the most notable bibliography ever sponsored by American Libraries.” Or as one reviewer began, “How can mere words express the appreciation of the library profession for the monumental and long awaited *Union List of Serials*.”² H. M. Lydenberg, who chaired the American Library Association (ALA) committee that oversaw the project, aptly noted the significance:

The emotional appeal of various enterprises may perhaps be stronger than that of a bare printed record of the files of periodicals and serials owned by the research libraries of the United States and Canada. Anyone, however, who has himself tried to do extended investigation that called for the use of books, any librarian who has at any time tried to help a scholar engaged in such an investigation, will unquestionably recognize at once the significance, importance, and possibilities of such a list. His only wonder will be that its fruition waited so long.³

Not that resources for locating periodical files had been entirely lacking earlier. Bolton’s *Catalogue of Scientific and Technical Periodicals* had been issued by the Smithsonian Institution in 1885, with a revised edition in 1897.⁴

This catalog of 5,105 scientific periodicals contained a “Library Check-List, Showing in what American Libraries the Foregoing Periodicals May Be Found,” prepared under the direction of Spencer F. Baird of the Smithsonian. But the checklist only identified holdings as complete or incomplete, and only about half of the titles from the catalog were represented in the checklist. Furthermore, Baird himself questioned the accuracy of the list.⁵ Though useful at the time, by the second decade of the twentieth century, according to Ernest Cushing Richardson, librarian of Princeton University, it was “not . . . in very constant use by a great many persons.”⁶ More useful perhaps were a number of union lists of serials that had been issued for libraries in specific cities or regions, beginning with a list for Baltimore in 1876.⁷ But these resources represented at best piecemeal efforts to solve a problem regularly confronting researchers needing access to a periodical not held in their own library.

The fruition of the *Union List of Serials* had indeed been long awaited, as Lydenberg noted. The project required the mobilization of considerable resources on the part of the research library communities and may be taken as evidence of the growing maturity of American research libraries and their willingness to work together “to aid research calculated to advance the boundaries of knowledge,” as the interlibrary loan code of 1917 had proclaimed.⁸ Its publication followed a half-century of development of American research collections and growth of the research activities that these collections supported; until the collections and the demand to use them were in place, a national union list was unlikely to gain the support necessary to make it happen. It carried national-level cooperation among research libraries, which had consisted principally of cooperative indexing projects, to a new level of time and resource commitment. Beyond coordinating the many different research collections, a considerable challenge in itself, this project required the substantial cooperation of a private publisher, the H. W. Wilson Company. It thus reflects the many concerns of the Progressive Era for efficiency in the use and coordination of resources, the need for continuity of organizational arrangements, and public-private cooperation—concerns still relevant today.

It also had the larger significance of setting the tone for further cooperative bibliographic projects; one commentator at the time, referring to the “one supreme effort” of the *Union List of Serials* and the regional lists that had preceded it and what they “have done for library service,” noted that “it seemed plausible to search for the beginning of other activities that might carry within them the possibility for other union effort.” The most significant of these was the so-called “Project B,” the expansion of the union catalog

at the Library of Congress (LC) into a true National Union Catalog. Also notable were the publication of various more specialized union lists in the 1930s and the development of regional bibliographic centers.⁹

This paper will focus on the process that produced this groundbreaking tool, and on the efforts made to organize and mobilize the research library community, efforts that constituted a quest for a workable plan. In addition to the intrinsic importance of the project, the survival of many of the original committee files, notably those of Lydenberg at the New York Public Library, make this particular project ripe for exploration. However, to understand the milieu in which this project took place, we must first look at the emergence of the research community and the research library created to serve that community, then at the emergence of structures and arrangements by academic librarians to share their common concerns and to better serve the needs of their clientele.

PART I: CONTEXTS

Development of a Research Community

The development of a research community in the United States is intimately tied to the emergence of the American university in the later part of the nineteenth century. It would be the large research libraries, for the most part located in these universities, that were the primary supporters of the *Union List of Serials* project and whose periodical holdings are recorded there. However, this close connection between research and the university is not a development that would have seemed inevitable in this country at mid-nineteenth century. The American college at the time of the Civil War was an institution largely peripheral to American life, content to teach classical languages, rhetoric, mathematics, and “moral and intellectual philosophy.” With few exceptions, research and the promotion of new knowledge were not among its concerns; research was largely conducted by individuals working with their own libraries or those of learned societies.¹⁰

By mid-century, the amateur researcher, however, faced serious competition from the increasingly specialized scholarly output of Europe, particularly Germany. Here the university had become a locus of research activity as early as the late eighteenth century, beginning with the development of the university at Göttingen as a new kind of university.¹¹ The founding of The Johns Hopkins University in 1876 on the model of the German university,

with its strong emphasis on research and graduate study, was doubtless the most influential single event in bringing this transformation to the United States. Other new graduate-oriented institutions soon followed, including Clark University (1889), the University of Chicago (1892), and the Leland Stanford Junior University (1891), the last with a substantial but less single-minded commitment to research. Older institutions such as Harvard and Columbia soon felt the need to begin significant graduate programs, and the University of Michigan, under James Angell during the 1880s, became the first of several state universities to follow suit.¹²

Concern for more practical knowledge and for a more “democratic” curriculum, which would accommodate new disciplines such as sociology and American history, and more practical courses such as agriculture and political science, was another strong element in the educational reform of this period, often existing at some tension with the rising emphasis on pure research. Historian Laurence Veysey has delineated the tension in the developing universities among defenders of research, utility, and high culture, and also the way in which the American university came to develop an organizational structure that embraced a number of conflicting goals and activities, among them a commitment to research. The impetus toward more practical learning was aided by the passing of the Morrill Act in 1862 and the founding of land-grant universities, though many of these were very weak institutions academically for a good many years. The result was a system that, while imitating the German system in its linkage of research to the academy, was more broadly inclusive and diverse in function, and was more ready to admit new subjects and teaching as well as research of a more practical bent.¹³

Not only did the commitment to research in such a system face considerable competition for resources within the academy, but the resources to fund such a commitment were unevenly distributed among the universities. Research activities did not simply become concentrated in the rising universities, but in a handful of strong institutions. Roger L. Geiger, in his history of the research university, estimates that by 1920 “probably fewer than twenty-five universities were seriously committed to research as an institutional goal.”¹⁴ In fact, the Association of American Universities (AAU), founded in 1900 to represent the interests of this rather small group of research universities, had grown to twenty-four members by 1920. These institutions were entirely in the East and Midwest, except for Stanford and the University of California. Since resources tended to flow to strong institutions, this system became self-perpetuating. Significant in maintaining the system were the activities of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, founded in 1905, which felt that the

progressive notion of the most efficient allocation of resources required it to strengthen this core of research universities.¹⁵ Though the number of graduate programs did continue to expand during the 1920s, as late as 1948–49 only twenty institutions were awarding seventy percent of U.S. Ph.Ds.¹⁶ Frederic Ogg's 1927 study, *Research in the Humanistic and Social Sciences*, detailed the results of limited support for research outside of the elite institutions, noting that "a considerable proportion of the studies undertaken are ill-planned, crudely executed, and barren of significant results," and that "serious and competent scholars notoriously lack time and means for carrying out important projects."¹⁷ At institutions at the bottom of the academic scale, support for and interest in research was often non-existent. A 1930 survey of land-grant colleges, in examining interlibrary loan patterns, reported that "it is in most cases the institutions which have the better collections that are borrowing the most. . . . Seven libraries whose collections are greatly inadequate borrowed an average of fewer than eight volumes per year. . . . Apparently in these institutions there is no great demand for books."¹⁸

At the same time, research was not confined to the academy, and it is easy to understate the complexity of structures for the support for research, as Ogg's 1927 survey of these resources shows.¹⁹ Governmental research, from Washington agencies to the far-flung and prolific agricultural experiment station system, was practical in orientation and often subordinate to a given agency's service functions.²⁰ Corporate research was probably the most practical of all, often having little direct contact with basic research in universities, but growth in this area was rapid in the years following the First World War; the number of industrial research laboratories grew from 297 in 1920 to 2,224 in 1940.²¹ Independent research institutes, such as the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research and the National Bureau of Economic Research, saw considerable growth in the first third of the century, and for a while in the 1920s the fear existed that they would divert research work from the universities. However, the elite research universities, at least, managed to develop funds to support research from such sources as the emerging major foundations, and to develop strategies for relieving productive research faculty of some of their other duties.²² In fact, as Edward Shils has argued, these various institutes and laboratories remained dependent upon the research universities both for the training of the specialists they needed and for the university's ability to cover "the entire range of learning."²³ Nonetheless, the achievements of these institutions cannot be ignored. Vitamin A, for example, was discovered simultaneously at two agricultural experiment stations, motivated by the economic needs of their clientele to bring together specializations that

remained separate in academia.²⁴ Finally, of course, private individuals continued to do research, but in a much more limited way, often in areas such as local history and genealogy. As knowledge began to grow much more rapidly and become more specialized, scholarship increasingly became the domain of professional researchers centered in the universities.²⁵

Development of Library Resources for Research

The rise of the university and its dominance of research activities are reflected in the parallel development of the university library. The largest libraries in the period just after the Civil War were not those connected with academic institutions, as statistics from the remarkable 1876 volume *Public Libraries in the United States* reveal. Columbia College, for example, was a weak seventh in size among the libraries of New York City, though in a practical tie with Union Theological Seminary for the largest academic library in that city. Harvard College did much better than most academic libraries at the time, thanks to the remarkable and unprecedented collecting efforts begun there by John Langdon Sibley, but was still outranked by the Boston Public Library. Of the ten libraries with more than 100,000 volumes, only two were academic: Harvard (227,650 volumes) and Yale (114,200).²⁶ There was little among the meager holdings of most colleges to interest students or faculty in any case; most of these libraries consisted, to a large extent, of donations, often of only marginal relevance to the curriculum.²⁷

By 1900, however, ten American university libraries had reached 100,000 volumes, and by 1928 twenty-four had reached that level, with Harvard and Yale exceeding one million. Periodical volumes were certainly a good part of these acquisitions. Particularly after the turn of the century, libraries rushed to buy sets of important journals from European booksellers. The number of American libraries employing the German firm Harrassowitz climbed from forty in 1897 to 120 at the beginning of World War I.²⁸ Data collected by George Works in his classic 1927 survey of academic libraries showed that the University of Michigan in 1920 received 290.7% of the number of periodicals it had in 1900, and Stanford 356.3%; Iowa State College in Ames received 500% of its 1900 figure, while the University of Illinois received a remarkable 1948.3%.²⁹ University libraries were increasingly the preeminent repositories for research collections and the primary loci of research activity, and their periodical collections were reaching a critical mass by the 1920s, the decade of the first *Union List of Serials*.

But just as support for research within the community of universities was unevenly developed, so was support for libraries. George Works, in his 1927

survey, was “greatly impressed with the marked differences that exist among the institutions with reference to the conception of the part that the library should play in the life of the university.”³⁰ Though support for libraries varied considerably even among the elite research universities, outside the small elite of research universities the disparity in collections was much greater. The 1930 survey of land-grant colleges found that many lacked very basic reference sets and files of basic chemical and biological periodicals. It noted a “wide gap” between the leading 9 or 10 land-grant universities (such as Cornell, Illinois, Minnesota, and California) and the remaining 42; and concluded that “more than three fourths of the land-grant institutions do not possess book collections which are adequate for their needs.”³¹ Benjamin Powell’s survey of major southern university libraries noted average book budgets in 1920 were only an eighth the size of the strongest midwestern and western university libraries.³² Elsewhere, the founding of the Pacific Northwest Library Association in 1909 was prompted by the isolation of the area and its meager library resources. It was a region “largely dependent upon its own resources,” a region of “small population, small libraries, small book appropriations, small salaries.”³³ The university libraries of the even more sparsely populated northern Plains and Intermountain regions were the subject of a study by William Carlson in the 1930s, who noted a “sense of isolation which was more than geographical,” and remarked that many of these libraries—each the major library in its state—were so inadequate “that it is difficult to see how their universities can conduct instruction equivalent to that of universities and colleges generally.”³⁴

As with research activities, research collections of importance to the scholar continued to exist outside the dominant research universities and need to be briefly considered here. College libraries were generally content to meet curricular needs (and many scarcely did that), though some, such as Amherst and Oberlin, did develop collections that rivaled those of libraries in the weaker AAU institutions. More notable for research purposes, though less numerous, were those endowed libraries referred to early in the previous century as “Reference Libraries,” and now more commonly known as “Independent Research Libraries.” Important examples that have survived to this day are the Newberry in Chicago, the Huntington in California, the Morgan in New York, and the James Jerome Hill in St. Paul.³⁵ Academic scholars represented their primary user, though Chicago’s John Crerar Library, with its strong collection in applied sciences, and the James Jerome Hill, with its emphasis on business, also served many corporate users.

Public libraries have mostly concentrated on meeting needs other than those of research for scholarly purposes. The New York Public is the most

notable exception, incorporating two previously independent reference libraries with additional endowments to form one of the most remarkable research institutions in this country, preserving (among other materials) ethnic research collections at a time when few university libraries were interested in collecting such materials.³⁶ Other important collections, such as the White Collection at the Cleveland Public Library, also existed then as well as now. Public libraries have been very active in supporting the needs of businesses in their community, and have also tended to preserve materials of local interest often ignored by academic libraries.

Other kinds of libraries were important to researchers in the 1920s, as they remain today: libraries in historical societies, museums, and various learned societies and academies; state and municipal reference libraries; the great variety of special libraries in companies and industrial laboratories, whose number showed a remarkable increase in the 1920s; the various libraries of the federal agencies and—in a class quite by itself—the Library of Congress. The point here is not to enumerate the numbers and types of all these libraries,³⁷ but to note the diffusion of research materials throughout a variety of collections, each with its own clientele and purpose, a condition that co-exists with the dominance of the research university library within this order of research collections. Finding appropriate resources for research can represent a considerable geographical and organizational challenge, and was so especially before locational tools such as the *Union List of Serials* became available.

This challenge was amply recognized by the librarians of that era. William Warner Bishop of the University of Michigan, one of the leading academic librarians during the two decades following the First World War, noted in 1920 that “outside of four or five great centers, there are not half a dozen American libraries competent for research, save in some very limited fields.” Speaking of the Midwest—where library resources were better developed than in many parts of the country—he continued:

Of what avail is it to bring to this central region a young man trained in the study of the history of science, for example? He will find no long series of academic transactions and proceedings, no masses of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth century treatises on his topic, no array of the minor learned societies in which appear those precious biographical notices of the less conspicuous savants. Indeed it is even doubtful whether that universal resource of the man stilled in pursuit of a date or an anecdote, our old friend “Notes and Queries,” is waiting on the library shelves. He must borrow and beg hither and yon, and by the time he gets his monograph half done some Dane or Dutchman anticipates him by the publication of a treatise containing

all those citations he has sought for in vain by correspondence across the continent. No wonder he retires in disgust from his own field and becomes an efficient extension lecturer or a noted "dean of men."³⁸

Two decades earlier Ernest Cushing Richardson had summarized the problem more succinctly, noting "the greatest handicap comes from the fact that the majority of the books cannot even be found in America, the next from the difficulty of finding where in America such works as there are are located, and a third from the great expense involved in travelling even to American books."³⁹ Much of Richardson's life's work was to document and to work toward solutions to this problem. In a union list of large sets and published collections on European history in American libraries, compiled for the American Historical Association under his direction, he found that "only ten or a dozen libraries have as many as 10% of the collections" listed. Even Harvard initially reported only slightly over half, though additional searching and determined acquisition soon pushed their total to about 1,900 out of 2,197 titles. A number of the sets could not be found anywhere in the United States.⁴⁰

Richardson's proposed solution was a program to insure that all these sets would be available in some library in each region of the country. Such proposals for cooperative acquisition, often dividing the country into regions where cooperative plans of acquisition could be established, sometimes with proposed regional or national centers, were common in the period, fueled certainly by the notions of efficiency that were gaining currency. Such proposals were part of the work emanating from two significant ALA committees during the 1920s: the Committee on Bibliography, chaired by Richardson, and the Committee on Resources of American Libraries, chaired by his successor at Princeton, James Thayer Gerould, who would have a major role in the *Union List* project. These proposals foundered, however, on the need of individual libraries to devote the substantial portion of their resources to local needs, and on the lack of any realistic plan to bring in additional funds to finance regional centers, though individual cases of informal local agreements on collecting interests among libraries did succeed, then as now.⁴¹

Nonetheless, the emergence of these ideas is an indication of the extent to which libraries recognized their lack of self-sufficiency and their dependence on a national collection, inadequate as it was, even in an era of increasing resources. Funds, though growing enough to produce real research collections in a number of locations, were never adequate to the needs of scholars and users of all kinds; even Harvard recognized the need

to supplement its regular funds by aggressively pursuing gifts, though at Harvard, as we shall see, the notion of self-sufficiency was stronger. Even when funds were available, the ability to acquire back files of periodicals and other sets was limited by their availability in an era before microfilm and before the growth of the scholarly reprint industry, and complaints about the scarceness of important sets are common in the decade before the First World War, as more and more universities added graduate programs that needed to be supported. The growth and increasing maturity of research libraries did not lessen the need to cooperate, but only brought increasing awareness of the impossibility of any one institution completely supplying all the needs of its clientele.⁴²

Development of Academic Librarianship as a Profession

A response to this challenge required an organizational structure that would support the cooperative efforts needed to effect solutions such as we see in the *Union List of Serials*. That structure grew out of the growing professional identity of librarians, and particularly of academic librarians as a distinct group with special interests. Professionalism is a phenomenon that has been understood and examined in a variety of manners. I am considering it here in a somewhat limited fashion as a measure of cooperative activity and orientation accompanying the increased self-awareness of a professional group. Thomas Haskell, in writing on the professionalization of intellectual fields, notes that for his purposes “professionalization is understood to be a measure not of quality, but of community. A social thinker’s work is professional depending on the degree to which it is oriented toward, and integrated with, the work of other inquirers in an ongoing community of inquiry.”⁴³ Academic librarianship found much of its focus not in the production of the intellectual works, but in the support of that production, a support which would soon require significant cooperative efforts and orientation toward the larger community.

The importance of these cooperative structures is corroborated in Andrew Abbott’s analysis of the information professions. He considers academic and special librarians to be the elite core of the profession, and notes that “since librarians, particularly elite librarians, rely so much on each other for services, the truly crucial professional social structures were organizations for work—the centralizing institutions that provided common services.”⁴⁴ While sociologists such as Abbott may regard academic librarians as something of a professional elite today, and as individuals they have always held leadership positions within the profession, in the years before the First World War they occupied a more peripheral place within the professional library

structure. Academic librarianship as a distinct field has its origins in the growth in size and complexity of university libraries during the nineteenth century, and is part of the broader growth of professional organizations and professional sub-specialties of this period.⁴⁵

In fact, academic librarians (then more often called college librarians) were active in ALA from its founding in 1876, but soon came to realize that they had unique needs, a realization given concrete form in the founding of the College Library Section at the St. Louis conference of the American Library Association in 1889. Thirteen librarians were present at this meeting, comprising all of the academic librarians among the 106 participants at this conference.⁴⁶ The College Library Section grew quite slowly. No organizational structure was adopted until 1898, when it came to be called the College and Reference Section, in recognition of the connections in work between academic librarians and reference librarians in other institutions, particularly in those called reference libraries. The section, however, did not reach 100 paid members until the mid-1930s, though attendance at the section's programs climbed into the hundreds during the 1920s, the decade of the *Union List of Serials* project.

The primary function of the College and Reference Section in its early years, until approximately the First World War, was to hold a program at the annual ALA conference, where the particular concerns of college and reference librarians could be discussed. Yet the development of academic librarianship during this period should not be dismissed, for common concerns were being identified and a professional identity was being built. The need for cooperative projects was notable among these concerns. Interlibrary loan was discussed as early as 1893, and in 1899 the need for union catalogs to locate needed books and the inadequacies of Bolton's *Catalogue* were raised in discussion, early expressions of the interests that were to lead to the *Union List of Serials* project.⁴⁷

ALA as a whole, however, was overwhelmingly concerned with public library problems during these years, a trend that continued into the 1920s and beyond. According to one analysis, only one of the 170 ALA publications during the years 1907–26 was aimed specifically at academic librarians.⁴⁸ The standardized techniques and efficient methods particularly desired by smaller libraries dominated activities and discussion, especially after Melvil Dewey's influence on the organization reached its zenith during the 1890s.⁴⁹ The ALA motto, "the best reading for the largest number at the least expense," offered little to librarians concerned with building resources for scholarly research; research collections by nature

often emphasize high-cost material needed by a few users. To be sure, a number of concerns and values were broadly shared by academic librarians and the rest of the profession: a concern for efficiency in operation, a missionary sense of the library movement, and the promotion of the use of collections, though the stronger curatorial concerns of academic librarians sometimes inhibited the last. In the years before the turn of the century these common concerns arguably were predominant even in the College and Reference Section discussions.⁵⁰

ALA's lack of interest in large bibliographic projects certainly came to be a concern of the section, though ALA did in fact undertake a number of bibliographic projects before the First World War: the *ALA Index* (an 1893 index to essays and other component parts of books); the *ALA Portrait Index* (1906); a continuation of Poole's *Index to Periodicals* called the *Coöperative Index to Periodicals* (1883–91); and cooperatively produced analytic catalog cards for articles in scholarly serials in the social sciences and humanities (1898–1918). These were projects that appealed to larger libraries of all types, though the last project may have been of interest primarily to academic librarians. However, after the turn of the century the many newly-founded small-town Carnegie libraries gained increasing influence, and diverted the work of the Publishing Board away from these bibliographic projects and toward the publication of more practical manuals of library administration.⁵¹

Yet academic librarians continued to work primarily through ALA, though the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) was founded in 1932 as a rather clubby organization of the largest research libraries. A 1937 report of the College and Reference Section complained of the section's lack of influence, stating that

it should also be noted that the activities of college and university librarians have been in the past conducted by committees of the American Library Association rather than by committees of this section, even when the projects were of interest almost entirely to college and reference librarians. For example, the *Union List of Serials* was conceived and compiled by members of the College and Reference Section, but under other auspices.⁵²

Though this frustration is understandable, it is questionable whether the *Union List of Serials* project could have been successful without the support of the larger public libraries. Still, academic librarians faced considerable difficulty in promoting their needs within the organization. Other groups were not as patient, most notably the special librarians, who formed the

Special Libraries Association in 1909 as an organization primarily of libraries serving business and governmental units. The separation of this group must have been a factor in the small number of special libraries included in the ALA-sponsored *Union List*.

Structures for Shared Resources: Interlibrary Loan Arrangements

Before tools to promote sharing could be developed, some mechanism for the sharing of those resources needed to be in place, beyond the time-honored method of offering access to scholars traveling from collection to collection. Cases of interlibrary loan can be documented as early as the 1870s, and by the 1890s it was not an unusual practice. There was considerable disagreement as to scope and purpose, however, as public libraries often lent rather broadly, but academic libraries, traditionally more concerned with their curatorial role, tended to be more restrictive.⁵³ Yet the need for broader agreement on access to remote collections became increasingly apparent as the activities and needs of scholars increased; finally in 1917 an official ALA code for interlibrary loans was adopted. That code opened with a statement that envisaged two sorts of loans, noting that “the purpose of inter-library loans is (a) to aid research calculated to advance the boundaries of knowledge, by the loan of unusual books not readily accessible elsewhere, (b) to augment the supply of the average book to the average reader.”⁵⁴ And indeed, though the code is not explicit about it, there were as a practical matter two interlibrary loan systems. Local and statewide arrangements, sometimes coordinated by the state library and involving public and (often) state university libraries, could be fairly liberal. The national system—rudimentary as it was, even after 1917—was chiefly reserved for scholars. There was disagreement among the committee drafting the code whether there should even be a clause “b” in the opening statement, and it in fact was dropped from the revised ALA code in 1940, a revision dominated by academic librarians.⁵⁵ The 1917 code, while acknowledging the needs of the average reader, did state that books were not to be lent for a “trivial purpose” and that, while a graduate student might make “occasional” use of such loans, “his choice of a subject [for a thesis] ought not to be such as to involve securing a large part of his material from a distant library.”⁵⁶

The new code was purely advisory, however, and libraries could and did deviate from it. Many of the larger libraries were quite firm about the more restrictive points of the code, as they also were about limiting the loan of periodical volumes. The Library of Congress, for example, refused to lend “books where the purpose is ordinary student or thesis work, or for mere

self-instruction. . . . Only for very serious research can the privilege be extended to include volumes of periodicals.”⁵⁷ Harvard noted that “volumes cannot be lent from large sets either difficult to replace or in frequent use, such as the publications of learned societies and periodicals.”⁵⁸ It is true that these two institutions were among the most restrictive, partly to discourage other libraries from applying to them automatically for any volume whose location was unknown, and they did make exceptions to their rules if the need seemed sufficiently serious. But Harvard and the Library of Congress often seemed to set the tone. “Full professors seem to be the only ones recognized as doing scholarly work,” complained one librarian in the late 1920s; another noted, “As a university librarian I venture the assertion that requests made to advance the researches of graduate students are not *prima facie* frivolous.”⁵⁹

Nonetheless, these restrictive practices were persistent, bolstered as they were by concerns about the increasing work and expense of the interlibrary loan activity, the loaning out of materials that might be requested by the loaning library’s patrons, and, of course, the potential loss of materials. It is perhaps too easy to dismiss this last argument as an excessive application of librarians’ gatekeeping function until one recalls that this was an era when replacements by photocopy and microfilm were not possible, and procurement of the limited supply of older periodicals and out-of-print books was uncertain. One librarian, noting the shortage of the supply of periodical sets and the demands placed on them by increased use, complained that “American librarians have gone to an extreme in making any book available to any person for any purpose,” and called for the “limitation of inter-library loan privileges, now so freely and even recklessly granted.”⁶⁰

It is of course easy to confuse this rhetoric with practice, and a much more difficult thing to reconstruct actual practice, which in any case varied widely. The 1926 ALA survey of American libraries showed Harvard and the University of Michigan loaning more than a thousand volumes a year and the University of Chicago over twice that number, while the University of Pennsylvania lent only 257 and Northwestern only 28.⁶¹ A 1932 survey of interlibrary loan practices in academic libraries showed that 71% of responding libraries did lend periodical volumes (and all the larger libraries did so), and that 69% lent volumes for the use of undergraduates.⁶² However, the restrictions placed upon the loans in question were often substantial, such as requiring an instructor’s approval in order to lend a book for the use of an undergraduate. And, as Arthur Bostwick of the St. Louis Public Library observed, the uncertainty of success in obtaining books through interlibrary loan was in itself a deterrent.⁶³ Despite the existence of loans, traveling to collections was

an option that surely needed to be exercised more frequently than now; a 1932 Bowdoin College report of denying a periodical volume to a library “only a hundred miles away” is probably not atypical.⁶⁴ A letter from Harold Leupp of the University of California on the need for a union list of serials speaks of the necessity of the faculty there to plan their vacations around the periodical holdings of libraries on the east coast.⁶⁵

Nonetheless, it had become clear that the research needs of faculty and even graduate students exceeded the resources of any single collection. Librarians increasingly justified interlibrary activity in language that reflected their commitment to the diffusion of knowledge, at least among serious students: “I can see no reason why we should not all regard ourselves as trustees of our possessions for the scholars of our country, indeed of the world,” wrote one of Princeton’s librarians.⁶⁶ Appeals to the value of efficiency were also made, as one librarian noted: “Rather than have a book, that has cost time and money, stand idle on the shelves, the library owning it would be better repaid for the expenditure if the book were used by more people.”⁶⁷

But it was the specific appeal “to advance the boundaries of knowledge” that was acknowledged in the code, wording that invokes the ideals of pure research that had become a strong element of academic life over the previous half-century, reflecting the mystique that science, broadly conceived, had achieved by the late nineteenth century in much of American society.⁶⁸ Knowledge is of course an important source of professional power, and librarianship arguably gains much of its professional legitimacy from the management of knowledge resources, so that the conflict between the need for access and the need to protect those resources has been a central one for the profession.⁶⁹ In the light of other concerns during the Progressive Era, it may seem odd that the code’s statement of purpose highlights the role of scholars rather than such other potential “serious” users of pure research as governmental units, businesses, and industrial labs. This was a time when reformers began to stress the practical application of research to society and industry, seen in such various movements as scientific management, or the wholesale application of university expertise to government in La Follette’s Wisconsin.⁷⁰ Library service to governmental units was increasing at this time, exemplified by the work of state libraries such as New York’s and Wisconsin’s, and by the emergence of municipal reference libraries. Public libraries were also beginning to offer special services to the business community, starting with the Newark Public Library’s business branch (1904) and the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh’s Technology Department (1902). The wording suggests that, however dominant public

library interests were in the ALA of that time, the large academic libraries here won a point; and, certainly, an interlibrary loan code without strong influence from these large collections would have had little meaning at all.⁷¹ The *Union List of Serials* would reflect these same tensions, being dominated by the large research libraries and their interests, but attempting to pull in public and governmental libraries and their collections.

One technological development that did make the distribution of periodical articles somewhat easier was the introduction of machines capable of making photographic copies, particularly the Photostat, first marketed in 1910. The Library of Congress and the New York Public Library installed such machines in 1912, and by the 1920s the equipment was found in many larger libraries. The 1917 interlibrary loan code called for the substitution of a Photostat of an article for the lending of a periodical volume, and this was certainly done to some extent. Arthur Hamlin concludes, however, that the Photostat “was an expensive service, sparingly used by scholars.”⁷² The John Crerar Library, which sold photostatic copies of any article indexed in the *Engineering Index*, was charging 25¢ in 1920 for the first exposure in an order, and 15¢ for subsequent exposures, enough certainly to ensure that users were very serious.⁷³ The expense of the equipment limited its availability to the largest libraries. Constance Winchell, however, noted in 1930 that it “is often cheaper for the borrowing library than the carriage charges on a heavy volume and furthermore the reader is able to retain the copy of the article for future reference.”⁷⁴ Actual data on its use are fragmentary. The University of California reported 67 orders in 1925/26, though that had increased to 436 requests in 1928/29. The Detroit Public Library needed a full-time Photostat operator by 1926. The scattered statistics available do not indicate what percentage are periodical articles, plates from books, manuscripts and rare books, or other materials, or what percentage are for interlibrary purposes, or for local users. The Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh in the early 1930s did show the bulk of requests coming from the Technology Department, and the New York Public Library noted in 1933 that “as usual the bulk of the [Photostat] work done involved material needed for legal purposes or for industrial research.”⁷⁵ Though this technology did increase the availability of articles and other library materials, its impact was far less than that of the introduction of photocopying later in the century.

Structures for Shared Resources: “Centralizing Institutions”

Andrew Abbott’s notion of academic librarians’ dependence upon “centralizing institutions that provided common services” points to the role

of the Library of Congress and reference publishers like the H. W. Wilson Company in such cooperative bibliographic projects as the *Union List of Serials*. This degree of centralization must be qualified, however. The national system for the provision and sharing of bibliographic information in the United States is not centralized in a single institution but has remained pragmatic and “essentially pluralist in its organization,” involving publishers, foundations, and associations in addition to central libraries such as LC.⁷⁶ While one might expect LC to have had a significant role in producing the *Union List of Serials*, its role was in fact limited to checking its own holdings and coordinating the checking of other federal government libraries, doing so with foundation help. Why was this so?

LC’s role as the national library has always been ambiguous. First and foremost a creature of Congress, by right of copyright deposit it became the *de facto* national library in 1865. Ainsworth Rand Spofford, the Librarian of Congress from 1864 to 1897, held to a limited view of LC as national library, considering it simply a national library collection, a view consistent with the practice of European national libraries of the period. Significant changes came when Herbert Putnam succeeded Spofford after the brief tenure of John Russell Young (1897–99) and began to develop LC’s services to the American library community. During his long tenure (1899–1939), Putnam worked to standardize American cataloging practice, distribute printed catalog cards, and develop the LC classification system, changes that had a profound and lasting impact on American library practice. Important bibliographic publications were begun, such as the *List of American Doctoral Dissertations* and the *Monthly List of State Publications*.

Putnam had to carefully balance LC’s internal needs and the services provided to Congress with the services he wanted to offer to the library community, though he tended to jealously guard LC’s role within that community. At least twice he directed LC staff members to help defeat proposals that he considered threatening. One was a proposal in 1902 for a National Bibliographic Center, the other a 1908 proposal for a College Library Lending and Reference Bureau. LC officials, doubtless speaking under Putnam’s direction, indicated that the proposed bureaus were unnecessary because LC was fulfilling or moving to fulfill the same functions, functions that would have included the provision of both bibliographic resources (such as a catalog of serial publications) and the resources for locating publications.⁷⁷ Though, obviously, the mere fact of these proposals reflects at least a perception that LC’s provision of these services was inadequate, it is also likely that these proposals would have died from lack of funding even without Putnam’s opposition. A speaker at ALA’s 1912 Ottawa conference,

in noting that “American librarians are looking toward a fuller development of interlibrary loans, and away from a central reference bureau,” underlined the resultant tendency toward a less coordinated system, and the reliance on LC and other existent library centers.⁷⁸

During the years following World War I, however, LC became less responsive to the library community, partly as a result of severe staff losses due to low wages and post-war inflation, partly because Putnam’s own interest turned increasingly to developing services to Congress and to “interpretation” of the collection through such means as the appointment of special chairs. Thus while it had appeared in the years immediately prior to the First World War that LC might edit a national union list, by war’s end LC was hard pressed to participate in the *Union List* at all. Despite this failure, it is important to remember that Putnam pioneered such services as distributed cataloging decades before any other national library.⁷⁹ Without the standardized rules of entry made possible by LC cataloging practice, editing the *Union List of Serials* would doubtless have been a much more chaotic experience than it in fact was.

“Centralizing Institutions”: The Case of H. W. Wilson

The modest role of national governmental agencies in library planning, certainly in comparison with many European countries,⁸⁰ has encouraged the increased reliance on private entities. It was in fact the publisher H. W. Wilson who was to play the decisive role in assuring the existence of the *Union List of Serials*, by agreeing in 1922 to publish the *List* without a profit if protected by the library community against a loss. Wilson was a remarkable man, in many ways the ideal of the self-made man. Orphaned at an early age and raised on a farm by his grandparents, he began a book-selling business while working his way through the University of Minnesota. Running the business came to take precedence over finishing his degree. Wilson’s business took a new turn in 1898 when, disturbed by R. R. Bowker’s discontinuation of a semi-annual cumulation of the list of new publications in *Publisher’s Weekly*, he began publishing the *Cumulative Book Index* out of his Minneapolis apartment, subsidizing his early losses with the profits from his bookstore. In 1901 he began his series of periodical indexes with the *Readers’ Guide to Periodical Literature*, and other reference books and books for the library community followed. Wilson eventually felt the need to move his company to the east coast to be nearer the publishing centers, settling in 1917 in the Bronx. ALA had a peculiar relationship with this publisher, as it had also with Bowker. It is difficult in our current environment, conditioned by the explosion of indexing services since the

Second World War and by the more recent proliferation of online services, to realize how fundamental Wilson products were to the day-to-day reference functions of libraries, particularly small and mid-sized libraries. John Higham has noted the special achievement of Wilson:

By 1900 American libraries were so numerous and avid for reference services that current, ongoing bibliographies could be produced for a profit. Wilson proved himself a master in articulating detailed subject entries. One project reinforced another and his efforts expanded rapidly. . . . By the 1930s the Wilson publications indexed, reviewed, and catalogued more than 1,200 periodicals and all books printed in the English language in all countries of the world. Nothing approaching this bibliographical empire existed anywhere else.⁸¹

How can we understand this relationship—perhaps even a partnership at times—between private publisher and professional library community? The classic assumption of the professions as a disinterested class, free from the acquisitiveness and unrestrained self-interest of contemporary business, was a common attitude dating back into the nineteenth century, often drawn upon by Progressive Era reformers such as Walter Lippmann and social thinkers such as Emile Durkheim. This line of thought stressed the differences between the value systems of the professions and private enterprise, and the need for business to move toward a more professional style of organization.⁸² While these assumptions remain and can be seen to operate at times in the profession's relationship with Wilson, scholars in the last forty years have stressed that professions often do not behave in disinterested ways, and have also explored ways in which both private and public sectors during the Progressive Era often underwent similar organizational developments and shared common values, values such as efficiency and continuity.⁸³ And indeed, during the 1920s notions of public- and private-sector cooperation were to gain increasingly wide currency, as business was widely seen to have evolved into a more professional and benevolent form as it incorporated such managerial practices as scientific management and welfare work with employees. Public approval of and accommodation to big business reached its high point, at least once the serious economic dislocation of 1920–21 was past, a trend that was reflected in the increased approval of business and business methods in the library community.⁸⁴ We do see Wilson using appeals to efficiency as a way to communicate with the library community; his circular letter of 1921 asking libraries to check some sample pages for the *Union List* begins not with an exhortation for libraries to increase the access to knowledge or service to scholars, but with this simple appeal: "I assume that a national union list of serials would be much more useful than a shelf full of local lists and more useful than several regional lists."⁸⁵

But it is difficult to attribute this cooperation solely to organizational values such as efficiency and continuity and to deny other shared values. Judith Sealander, in her study of businessmen reformers in Ohio's Miami Valley during the Progressive Era, warns against reliance on self-interest in explaining the motives of such businessmen and ignoring "the roles also played by religious conviction and moral fervor."⁸⁶ There indeed was a strong moralistic base to the Progressive Era efficiency movement itself, which appealed to virtues of individual and social improvement.⁸⁷ Max Weber posited a more significant insight into this moralism in the religious notion of a "calling" as the basis of both capitalistic and professional activities, writing that "it is an obligation which the individual is supposed to feel and does feel toward the content of his professional activity, no matter in what it consists, in particular no matter whether it appears on the surface as a utilization of his personal powers, or only of his material possessions (as capital)."⁸⁸

Wilson's interest in many of the projects he began or was involved with do seem to stem from far more than the potential for profit; after all, there are better ways of making a fortune than by publishing bibliographies. Wilson's own explanation of why he was in this strange sort of business reflects a tension between the idealism of a "calling" and demands of business efficiency. He blamed what he called "the Bibliographic Urge" for his many activities, noting "the germ has not been isolated, and, consequently, no cure is forthcoming. The malady is almost always financially fatal. The only known relief is a large dose of practicalism to antidote the idealism of the patient."⁸⁹ A more explicit tribute to Wilson's deep idealism comes from Miles and Fannie Price, two law librarians charged in the 1930s by the ARL with examining Wilson's pricing policies, who noted that "no one can talk for five minutes with him without realizing that he has the abiding and militant faith of the missionary in the library movement."⁹⁰

Wilson's agreement to publish the *Union List of Serials* without a profit if protected from a loss was not unique for a publisher who continued a number of publications, despite losses, for several years.⁹¹ A *New Yorker* profile of Wilson published in 1938 noted that "he likes to think of himself as engaged in public service. This, of course, is the attitude of most big business these days, but there are concrete evidences of Wilson's sincerity." The article does go on to add, quite appropriately, "There may be more than a touch of unconscious shrewdness in all this, too, for the success of Wilson's enterprises depends greatly on his good standing with the librarians of the country."⁹² Certainly, this was an era in which corporations were becoming increasingly aware of the public-relations potential of being perceived as engaged in a public service,⁹³ and Wilson could not have

been unaware of this. Yet Wilson's service ethic was clearly not a matter of window-dressing, for the intensity of his repeated efforts seems to stem from clear convictions.

Another way of understanding Wilson's motivation may be by viewing him as an entrepreneur. According to Joseph Schumpeter's classic analysis of the entrepreneur, the entrepreneur works by creating "new combinations," which we may see as Wilson's centralization under his own control of many formerly cooperative bibliographic services, a move that led to their considerable expansion. There is always a destructive nature to these combinations, and we observe Wilson's activities leading to the end, lamented by some, of the voluntary, cooperative preparation of some of these services. The process is often more intuitive than managerial in the usual sense, and certainly Wilson had a deeply intuitive sense of what might work. Schumpeter notes several sources of entrepreneurial motivation; particularly relevant in looking at Wilson is "the joy of creating, of getting things done, or simply exercising one's energy and ingenuity," a set of motivations that may have little to do with pecuniary gain. And indeed, the spirit of the promotion of libraries shared by Wilson and many librarians of his era, commonly referred to in such terms as the "missionary spirit," in addition to pointing toward a deeper set of values and community, may also elicit a sense of enterprise and initiative that helped to unite the entrepreneur and the librarian. Other sets of motivations that Schumpeter notes, such as the desire to "found a private kingdom," seem somewhat less applicable to Wilson, except in pointing to the pride he took in the accomplishments of his company and the strong desire, as we shall see, to make sure that proper attention was paid to it.⁹⁴

Not that entrepreneurs could operate without a profit, and the value of efficiency was often the link between profit and entrepreneurial energy.⁹⁵ Wilson was certainly a shrewd businessman. His great innovation was pricing his indexes on a "service basis," whereby libraries were charged according to which of the indexed periodicals they subscribed to, an innovation that for the first time, at least in the Anglo-American world, made such bibliographic publication profitable. The service basis was widely disliked by larger libraries, who wound up paying more because they subscribed to more of the indexed periodicals. They often referred to the pricing method as a "system of taxation," and the ARL devoted a great deal of energy during the 1930s toward an unsuccessful effort to fight it.⁹⁶ However, the report they commissioned (but never formally released) in the end substantially agreed with Wilson's position that, by allowing smaller libraries to purchase indexes at a much reduced price, the price for larger libraries was in fact reduced, and the larger

libraries also got the fuller indexing that they wanted but that the smaller libraries could not have afforded.⁹⁷ In this light the service basis of pricing may in fact be seen to unite profitability with values both of efficiency and the diffusion of knowledge.

But, however they may be defended, Wilson's pricing policies were a perennial source of disagreement between librarian and publisher, as pricing policies generally are, and point to the world of profit and loss inhabited by Wilson, apart from those values shared with the library community. It is surely from this difference in culture, along with the structural changes effected by Wilson's entrepreneurial energy, that an elusive set of issues emerges in Wilson's relationship with ALA centering around issues of control, issues that point to a deeper level of distrust between professionals and businessman. Andrew Abbott's observation that the story of the various professions lies in the management of their work and the maintenance of professional jurisdiction over that work provides us with another clue as to why such issues of control might arise.⁹⁸

These issues of jurisdiction and control are elusive, however, because they only occasionally, except in the issue of pricing, become overt. Few real objections were voiced, for example, to Wilson's taking over a number of bibliographic projects that ALA had previously handled cooperatively.⁹⁹ The attitude of one member of the ALA Executive Board toward Wilson's proposal to continue the *ALA Index to General Literature* as the *Essay and General Literature Index* is probably typical: "You know I am keen enough about having A.L.A. do all these things, but what is the use of trying to 'bust our galluses' by working so hard, especially when there seems to be no money available?"¹⁰⁰ True, one librarian—Louis N. Wilson of Clark University—did object during the campaign for subscriptions to the *Union List of Serials* to "all of the bibliographic work of the country being turned over to the H. W. Wilson Company," stating that "if anything of this kind is done, it ought to be controlled and owned absolutely by the A.L.A. and not by a private firm."¹⁰¹ And the earliest organizers of the *Union List* project did go to some length to exclude the participation of the Wilson Company. But these few overt expressions are balanced by voices of approval for such a partnership, in language that reflects the increased prestige of business and of cooperation between business and non-profit enterprises during the 1920s, as in a review that called the *Union List* "the result of a unique combination of bibliographical scholarship and effective business administration."¹⁰² Yet the issue of control would manifest itself most clearly in a disagreement at the end of the *Union List* project, making it a fascinating case in the tensions behind such cooperation.

PART II: PROGRAMS

Early ALA Initiatives

The ALA's formal involvement in the *Union List of Serials* project dates from the midwinter meeting of 1912–13, when a letter from Ernest Cushing Richardson was read before the Publishing Board, “advocating the preparation and printing of a union list of periodicals in the principal libraries of the United States and Canada, and inquiring whether the American Library Association could help in such a project.”¹⁰³ Richardson had in fact been asked to make the proposal by the Council of the American Historical Association, a request that had been prompted by that association's publication of the union list of collections in European history mentioned earlier.¹⁰⁴ Richardson's role in promoting library cooperation has been alluded to; as chairman of the ALA Committee on Bibliography from 1922 to 1934, he would continue to provide a major voice for cooperative purchasing and cataloging schemes as well as union catalogs. Most of these projects were not to come to fruition within his lifetime, and his tenure as committee chair was marked by recurrent quarrels with the ALA Executive Board. Richardson, however, in his capacity as consultant in bibliography to the Library of Congress (1925–39), did oversee “Project B,” the massive expansion of the library's National Union Catalog.¹⁰⁵

Richardson's letter prompted the Publishing Board to appoint a committee to study the feasibility of a union list.¹⁰⁶ Clement W. Andrews, librarian of the John Crerar Library, was to be chairman, and Arthur E. Bostwick, director of the St. Louis Public Library, was the sole other member. Andrews was a logical choice for chairman, for he had been editor of the *Chicago List of Serials* and its supplements, among the best of the regional union lists of the time.¹⁰⁷ Bostwick was, like Andrews, a member of the Publishing Board, but his reasons for interest in this particular project are less clear. One of the foremost public librarians of his day, his interests otherwise seem to have had little to do with large bibliographic projects. However, his strong advocacy for efficiency in library operations may have contributed to an interest in cooperative enterprises.¹⁰⁸

Andrews, working closely with Richardson, began to consider ways in which such a publication might become a reality. Though Andrews soon turned his attention to the Library of Congress, where it remained with some persistence, other possibilities were briefly raised. Andrews reported to Richardson a suggestion made by Walter Lichtenstein, librarian of Northwestern University, that the larger institutions strongly interested in a union list subscribe to a number of copies, even if beyond their actual needs, in order to provide the

necessary financing. The use of subscriptions to finance a publishing project was, of course, a time-honored (if sometimes abused) method appropriate for works that would have been too risky to publish otherwise, and was apparently under consideration for a union list of serials for the large midwestern university libraries. Both Andrews and Richardson thought that their own institutions would approve such a scheme.¹⁰⁹ Richardson noted that “it would be much better for us to guarantee a considerable number of copies each than to charge big prices in the way Wilson does, for perhaps the greatest importance of this list from this point of view is that the professors of the smaller colleges may be able to use it, and the cost ought to be within the means of the smallest college which is doing dignified work.”¹¹⁰

The *Union List* was in the end to be financed by a subscription campaign such as Lichtenstein had suggested, but in fact only with the cooperation of Wilson. Richardson, it may be noted, considered library cooperation to be a matter of efficiency and sound business-like practice, and a decade later would even hold up the Wilson Company as a model for bringing such values to bibliographic projects.¹¹¹ At this point, however, there is evidence of a more circumspect view of Wilson. Since Andrews was never reticent about criticizing Wilson’s pricing policies, it is no surprise that cooperation with Wilson was deferred. Librarian of Congress Herbert Putnam was approached instead about the undertaking and, in a masterfully ambivalent letter, he indicated interest in the project, but thought that the Publishing Board “should have the first chance at it. If the Board cannot undertake it we shall be glad to consider it. It is true that our funds are at present very much pressed.” After reviewing the limitations of his printing budget, Putnam noted that the situation

would not prevent our considering with interest the publication of the Union List. I think, however, that in view of [the financial situation], we should be wise to defer any engagement to publish the list until the copy was prepared, or at least well on towards preparation. Need a decision be made before that stage! I should think not, because the probable utility of such a list is so obvious that some method of publication will undoubtedly be contrived, and it might well be, I suppose, that with the copy in hand, even the Publishing Board itself might see profit in undertaking it.

The preparation itself seems to me matter of more present concern, but doubtless you have considered how the difficulties of organizing this and ensuring sufficiently prompt cooperation can be met.¹¹²

Putnam’s letter seems a bit chilling, and a letter written as a follow-up (but perhaps never sent) made clear what Andrews’s and Richardson’s reaction must have been:

What is it that has so discouraged you? It cannot be a supposed indifference on my part to the value of the Union-List: since I am heartily for it. Your proposal of it enlarges the signal service which you rendered in the present list of set-collections. Is it that the Library of Congress did not leap to the opportunity of publishing it? But I didn't write that we would not publish it. And if I did not leap, this was merely because (1) the Publishing Board seemed to me entitled to the first choice; and (2) because experience has indicated the danger of impetuous assurance in such matters.¹¹³

No one could accuse Putnam of "impetuous assurance" in this instance.

Andrews continued to seek some sort of cooperation with Putnam. Not willing to let Putnam's evasion of the publication issue stand, he noted that "the decision [of publication] would have to be made before the preparation of the copy was undertaken, inasmuch as the assurance of printing would be a necessary factor in securing the cooperation of the libraries; and moreover, a not inconsiderable financial expense would have to be met."¹¹⁴ Nor was the disposition of the editorial work so easily resolved as Putnam had implied: Bostwick did not think it appropriate for editorial work to be paid for by ALA, and Andrews did not think Bostwick's suggestion that the work be done cooperatively under general direction from ALA headquarters at all realistic.¹¹⁵ Putnam suggested undertaking the issuance of a preliminary checking edition, that is, an initial list of serial titles for participating libraries to use to check their catalogs. However, he was concerned about the burden on LC's Periodicals Division, then dealing with twice the receipts of a decade earlier, and with no increase in staff.¹¹⁶ By December he had a more concrete but limited proposal:

What we have decided . . . is that we must, as soon as possible, compile with a view to publication such a list of our own sets, and very likely this decision would aid the general project, for naturally the first stage of the union project would be a list based upon the collections in a particular library or in a particular group of libraries, or perhaps a combination of these two.

As to the larger project, we have not at all abated our disposition. We are still disposed to handle the project, the question is only of time. In a season, however, when we are so pressed with routine that we cannot even compile our own lists, we ought to be chary of professions about a general one with all the correspondence that this would involve, irrespective of the cost of publication.¹¹⁷

Putnam also asked for a preliminary sense of what should be included in such a list: should it include newspapers, documents, society publications, and the like, and should these be in separate sections? Andrews reported on progress to the ALA Council at the 1913/14 midwinter meeting,

noting that the LC plan was “agreeable news, as they could do it better than it could be done elsewhere.” He inquired whether a list of all serials was desired, or should a list of periodicals only be issued first? Andrews felt that a list of periodicals could be produced two years sooner than could a full list, and that LC cooperation would be more likely for the briefer list; according to the minutes, “those who expressed themselves thought best to include only the periodicals if this would expedite matters.”¹¹⁸

Putnam and Andrews continued to correspond and work out details of scope, format, method of entry, and level of detail of statements of holdings. Proofs of LC’s serials list were to be sent to participating libraries, to be returned with holdings information and additional titles. Andrews estimated that a list of periodicals and transactions would include about 30,000 titles; LC staff (doubtless the more accurate, as experience would show) placed the number at 75,000 to 100,000.¹¹⁹ At ALA’s 1914 Washington conference the committee briefly reported its plans. Preliminary lists would be issued in sections, “taking those classes [e.g., periodicals as opposed to other serials] first which appear likely to be of the most use.” The committee thought that the advantages of having the work done at the Library of Congress were “so obvious” that there was no need to consider alternative courses of action as long as this project seemed likely to succeed.¹²⁰

At the midwinter meeting of 1914/15 a note of caution appeared in the committee’s report. Progress seemed slow, though Putnam “hoped that more rapid progress could soon be made.”¹²¹ The year 1915 brought little progress, however. LC’s list had not extended beyond “A,” and Putnam had “no confidence that the results will be available soon enough for your Committee.”¹²² Andrews was prepared to recommend that ALA go ahead on its own, and was ready to work on a revision of his Chicago list if neither project materialized.¹²³ In his midwinter 1915/16 report to Council, Andrews blamed the lack of progress on the fact that “those having the matter in charge feel obliged to search through the card catalog of the Library of Congress for all possible titles before making a start.” A “tentative list” compiled by LC, to be checked and used until a permanent edition could be published, was still seen as a possible solution.¹²⁴

It soon became clear, however, that Andrews had misread Putnam’s position; a “tentative list of titles . . . compiled from easily accessible bibliographies” was not a possibility either. “We are not in a position to afford the service; and if we could we aren’t in a position to afford the printing.” LC, Putnam noted, “ought practically to be counted out in the calculations of your Committee.”¹²⁵ Though not mentioned explicitly, continually worsening

staff problems were clearly behind Putnam's reluctance to undertake this project. Inadequate salaries had caused turnover to become unacceptably high, and the recruitment of qualified personnel had become difficult, despite a modest salary increase granted by Congress in 1915.¹²⁶

So Andrews began to pursue the possibility of issuing a series of lists by subject, beginning with a new edition of Bolton, issued by the Smithsonian and listing scientific periodicals. "If, then, the American Historical Association will finance the issue of a check list of historical periodicals there will be left only the general and literary ones and it will be 'up to' the philologists to finance these. I write philologists because I doubt if the literary men do much research work."¹²⁷ Though the split in the humanities between researchers and advocates of literary culture was in fact real,¹²⁸ Andrews's plan, at the very least, ignored the rise of the social sciences and the needs of governmental and business information centers. One might speculate that the pursuit of a revised Bolton reflected the fact that both members of the ALA committee were scientists by training, Andrews having a master's in chemistry, Bostwick a doctorate in physics, with Andrews having spent his entire career in libraries with a scientific emphasis. However, the particular dependence of scientists upon serial literature, as well as the claim of scientific research to a practical utility, is probably more to the point. In fact, lists of purely scientific periodicals were to be compiled in Britain, France, and Canada during the 1920s.¹²⁹

But even this partial solution faltered; though the Smithsonian was considering issuing a revised Bolton, the plans again failed to materialize. In reporting to Council at ALA's 1916 Asbury Park conference, Andrews could only counter his disappointments with a note that proposals for special lists in medicine and agriculture had been put forward. He "stated it was a pity we could not get together and issue one list which would cover all sections of the country; but if we can not it would appear we shall have to be content with special lists on special subjects." The committee, however, was still planning to check with the H. W. Wilson Company on plans for cooperation.¹³⁰

Wilson and the North Central List

The H. W. Wilson Company had indeed been interested for several years in a Midwest serials union list. The original initiative for this project seems to have come from Phineas L. Windsor, librarian of the University of Illinois. In October 1911, he issued a memorandum proposing topics for the meeting of the College and University Librarians of the Midwest, an informal discussion group of the heads of the larger university and

reference libraries in the region held in conjunction with the ALA mid-winter meeting. One item on this agenda proposed “some discussion of a possible union list of serials in Middle Western State University Libraries.”¹³¹ In November Windsor wrote Putnam about the project, stressing the concern of midwestern librarians at the large number of loan requests their institutions were directing to large eastern libraries rather than to regional institutions, but Putnam was not concerned since few loans were made by LC.¹³² Finally, in January 1912, Windsor approached Wilson:

As you know, I am interested in securing the publication of the Union List of Serials in the larger libraries of the Middle West (omitting Chicago possibly). Mr. Severance [librarian of the University of Missouri] has just told me that he expects to begin compiling his own list of serials soon. If Michigan and Wisconsin and one or two others could also furnish ‘copy’, don’t you think some arrangement might be made for issuing within a couple of years a Union List? Of course, someone will have to combine the copy, edit and read proof on it, but I am inclined to think that we could find volunteers to do that. We might attempt it in this library. Do you think it would be feasible to finance the project by having certain of the cooperating libraries agree to purchase a certain number of copies of you, if you should publish such a list? Or what financial arrangements do you think the most feasible?¹³³

Though details of the early years of this project are scarce, Wilson indicated later that he corresponded with Windsor for the next several years about the project, and that other libraries were recruited.¹³⁴

H. M. Lydenberg, in his preface to the *Union List of Serials*, made a great deal of the importance of a contemporaneous project at the University of Nebraska, basing his account on a letter by Malcolm Wyer, one of the participants:

In 1915 Mr. Malcolm G. Wyer, then librarian of the University of Nebraska, set Mr. Frank Peterson at the preparation of a list of periodicals and serials in the various libraries of that University. When this was finished they decided to extend it to libraries in Lincoln, Omaha, and other Nebraska cities, thirteen libraries in all. This work was completed late in 1916, and on October 21 of that year Mr. Wyer asked the H. W. Wilson Company to quote on the cost of printing the list in an edition of 500 copies.

At the midwinter meeting of the American Library Association held in Chicago in 1916, Mr. Wyer announced his intention of printing this list, whereupon Mr. James T. Gerould, then librarian of the University of Minnesota, Mr. Walter M. Smith, librarian of the University of Wisconsin and Mr. P. L. Windsor, librarian of the University of Illinois, suggested it be extended to include their collections. Dr. Clement W. Andrews, as librarian of the John Crerar Library and as chairman of the committee

to which the suggestion of Dr. Richardson had been referred in 1913, urged inclusion of the libraries of the north-central region, accepting the chairmanship of the committee in charge, and made some progress toward editing the material thus collected.¹³⁵

There are some problems with Wyer's and Lydenberg's version, however. Wyer seemed unaware in his letter to Lydenberg of any involvement in a union list project on the part of Andrews, Wilson, or Windsor prior to the December 1916 midwinter meeting; indeed, his letter implied that the original ALA committee was appointed in response to the events of that meeting, which, of course, was not the case. Lydenberg correctly dated the formation of the ALA committee to 1912, but allowed Wyer's initiative to stand as the genesis of the proposed Midwest serials list. Lydenberg's account appears to have been relied on by Howard Rovelstad, chairman of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials during the 1960s, for his account of the origin of the project in the preface to the third and final edition, which has become the standard account.¹³⁶ Lydenberg and Rovelstad's accounts failed to mention any involvement by Wilson in the Midwest list prior to Wyer's 1916 initiative.

Accounts of the early history of the project that originate with the Wilson Company, including a report submitted by the company to the ALA Executive Board in 1938 and John Lawler's sympathetic history of the Wilson Company, dated the company's interest in the project from the 1912 Windsor letter and left Wyer's project unmentioned.¹³⁷ An account published in an early checking edition of the *Union List of Serials* did mention the Nebraska list (along with a Twin Cities list), but stated that it was Wilson who suggested that these be expanded into a regional list.¹³⁸ Wilson is in fact listed on the program for the University Librarians of the Middle West meeting at that 1916 midwinter (a meeting chaired by Wyer), under the heading "Union List of Periodicals."¹³⁹ These differences are perhaps trivial, as the origins of cooperative projects often stem from a number of parties each trying to find a solution to a common problem. But in this case these differences do reflect fundamentally differing views on which party bore the primary responsibility for organizing the project, and these differences reappear during the disputes between Wilson and the ALA representatives in 1927 and 1938 over who had ultimate ownership of the *List*. Indeed, as we shall see, it was Lydenberg's preface, which places Wilson's involvement only from 1916 and at the invitation of Wyer, that prompted a dispute in 1927 immediately prior to the publication of the *Union List*, and Wilson ultimately accepted the preface only grudgingly.¹⁴⁰ Wilson clearly viewed the national *Union List of Serials* as an extension of the North Central list, which he in turn viewed as his project.

The First World War and its Aftermath

Progress was interrupted by the First World War. That conflict caused American society to mobilize in an unprecedented manner. This mobilization had notable effects on a number of institutions, effects that should be considered here. After a couple years of declining enrollment early in the war, colleges and universities were enlisted in the war effort through the Student Army Training Corps, which established units at hundreds of colleges in order to ensure a steady supply of engineers needed for the war effort and of college-educated men to help with the rebuilding effort after the war. It has been argued that the corps, though only in existence for the three months before armistice was declared, led to the increased legitimization of American higher education, and was an indication of the value society at large was beginning to attach to a college education.¹⁴¹ Certainly an enrollment boom followed the war that, for the first time, began to make a college education something of a middle-class expectation, and helped to usher in an unprecedented decade of academic prosperity.¹⁴²

The war effort also involved academic scientists, who were utilized by the federal government to an unprecedented extent through the agency of the National Research Council (NRC). This program helped to legitimate university researchers, who succeeded where more old-fashioned scientists of the “cut and try” tradition had failed, and the NRC continued its enhanced role into the post-war years, bringing university scientists into the service of industry as well as the military. Social scientists and historians were also called into the war propaganda effort, and the NRC in turn began to support a social science research agenda aimed at the solution of social problems.¹⁴³ It is true that the claims of research were to suffer in public opinion from the postwar backlash against President Wilson and the war effort, and that the era of Normalcy displayed ambivalent and conflicting notions about the role of science.¹⁴⁴ However, the major foundations, now more cognizant of the importance of graduate training in the research universities for the production of scientists, moved strongly to support research and graduate programs in the universities.¹⁴⁵ Education was clearly in an expansive mode, a mode conducive to the beginning of new projects. As Roger Geiger has noted, during the 1920s “the advancement of knowledge for the first time became a lucrative undertaking.”¹⁴⁶ One result of this new environment was a dramatic increase in university library budgets in the early 1920s, after a few difficult years caused by the war and its immediate aftermath. Library budgets in many places more than doubled in a very few years, though postwar inflation and the advances in book and periodical prices made these increases less than they might seem.¹⁴⁷

The war effort also had its effect upon the library profession. ALA took on responsibility for furnishing library service to American soldiers, a project organized by the War Services Committee and directed by Herbert Putnam. Over \$5,000,000 was raised, donations of books were solicited, thirty-six camp libraries were constructed, and 1,200 individuals, including many librarians, were recruited to staff these libraries, this by an organization of just over 3,300 members with an annual budget of \$24,000. The war experience has often been credited with a new and more activist orientation by the ALA.¹⁴⁸ The College and Reference Library Section, too, became more active during the following decade, whether through the war experience, or from factors such as the increasing ability of the academic library community to document and communicate its concerns through publications and programs, and ALA's increasing tendency to work through sections. Cooperative and bibliographic projects, such as union lists, were among the continuing concerns of the section.¹⁴⁹ However, ALA's first attempt to capitalize on the war experience, an ambitious fund-raising plan called the Enlarged Program, was an embarrassing failure. Both the library community and the public were tired of appeals and campaigns, and the program quickly died a quiet death. Nonetheless, certain programs, such as ALA's involvement in international librarianship, can be directly attributed to the war experience, and other programs proposed in the Enlarged Plan were in fact implemented during the 1920s, in many cases with help from the Carnegie Corporation.¹⁵⁰

In view of the dislocations the war effort caused in the library community, and the focus of that community on the war effort, it is surprising to read that planning for union list projects continued during 1917; Andrews was not one to be readily sidetracked or distracted. In his report for the ALA Union List Committee in the summer of 1917, he noted that arrangements were "practically completed" for a Midwest list. He specifically stated that the work was being undertaken by a "committee of the libraries of the universities of the Central States"—clearly not the ALA committee of Andrews and Bostwick—and that the Chicago libraries had been invited to join. The list was not to be as comprehensive as the older Chicago lists, but was expected to have at least 20,000 titles and 5,000 cross-references.¹⁵¹

By the summer of 1918 we find a list of 30,000 entries and 600 pages contemplated, with complete holdings of university and state libraries, and "additional sets" held by public libraries of titles not in the other libraries.¹⁵² Andrews was selected to edit the list, a decision doubtless based on his editorship of the Chicago lists. The Midwest list was mentioned in Andrews's 1917 report as one of several lists in progress, and there was no indication

that it was an official ALA project as the earlier proposed national list had been. Nonetheless, after 1917 the ALA committee seemed to have focused its interest almost entirely on the North Central list. Any initiative involving LC became increasingly remote; LC's staffing problems, significant enough in the years before the war, reached the level of crisis in the severe inflation that immediately followed the war. As efforts to ameliorate salaries did not take place until the mid-1920s, LC's problems in retaining staff and recruiting library school graduates made its involvement in any kind of serials list unthinkable.¹⁵³

The year 1917 also seems to have marked the signing of a contract between the cooperating North Central libraries and the Wilson Company, and was the year that Frank Peterson of the Nebraska serials list project went to work on the new list at the Wilson Company in New York.¹⁵⁴ Peterson was not a librarian but a plasterer from Lincoln whose fascination with bibliography led him to Malcolm Wyer, who persuaded him to work on the Nebraska serials list in his spare time. Peterson's primary contribution was devising a standard set of library abbreviations for use in the Nebraska and North Central lists, abbreviations familiar from their subsequent use in the *Union List of Serials*, the *National Union Catalog*, and other bibliographic tools. Peterson and Andrews conferred several times on the editing of the list.¹⁵⁵

The list was to be financed by subscriptions from cooperating libraries, with participation extended to smaller institutions that would only be represented in the list by those periodicals among their holdings that were out of the ordinary. William Warner Bishop, at this point librarian of the University of Michigan, was given responsibility for recruiting libraries in the state of Michigan, and his files reveal a great deal about the subscription campaign. Twenty-two subscribing libraries are listed for the state; the University of Michigan subscribed at fifty copies, the Detroit Public Library at eight, and most of the rest at a single copy, at four dollars a copy. Some of these are small libraries indeed, such as the Escanaba Carnegie Public Library and the Digestive Ferments Company in Detroit. However, the list does not include the Grand Rapids Public Library, valued for its collection of periodicals on furniture making. That library declined to participate on the grounds that it could not loan these volumes, since they were needed for immediate consultation by the furniture manufacturers in the city.¹⁵⁶

However, new difficulties were encountered, since the post-war inflation had rendered the charges specified in the original contract obsolete, and, certainly, because of the difficulty inflation was causing libraries generally.¹⁵⁷ At the ALA Colorado Springs conference in 1920, Andrews

simply “reported progress” but offered no details of the situation, though a preliminary checking edition apparently was half in type.¹⁵⁸ These delays occasioned some frustration on the part of at least one librarian; William Warner Bishop complained, “Can we stir up Andrews on the Union List? I suppose he has had so much trouble that I do not wonder he has not made much headway. But will he get going? He is getting old, and can not do as much as he could twenty years ago.”¹⁵⁹ Andrews was in fact still trying to negotiate revised terms with Wilson, but was “very doubtful as to the possibility of our getting it done within the means of the institutions interested.” By 1921 activity seems to have come to a total standstill; apparently the immediate reason for the cessation of work was Andrews’s need to plan for a new building for the John Crerar Library.¹⁶⁰

During these years the Eastern College Librarians’ Conference Committee was also at work planning cooperative efforts, including general and subject-specific union lists. Help was sought for this project from the Institute of International Education, which agreed to be responsible for printing and distributing the list if the library community would be responsible for its compilation. Help was also sought in 1919 from the ALA Enlarged Program. The Joint Committee on the Enlarged Program recommended funding for union list projects to the ALA Executive Board at the midwinter meeting of 1919/20, but support for the Enlarged Program was by then faltering among the ALA membership. The Eastern College Librarians’ Conference Committee was thus not able to find funding from ALA or from any other source, and the project was abandoned.¹⁶¹

Other projects abounded. Andrews’s 1917 report mentions two, along with the North Central project: a list of mathematical periodicals sponsored by the American Mathematical Society and a bibliography of American periodicals, proposed by William Abbatt of New York, which would include the holdings of sixty-five libraries. Also, the National Research Council was contemplating a national union list of scientific serials. Many local lists were also underway, including projects in Philadelphia, Baltimore, Providence, and Boston; the Boston list is noteworthy because it served as an impediment to the participation of the Boston and Cambridge libraries in the *Union List of Serials*. At ALA’s 1919 Asbury Park conference, the Agricultural Libraries Section formed a committee to explore a union list of agricultural periodicals. Wilson and Andrews promised this project the use of any slugs for agricultural periodicals in the North Central list.¹⁶²

As Lydenberg was to state in his preface to the *Union List of Serials* (reflecting Wilson’s earlier wording in his 1921 circular letter promoting the *List*), “It

was obvious to everyone that a single national list would be infinitely more useful than numerous lists covering smaller regions."¹⁶³ An initiative for a national union list by the Board of Research of the University of California confirmed both the need for such a list and the continuing problems at LC. A circular was sent out in August of 1922 to various institutions, the Library of Congress among them. H. H. B. Meyer, chief bibliographer of the library, replied that the library did not have the staff for the project, and noted, "We are convinced here, after long and careful study of the problem, that a complete list is not a 'workable proposition.'" A National Catalog of Serials on cards, on the order of the National Union Catalog, was seen as more feasible, though Meyer stressed that the condition of the staff allowed little if anything to be done.¹⁶⁴ At this point Wilson was set to take the initiative.

Wilson's 1921 Initiative and the Organization of a Plan

So it was that a project that college librarians had talked about since the 1890s, and for which a two-person ALA committee had been in place since 1913, came to fruition in the 1920s, in the years after the war. Wilson's initiative of December 1921 has been alluded to earlier; his letter noting that "a national union list of serials would be much more useful than a shelf full of local lists" was sent to forty libraries, along with a sample checklist of several pages of periodical titles and the request that the libraries check the list for purposes of a demonstration.¹⁶⁵ This initiative resulted in the ALA Executive Board, at the request of the established Union List committee, dissolving the older committee and appointing a new and larger one. The new committee included both members of the previous committee, Andrews and Bostwick, in addition to James Thayer Gerould, librarian of Princeton University; Willard Austen, librarian of Cornell University and a member of the Eastern College Librarians' Conference Committee; and Harry M. Lydenberg, chief reference librarian of the New York Public Library. Clearly it was Wilson's involvement, and his willingness to publish the *List* without profit if protected by the library community from a loss, that provided the structure needed to effect a solution to the problems Andrews had been struggling with for a decade.¹⁶⁶

The seriousness with which this project was now being undertaken can be gauged by the composition of the new committee. All except Lydenberg were directors of large and important libraries, and Lydenberg headed what is now known as the Research Libraries unit of New York Public, a unit larger than many university libraries of the time. All, except possibly Austen, can be considered among the principal leaders of the profession of their era. Bostwick and Andrews had served as ALA president, and Lydenberg would

do so only a few years after the publication of the *Union List of Serials*. Gerould was to be instrumental in organizing the ARL. All except Bostwick had chaired the College and Reference Section. The committee also represented to a considerable extent the variety of libraries interested in such a project, from academic to large public libraries, though it understated the predominant role librarians from universities had had in promoting the notion of a national union list, and were to have in supporting it.

It was a committee that would have the authority to represent the library community in working with the Wilson Company. Lydenberg was chosen chairman of the new committee, at least partially because his position in New York made it easy for him to work with Wilson, and Lydenberg's role cannot be overstated. He was a man of tremendous energy, tact, ability, and scholarship, who is commonly given the primary credit for building the remarkable collection of the New York Public Library. Keyes Metcalf noted of him that "in his sixty years of active library service from 1890 to 1950, he was, all things considered, our greatest librarian."¹⁶⁷

The immediate problem was developing a strategy for funding the project. Wilson estimated that the project would take two to three years to complete and that the work would cost about \$1,000 per month.¹⁶⁸ Lydenberg, working with Wilson in the early months of 1922, submitted to the committee a financing proposal that envisioned a series of subscriptions—thirty-six subscriptions, at \$1,000 each.¹⁶⁹ Wilson had noted that the forty libraries asked to check the sample pages, generally the large research libraries, were probably the libraries principally interested in the *List*, though other libraries with strong collections in special subjects might be asked to contribute their holdings. (This last suggestion was likely drawn from a letter written by William Warner Bishop in response to the sample checking edition.)¹⁷⁰ The implication seems clear that the *List* was designed primarily as a tool for the large libraries: if they wanted such a tool, they would need to finance it themselves. Lydenberg at this point thought it "no difficult task" to secure the necessary subscriptions.¹⁷¹

The members of the committee, however, were by and large less sanguine. Austen thought that the publication should be offered on a subscription basis to as broad a group of libraries as the *United States Catalog* or the *Readers' Guide*. Echoing the language that larger libraries had applied in general to Wilson's pricing structure, he replied to Lydenberg that "the tax on thirty-six libraries for three years without any tangible returns is likely to meet with opposition. I cannot believe that the number of libraries wanting this list would be limited to thirty-six."¹⁷² And Bostwick noted:

The matter immediately before us is the raising of money, which despite what you say in the letter, it seems to me will be a very difficult task indeed. I can well understand that Mr. Wilson does not feel like putting up \$36,000. I think very few libraries will feel like advancing money. I am sure ours would not. Instead of trying to get a thousand dollars each from 36 libraries, I think the best plan would be to fix a sum for subscription and get as many advance subscriptions as possible. Even in this way I doubt whether many libraries would want to pay in advance.

In getting up a work of this kind, some capital seems to me absolutely necessary. Either Mr. Wilson must furnish it or we must get it somewhere else.¹⁷³

Lydenberg proposed that the matter be discussed at the meeting of the American Library Institute in Atlantic City in late April 1922, attended by all the committee except Bostwick.¹⁷⁴ Subsequent to this meeting Lydenberg submitted to the committee a draft of a letter to potential subscribers, containing a plan he obviously felt represented the consensus achieved at Atlantic City. The new proposal attempted to make the subscription look more like a periodical subscription in order to circumvent the objection to payment in advance, an idea initially put forward by Wilson. In this new plan, monthly checklists and quarterly sections of a provisional edition would be issued as subscribers sent in their thirty dollars a month.¹⁷⁵ A checking edition issued in parts had long been planned as a way of facilitating libraries in locating periodical holdings in their catalogs, since many (and perhaps most) libraries at this time did not have adequate serials records. The provisional edition would list additional titles that libraries would submit as they worked with the checking edition. These additional titles would be marked with a special symbol so that they could be identified and checked by other libraries to report their holdings. In addition, and more optimistically, the provisional edition would permit libraries to exchange sets before the final edition was printed, so that fragmentary sets could be combined into more complete sets through exchanges. The provisional edition was strongly supported by Wilson, who noted that a union list he had published for libraries in Urbana, Illinois, had quickly become dated because of the exchanges and consolidation of sets it occasioned.¹⁷⁶ Whether such an exchange could take place on a larger scale was a very real question.

However, not all parties seem to have heard the same thing in Atlantic City. Andrews wrote emphatically that this was not what he thought had been decided, and raised several points. What was to be done with the rest of the edition, he asked—surely more than thirty-six copies would be wanted? Could subscribers be credited for sales to other libraries, and

should they be debited if they wanted extra copies? Could the committee seek more subscriptions at a cheaper rate, as had been suggested earlier?¹⁷⁷ And Bostwick noted in reaction to this proposal:

In my opinion it will be very difficult to get this amount from 36 libraries and simply calling it a subscription will not help matters. I think that the subscriptions to the list should not be limited to the libraries that agree to check it over and that an offer should be made to see whether the list cannot be issued at a very much lower price in this way. I am sure that our Library would not subscribe at \$360 a year.¹⁷⁸

So the committee considered the matter again at the ALA conference in Detroit that June, and yet again tried to reach a consensus. The number of potential subscribers was increased to forty, and the amount of each subscription reduced to \$900, paid in three yearly installments of \$300 each. It was anticipated, however, that advance sales of copies would reduce the amount of the subscription, and an early draft of the letter to subscribers even suggested that the third year's subscription would likely not be needed. Each subscriber would receive the number of copies of the *List* that their final payment would purchase at the sales price, which the letter suggested might be \$25, a price that proved to be much too low. Those copies that subscribers did not need could be sold by the Wilson Company, who would credit their accounts.¹⁷⁹ In early December of 1922 packets of materials were ready to be sent out to potential subscribers. Each contained the letter drafted by the committee explaining the subscription plan; a one-page printed "Plan for the National Union List of Serials," drawn from Wilson's earlier document "Suggestions for National Union List Serials" and explaining the scope, form of entry, style, and method of compilation; the sample pages drawn from those prepared by Wilson for the ALA midwinter meeting the previous year, now with the holdings of the checking libraries displayed; and a form for the library to sign and send in to become a subscriber.¹⁸⁰

The committee, however, was less than entirely confident about this plan. Austen wrote that "the proposed plan has my approval altho I still fear that the charge will be prohibitive for some libraries to undertake."¹⁸¹ Lydenberg, however, demonstrated a degree of faith in the plan that he would need to get the project through the coming months and years, writing to Bostwick:

There are times that I agree with you in feeling that it will be hard to get forty libraries to subscribe \$900. and then again the skies brighten and I feel that \$300. a year is a very small amount to pay for results so important and so helpful. It certainly is an amount that will be saved over and over again by any library pretending to do research work

and enjoying the use of such a list as we hope to provide for this sum. This service will be received with gratitude both by the staff and by the public. It will be helpful to the staff in deciding as to the acquisition of new titles. It will help in the cataloging of sets already on hand and it will tell the student and investigator where he can locate the nearest file for his consultation.¹⁸²

During the year-long exchange over the development of a plan, several important issues were raised sporadically, but the initial decisions apparently were never seriously challenged. Most notable is the financing of the project through the more democratic means of a larger number of small subscriptions, as suggested by Andrews, Austen, and Bostwick. The proposed North Central list had after all been financed in this way. Wilson's initial prospectus suggested that a group of libraries in a state or region might purchase a single subscription, and this was in fact permitted, but the norm clearly was full subscriptions by large libraries. No extant document clearly states the reasons why a plan more reliant on small subscriptions was opposed; Lydenberg's tendency in defending the arrangement was a rather bland deferral to the financial needs of the Wilson Company:

To provide \$36,000 by sales at \$50.00 a copy will call for the sale of 720 copies. It is a question whether 720 copies could be sold within three years, granted that the Wilson Company was willing to advance the entire cost of the enterprise and to wait for return of its money by means of sales. If the Wilson Company had to advance this money, a larger sum would be required, for it is obviously only fair to re-imburse the Company for the use of this money either supplied from its own capital or provided as a loan through its bank.¹⁸³

On the other hand, a memorandum written by Wilson in the late 1930s states that "the Wilson Company would have much preferred to distribute the financial load on a fair basis between the small and large libraries, but a majority of the Committee favored the plan of barring the small libraries from sharing in the use of the publication and in its financial support, with the result, of course, that the large libraries had a very heavy load to carry."¹⁸⁴ Yet other evidence points to a more complex disagreement. During the year-long subscription campaign Austen would write that he "had a feeling that the subscription was pretty large for most libraries and was in hopes that Wilson could put it on the other basis," and noted that he had urged Wilson to put the subscription "on the same basis as accumulated volumes of the Readers guide [*sic*], and other index volumes, that would enable many libraries to subscribe at a nominal cost."¹⁸⁵

The available evidence points to the committee's need to find a solution that would assure in advance that Wilson would be protected financially,

and a limited number of advance subscriptions would certainly be the easiest solution to the problem. To administer a great many small subscriptions would have involved some expense, and the result would have been a much larger group of subscribers for the committee to represent, all of whose holdings would probably have to be fully represented in the final list. But perhaps a more compelling reason was that the project would be most beneficial to larger libraries, and it was they whose full cooperation was needed and whose interests were most involved, much as it was those libraries whose needs had to be met in order to create a national code for interlibrary loans. Wilson had written to those potential subscribers that a single national list would no doubt be more useful to them than a shelf full of local lists—but useful for whom? Only useful to those who could acquire the material through interlibrary loan or photostatic copy, or travel to a distant collection. Useful, in fact, primarily to a rather small number of library users concentrated in a relatively small number of universities and, perhaps, useful to certain special libraries, to industrial and governmental clients of urban public libraries and to an occasional independent researcher. Of course the ultimate nature of the negotiations between Wilson and the committee must remain to an extent speculative. But, although additional libraries ultimately did contribute holdings, the impression seems to have been created that this was a list for forty libraries; George Alan Works's description of the still-unfinished project in his *College and University Library Problems* portrayed it simply as a listing of the holdings of the forty guarantor libraries.¹⁸⁶ The *Union List of Serials* in fact did not obviate the need for local lists and special lists that could record the holdings of smaller libraries more fully; the few years after its publication saw special lists published for New York City, Dallas, San Francisco, and Southern California.¹⁸⁷

It is, of course, not surprising that the issue of a broader base of support and broader representation kept resurfacing. ALA's dominance by public library interests, coupled with the broad diffusion of public libraries and the strongly democratic character of American culture, would suggest a strategy to maximize the utility of the proposed tool. John Higham, in his interesting essay "The Matrix of Specialization," calls attention to the role of reference works in bridging the gap between the increasingly specialized needs of researchers and a democratic culture:

The crucial challenge to the American system . . . was to coordinate specialized knowledge and to give outstanding scholars and ideas wide hearing. The challenge was met with a new panoply of reference tools. Instead of vesting leadership in an academy, Americans called on the neutral services of bibliographers and librarians.

Certain types of reference works were done better in Europe than in the United States. The great nineteenth-century encyclopedias were European. Americans also lagged far behind the French and Germans in the production of comprehensive guides to a single specialized field, like the *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte*. . . . Works of this kind, surveying a large subject and evaluating the leading materials for it, expressed the stability and concentration of intellectual authority that existed in a European research institute. By contrast, Americans excelled in producing open-ended reference works designed to acquaint a miscellaneous variety of users with what was current outside their own specialties. The notable American achievements in the organization of knowledge were indexes, catalogs, and directories.¹⁸⁸

While a union list only indirectly “acquaint[s] . . . users with what was current outside their own specialties,” what better way to express the ideal of a broad diffusion of knowledge than a widely available list of the research periodicals held by all libraries of importance in the land? Lydenberg himself was perhaps too generous in claiming this, in a letter trying to persuade the Los Angeles Public Library to subscribe, when he noted that “your library would undoubtedly have the privilege of borrowing a bound volume of periodicals from any of the subscribing libraries with the exception of some libraries with legal restrictions, such as the New York Public Library.”¹⁸⁹ Given the state of interlibrary loan practices at the time, this seems a rash promise to make. Evidently the library agreed, since Los Angeles Public did not participate in this project, though it found the time to participate in a union list for Southern California completed in 1925. Smaller libraries (and special libraries) were doubtless more interested in the holdings of those libraries they customarily dealt with, rather than the large, remote libraries that could not always be counted on to lend the needed material. Yet the *List* certainly made loans and applications for Photostat easier, if only by disclosing the location of files of periodicals, especially those outside of the most restrictive libraries such as Harvard or LC. There is certainly evidence that it did in fact promote access to such files. A 1926 article by Josephine Hollingsworth in *Special Libraries* surveyed the union list activities of the time and optimistically concluded, “Now it is beginning to look as if the entire periodical resources of the country may be mobilized for the benefit of the student and industrial investigator.”¹⁹⁰ Despite significant limitations and a narrow base of subscribers, it was the beginning of a broader diffusion of periodical resources.

Initial Considerations of Scope

The pressure to create what Higham calls an “open-ended reference work,” along with the broad needs of the subscribing libraries, may help explain

the defeat of several attempts to limit the scope of the *List* in order to decrease the cost. A letter by William Warner Bishop, for example, written to Wilson and distributed to the committee members, advocated a policy of “severe compression”—a published list of perhaps the 10,000 to 12,000 most significant titles (instead of the 40,000 then contemplated), with a depository union list in card format at the Library of Congress for less common titles, a proposal committee members found extreme.¹⁹¹ Other suggestions were received to limit the *List* to scientific serials, or to carefully limit it to research periodicals. The NRC continued to support the idea of a scientific list, arguing that a separate scientific list would sell enough copies to industrial research laboratories and similar agencies to finance a list of non-scientific titles.¹⁹² A contrasting suggestion came from Baltimore’s Enoch Pratt Library, which wanted the *List* limited to English language titles, a proposition obviously unacceptable to research libraries in an era when much of scientific publishing was not in English.¹⁹³ In fact, in the end, a special checking edition of titles in non-Roman alphabets was even produced, and consideration was given to listing these titles unromanized in separate alphabets, though the New York State Library protested that “the English alphabet is enough for us.”¹⁹⁴

Lydenberg, however, pushed for as inclusive a list as possible, excluding such obviously problematic items as newspapers and administrative serials of governmental agencies, though with the exact limits of inclusion to be decided once the subscriptions were assured. The production of a list of purely scientific titles, as suggested by the NRC and as seen in most of the foreign union lists of the period, had perhaps the strongest rationale. In addition to the greater use of serials (as opposed to monographs) by scientists, it is easiest to make a claim of social usefulness for research in the pure sciences. But it may have been difficult for ALA, with its broadly democratic public library philosophy, to produce a list so explicitly for the use of specialists. Whatever the actual limitations in access to (or interest in) serial files recorded in the *Union List of Serials* for most library users, the notion of promoting broad access to a wide range of literature was still important. Scientific serials were of course those least likely to be intellectually accessible to general library patrons. Furthermore, many of the librarians most likely to be interested in a narrowly focused list—the special librarians—had left ALA and felt a substantial degree of dissatisfaction with that organization. Even so, Hollingsworth’s *Special Libraries* article, noted above, boasted that “the forthcoming union list for the United States and Canada is the first important national list to include general periodicals.”¹⁹⁵ The broad-based curricula of the American university, including many practical subjects not readily found in European universities,

and the tendency of American research libraries to define broadly what might be considered publications of research value also argued toward broad inclusion.¹⁹⁶

It is also difficult to imagine Lydenberg, who was to serve as president of the Bibliographic Society of America and secretary-treasurer of the American Council of Learned Societies, promoting a list limited to strictly scientific titles. Not that he was unwilling to exploit the peculiar dependence of scientific scholars on serial literature when enlisting the support of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) in the subscription campaign or the NRC for grants to assist larger libraries with the rigors of checking the *List*, but he always did so in such a way as to protect the general nature of the *List*. While seeking AAAS support he still argued for inclusiveness: "I . . . trust your Association will recognize the catholicity of science and not insist on limiting its interest and participation to a strictly technical definition of science as it is conceived to-day."¹⁹⁷ And, in a remarkable letter written earlier to a zoologist connected with the AAAS who wanted the *List* strictly limited to research periodicals, Lydenberg's arguments reflected a desire for an "open-ended reference work," as well as the broad collecting interests of American libraries:

Indeed, it is the object of the committee in charge of the project to see that the ephemeral is discarded. Unfortunately, however, though we are all willing to subscribe to the abstract statement, we get into difficulties the minute we attempt to go from abstract to concrete. Everybody, of course, is willing to include the "American Journal of Science," for instance, and nobody wants to include "Snappy Stories." Where we get into trouble is when we decide to include, or exclude, such a thing as "Harper's Monthly," or the "Saturday Evening Post." . . . The obvious statement as to the "Saturday Evening Post" is "Away with it." If, however, you had stood at the delivery desk in a large public research library such as ours, you would appreciate quickly how great a demand there is for back volumes of the "Post" and in many cases how important are the uses the back volumes of this periodical serve. A distinguished professor from a university not a thousand miles from this city made a special trip to New York to consult a file of the "Saturday Evening Post" because it was not kept by the library of his own university and because a particular article in it was needed in a particular bit of research on which he was engaged.

At the mid-winter meeting of the American Library Association at Chicago this question of inclusion and exclusion was considered at great length. A strong plea was urged for the papers issued by labor unions. The reply was that they were printed on such poor stock their complete disintegration was almost certain before the ink would be dry on the pages of the Union List. All this brought forth the comment that, granting such a fate, the necessity for their inclusion was all the

greater; they would have a scarcity value and would be sought after by students of social problems.¹⁹⁸

Lydenberg's early confidence that a full and broad range of periodicals could be included, and his desire to delay certain hard decisions, was certainly a pragmatic decision and perhaps helped to prevent the campaign for subscriptions from being sidetracked by these many issues. As Lydenberg noted, "In all discussions of the matter so far I have tried to keep away from the questions of detail, feeling that they could easily be settled if the thing got on its feet and if the child never was born we need waste no time in discussing what color its hair ought to be."¹⁹⁹ On the other hand, the delay in confronting these issues would come back to haunt the committee, as the project in fact ran over budget from the pressures to include many materials and from the unreliability of the initial estimates, necessitating a fourth annual installment on the subscription, and as disputes on what to include and exclude occupied the committee's time. But untidy as the process was, the committee had at last a workable solution to the problem of cooperation.

The Campaign for Subscriptions

The year 1923 was a propitious one to undertake such a project, as university library budgets tended to rise (not that they ever satisfied the demand for resources) and postwar inflation moderated. However, with periodical prices increasing, and with increased competition for the limited number of back files that were needed by the many libraries seeking to support new and augmented graduate programs, libraries were becoming increasingly aware of the difficulty of obtaining the resources needed by their researchers for their local collections. The effects of the war caused the supply of back files to be even more limited than it otherwise might have been. American libraries at the time may have been, in the words of Norwegian librarian Wilhelm Munthe, the "playboys of the European book market," but the University of Washington, seeking to acquire a number of sets essential to its work, complained that "it has been impossible during the past six years to spend even the modest amount of money available" because many of the sets simply could not be found.²⁰⁰

Nonetheless, it was to take the better part of a year to secure the necessary subscribers for the *Union List*. An examination of Lydenberg's office files at the New York Public Library reveals a prodigious amount of letter writing in the attempt to drum up subscriptions. Lydenberg's letters generally explained the plan; enumerated the advantages and the many uses for the *List*, including assisting with cataloging, interlibrary loan, and completion

of sets through exchange; and then ended with a strong appeal to the library's sense of duty toward the advancement of librarianship. "We are not here suggesting a thing of mere bibliographical or antiquarian interest," he noted at one point. "What we are trying to do is to provide a fundamental source of information for everyone interested in American scholarship and productive research."²⁰¹ Lydenberg's letters, here as always, were sprightly and full of humor; still, the campaign was slow-going. By late February 1923, Lydenberg could report to the committee only seventeen subscriptions and inquired of the committee members whether the project should be abandoned or the committee chair changed. The members, fortunately, thought neither should be done. The committee's annual report, written in late February, reflected this pessimism, even though the bitterness of Lydenberg's original draft was modified at Bostwick's suggestion.²⁰²

At the April 1923 Hot Springs ALA annual conference, the number of subscriptions jumped from nineteen to twenty-five, passing the halfway mark, and Lydenberg was modestly encouraged.²⁰³ As time went on, Lydenberg began increasingly to underplay the possibility of reimbursement of subscription costs through sales:

It would be unfair to stress too much the possibility of financial return from disposal through the Wilson Company of copies not needed by subscribers. Mr. Wilson has been very frank and very obliging in this connection. Neither I nor any of us has any idea as to how much this would amount to in the case of any subscriber. We have no data on which to base an opinion, and any opinion any of us has is solely a guess. I should certainly not want to induce anybody to come into the scheme by holding out hopes for which we could not assure realization.²⁰⁴

Gerould, however, spoke more freely even of the possibility of not calling for a final year's subscription, due to the sale of individual copies.²⁰⁵

Gerould did write a great many appeals for the committee, though the other committee members, joined by William Warner Bishop, seem to have limited their appeals to local libraries.²⁰⁶ In June Lydenberg persuaded Burton Livingston, the permanent secretary of the AAAS, to write the libraries of sixty-three member institutions that were not yet supporting the project.²⁰⁷ It is difficult to say precisely how much effect any one of these appeals had, but the strong impression is that credit for the eventual success of the subscription campaign belongs to Lydenberg's persistence and influence. Lydenberg wrote letter after letter, to any library of note, to attempt to obtain a subscription. Appeals to local pride became increasingly evident; to the Indianapolis Public Library, he wrote "you surely do not mean to tell me that when states like Texas, North Carolina, Missouri and

Nebraska are represented as supporters of such an enterprise, Indiana is going to lag behind. . . . If you want any further information, I'll be glad to pour it in till you cry quits."²⁰⁸ Even the special library community was not entirely ignored; a letter to W. J. Karslake of the National Aniline Chemical Company of Buffalo asked whether Karslake knew "of any special libraries connected with the great engineering, chemical, or industrial concerns of this country from whom we could count on help in completing the list of subscriptions."²⁰⁹

The most obvious difficulty, particularly for smaller libraries, was the \$900 price tag. "Before we could contribute the amount called for, we should have many times the amount we now get for the support of this library," lamented the University of Georgia, and this tale can be found often in Lydenberg's office files.²¹⁰ Another obstacle to subscribing, particularly for larger libraries, was the enormous task of checking the lists. J. C. M. Hanson of the University of Chicago noted:

The Serial Record, here, contains about sixty thousand cards, and you know what it means to go over a collection as extensive [*sic*] as that, and growing day by day. . . .

I suppose that, in the long run, coöperation of this kind is worth while, but when you are in the midst of a difficult re-organization and called on to complete it inside of three years, with a force badly shot to pieces by resignations, and with salaries not sufficient to secure Library School Graduates, one feels a little reluctant to tackle a job as extensive as the one which your Committee has in mind.²¹¹

In many cases, in an era when faculty controlled most collection decisions in university libraries, librarians could not directly commit such funds on their own. Bowdoin College noted that the college Governing Board would need to make a special appropriation for the necessary funds, and even at The Johns Hopkins University the Board of Trustees was required to approve the expense. The Library Budget Committee at the University of North Carolina appointed a subcommittee to consider the matter, though other library directors seem to have had an easier time. Olive Jones of the Ohio State University had "no doubt" that her recommendation for a subscription would be approved by her board, as indeed it was. Even in non-academic libraries the situation often prevailed; J. I. Wyer of the New York State Library noted the need for presenting the project to the Board of Regents as an "educational, rather than a bibliographic, service," and a subscription from the Grand Rapids Public Library was apparently stymied by the opposition of the Book Committee.²¹² However, active cases of opposition by library committees seem few, at least in those larger libraries most likely and able to subscribe. The experience of the University of

Kansas, one of the AAU institutions not among the guarantors, may be typical. One barrier there was the failure to obtain special funding from the university Committee on Research to supplement library funds for the subscription, but more pressing seems to have been the chaotic nature of the library's record of its serial holdings, the lack of staffing, and the pressure of moving to a new building.²¹³

It is noteworthy, and was certainly problematic in terms of promoting the project, that many of the earlier subscribers were comparatively small institutions. The first fourteen subscribers included Oberlin and Dartmouth Colleges, the University of Washington, and the public libraries of Cleveland, Detroit, and St. Louis. Yale, Columbia, and the University of Illinois did not subscribe until the Hot Springs conference, and the University of Chicago subscribed still later. The University of California agreed to participate only if the *List* included eight specific libraries, whose holdings that university, with its location remote from other centers of learning, considered essential to its needs. Even when forty subscriptions were at last entered by July 1923, four of the libraries on the University of California's list were not enrolled: the Library of Congress, the Department of Agriculture Library, the Surgeon General's Library, and Harvard University. Lydenberg noted that without the Washington, D.C., libraries the *List* would be "a failure," and the importance of Harvard was scarcely less.²¹⁴

Group Subscriptions

The committee needed to address both the magnitude of the cost to smaller libraries and the magnitude of the checking effort in certain larger libraries. The committee's answer to the first problem was to promote group subscriptions, a solution anticipated by Wilson's suggestion that subscriptions be accepted by libraries in a region. Group subscriptions were sought in areas where several libraries, each too small to afford a full subscription, might jointly purchase a single subscription, in an arrangement anticipating the consortia of today. The most elaborate group consisted of six libraries in the Amherst region: Amherst, Smith, Mt. Holyoke, Massachusetts Agricultural College, the Jones Library in Amherst, and the Forbes Library in Northampton. At least two other groups were counted among the initial forty subscribers: a Providence group of Brown University, the State Library, and the Public Library; and an Iowa group of the State University of Iowa in Iowa City and the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts in Ames. Several other groups promoted by the committee were added after the forty subscriptions needed to ensure the project were enrolled: groups in Rochester, New

York; the Pacific Northwest; and a Canadian group of the Toronto Public Library, the University of Toronto, the University of Western Ontario, and Queen's University. This last subscription made the *List* international in scope and prompted a change in title from the *National Union List of Serials (NULS)* to the *Union List of Serials in Libraries in the United States and Canada (ULS)*, along with the addition of Nathan van Patten, librarian at Queen's University, to the ALA Committee.²¹⁵ (Van Patten, however, within a year moved to Stanford University, though he remained on the committee.) More problematic were attempts to extend representation in the Southeast, represented among the guarantors only by the University of North Carolina. Lloyd W. Josselyn, director of the Birmingham Public Library, apparently indicated interest in forming a group, but Wilson noted "it would be necessary to give him the whole list of southern states in order to give him enough backing."²¹⁶ For one library, a group subscription was less attractive; the Connecticut State Library, invited to form a group of Hartford libraries, decided to shoulder the full burden of a subscription itself, noting that "small committees work best, and the best committee as a rule is the Committee of One."²¹⁷

Individual partial subscriptions were not generally encouraged at this point; later, once work had begun and the guarantees secured, individual, single-copy subscriptions were solicited, but these subscribers were not considered guarantors, and there was no assurance that their holdings would be comprehensively recorded. For one thing, the committee was reluctant to consider any step that could be construed as "service basis" pricing for this publication, reflecting the concerns of the large libraries that were the primary supporters of the *List*.²¹⁸ However, some flexibility was shown, especially for libraries initially approached as part of a group, in instances where that group failed to successfully materialize. A list of subscribers compiled in 1925, for example, did show several partial subscriptions for upstate New York. The Grosvenor Library seems to have been approached for a joint subscription with the Buffalo Public Library, and is on earlier lists as a full subscriber, but when the latter institution did not come through the Grosvenor was allowed a half subscription. Partial subscriptions for Vassar College, Syracuse University, and Hamilton College may also have been part of an additional upstate New York group promoted by Wilson and Donald Gilchrist of the University of Rochester that did not entirely materialize. By late 1925, as the need for funds became more pressing, a \$150 subscription was allowed to the University of Maine, which had much earlier wanted a subscription in cooperation with other Maine libraries, and Lydenberg was soliciting Adelbert College in Cleveland for an independent \$300 or \$600 subscription.²¹⁹ Group subscriptions and their variants were one way of

attempting to extend representation and produce a more generally democratic and inclusive list, while retaining a structure that made essential the participation of the large research libraries most critical to the success of the project.

The Library of Congress, Harvard, and the Commencement of Work

A more intractable problem was presented by the few larger libraries that felt that they were unable to check their holdings for the *List*. Lydenberg recognized that LC and the other Washington, D.C., libraries were “so shot to pieces by wartime conditions it is impossible to expect any of them to take on a single piece of additional work.” But at the conclusion of the subscription campaign Harvard also was not yet participating in the project, and Yale, though subscribing, felt unsure of its ability to check the lists. Lydenberg considered approaching the National Research Council for funds to assist the Washington libraries at least. However, no formal appeal seems to have been made, possibly because the council was already deeply involved in beginning *Biological Abstracts* to the exclusion of other bibliographic projects.²²⁰

The Carnegie Corporation and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial were finally settled upon as foundations the committee could solicit for support of the work of checking at the Washington libraries, Harvard, and possibly Yale. Lydenberg approached Beardsley Ruml, director of the Rockefeller Memorial, who indicated that the memorial would probably be favorably disposed to help with the Washington libraries, but thought that Harvard and Yale had alumni and should look after themselves. Lydenberg, though, still had hopes for help for Harvard and Yale from the Carnegie Corporation, since Gerould had made contact with his friend Frederick Keppel, who had recently become president of the corporation, and was optimistic that Keppel was favorably disposed toward the appeal. Formal letters requesting assistance from the two foundations were drafted and sent to Judson T. Jennings, president of the American Library Association, for his signature. Jennings sent the request on to the Rockefeller Memorial, but refused to send the letter to Keppel, because ALA had at that time a major request for a permanent endowment before the corporation. Jennings also was concerned that the request might be viewed as part of a “Census of Material Available for Research in the Large Libraries,” a project that was among the statement of needs then before the corporation. That project had been proposed by the ALA Committee on Resources, chaired by Gerould. Gerould appealed at least twice to Jennings, who sought the assurance of Sarah Bogle, the ALA assistant secretary who was dealing

extensively with Carnegie Corporation relations, that he was on solid ground, and wrote Lydenberg for assistance. As Lydenberg was out of town, the letter came to Edwin Anderson, director of the New York Public Library, who urged Jennings to “call Gerould off.” Gerould finally did rest his case, but he touched a raw nerve in the ALA establishment—Jennings called his proposed appeal in “bad taste,” Bogle “undignified,” and Anderson “tactless.”²²¹ The experience illustrates the tensions between the broader ALA agenda and that of the research library community. Lydenberg at a later point would complain that “certainly [ALA Secretary Karl H.] Milam’s enthusiasm for the Union List has never been oppressive,” and that “there are very few members of the Executive Board interested in such unpopular things as union lists.”²²²

With foundation support for Harvard’s participation unlikely, Lydenberg appealed to Andrew Keogh, librarian of Yale University, to approach Archibald Cary Coolidge, director of the University Library for Harvard, regarding joint action toward raising funds by their own efforts. Neither Keogh nor Lydenberg, however, managed to persuade Harvard at this point. Keogh did agree to participate in the checking for the *List*, hoping to be able to raise money to help in the effort, but determined to check in any case.²²³ Lydenberg also approached George Parker Winship, assistant librarian of Harvard College, to ask him to take the case to Coolidge.²²⁴ The mission failed, and in an apologetic letter signed “sorrowfully yours,” Coolidge reiterated the complexity of the task at Harvard:

. . . as for serials that are no longer in active existence, we have no lists or beginnings of lists or any way of getting at such things except by actually going through the shelf lists of almost every collection in the library. . . . You do not need to be told that we must have thousands of serial publications in a hundred different languages, a large number of them more or less incomplete, and whose exact condition could only be determined by looking at the individual card for each. . . . Now we haven’t any money for that sort of thing. I am carrying on the difficult fight of meeting increased demands with no increase in appropriations. If I were presented with some thousand dollars for cataloguing expenses, I should feel that catching up with our own back work was a more pressing duty than taking part in any joint list and I do not know where to turn for assistance. The result is I am helpless.²²⁵

Lydenberg confessed to being a “flat failure,” noting that “we have been able to convince the librarians of practically every other library of any importance in the country that the national Union List is worth doing and will pay for itself over and over again when once the work of compilation is finished, but I cannot sell it to Coolidge. . . . I thought I had Winship, but then that was easy because he had no responsibility in the matter.”²²⁶

With forty-one subscriptions now firmly promised, and several additional group subscriptions being promoted, the question was whether to begin work without the participation of Harvard and LC and the other Washington libraries. However, help from the Rockefeller Memorial for the Washington libraries seemed a virtual certainty, and in fact would be forthcoming. Gerould, who was acting chair during Lydenberg's absence on a major European book-buying expedition, sent out a memorandum on October 14 to the subscribers asking if there were any objections to going ahead. Having heard none by the deadline of November 15 (though the University of Minnesota was reported weakening), plans proceeded. An announcement to this effect was placed in the *Library Journal*, which also invited those smaller libraries unable to undertake full subscriptions to subscribe to single copies. These were now priced at \$50 each, reflecting Wilson's concern that the earlier \$25 price would result in too many unwanted copies from the guarantor libraries to be disposed of.²²⁷

The next order of business was hiring an editor. Winifred Gregory was at the time employed in the Technology Department of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, but was known to Gerould from her work at the University of Minnesota School of Mines Library between 1911 and 1916, during Gerould's tenure as librarian at that university, so that Gerould was able to recommend Gregory to Wilson.²²⁸ She had also authored two substantial bibliographies on civil engineering topics.²²⁹ Though this bibliographic experience may have been fairly modest, and though, other than her five-year stint at a University of Minnesota branch, her library experience had been confined to one hospital and three public libraries, Gregory was to begin a new and notable phase to her career producing major scholarly bibliographic works—not only the first two editions of the *Union List of Serials*, but the *List of Serial Publications of Foreign Governments* (1932); *American Newspapers, 1821–1936* (1937); and *International Congresses and Conferences, 1840–1937* (1938). The complexity of her task should not be underestimated, including incorporating the checking of a variety of libraries (not always done with comparable care); trying to resolve the various discrepancies in holdings and bibliographic information; and determining which of the titles suggested by the participating libraries were in scope, or may even have already been listed under another entry. The quality of her work speaks largely for itself; Howard Rovelstad, at the time that the third and last edition of the *Union List of Serials* was compiled, praised her “superb work” on the earlier editions, and indeed that work was directly incorporated into the third edition.²³⁰ Gregory set up office in the Wilson Company headquarters in the Bronx in January of 1924 and began to compile the first checklist, deriving titles from the various published regional union lists, Bolton's *Catalogue*, the *International*

Catalogue of Scientific Literature, and the *Catalogue of the Periodical Publications in the Library of the Royal Society of London*, among other sources.²³¹ Work on the *Union List of Serials* had begun.

Expanding the Circle of Cooperating Libraries

While the *List* may have been perceived at times as the repository for the holdings of the forty subscribers, interest in broader inclusion is evident at least as early as 1922, when William Warner Bishop wrote to Wilson of the “rare periodicals of importance” that were often to be found in smaller libraries, citing the periodicals on furniture making in the Grand Rapids Public Library.²³² Individual subscriptions were solicited once the project was underwritten, though the individual subscribers were not regarded as guarantor libraries, and the financial arrangements were different. The price for individual copies had been set at \$50 with the option of purchasing a single copy of the provisional edition for \$15. Lydenberg had wanted a price for the provisional edition closer to the cost of manufacture, but Wilson argued that the libraries were buying a service—two years more use of the *Union List*, and an ability to participate in the exchange of holdings—that was being financed by the guarantor libraries.²³³ Guarantors, on the other hand, received two copies of the provisional edition—one to check, and one to use until the final edition was published. One cluster of individual subscribers recruited in Colorado by Malcolm G. Wyer required additional assurances that the Wilson Company was in fact not profiting from the project.²³⁴

In March of 1924, Gerould, still acting as chair, sent a circular to all subscribers, asking them to suggest libraries whose holdings would increase the usefulness of the *List*. It was assumed that subscribing libraries would be most familiar with the resources in the libraries of their area. It was also assumed that these checking libraries would subscribe to one or two copies of the *List*, and thus reduce the burden on the underwriting libraries. The suggestions were numerous, causing Gerould to be concerned that “we are going to be swamped by the number of checking libraries,” and that “the amount of labor involved in handling the lists from smaller institutions is all out of proportion to the advantages to be derived from printing their complete checking.” Gerould strongly urged that the number of checking libraries be limited to one hundred.²³⁵ Wilson, ever the optimist, was strongly in favor of expansion, stating that “we shall have to learn a good deal by experience in getting libraries to check. I think we can manage to find out what libraries have important sets and get the checking. I think that we may get additional checkings as soon as the provisional edition is out if we then find that there are libraries that can strengthen the list regionally and in respect to the rare sets.”²³⁶ By the end of 1924, there were about 190 libraries

checking the lists, and by mid-1927, shortly before publication, the amount advanced by individual subscription sales totaled about 12% of the amount advanced by the guarantors.²³⁷ Still, smaller libraries found all subscription options prohibitive. Lehigh University noted, "Our funds are very limited and the demand is enormous. I regret this because we probably have some sets of periodicals which would be rather scarce in America, and should be represented in the final edition."²³⁸

Certain collections were pursued more aggressively. The Philadelphia Academy of Sciences, with a rich and underutilized collection of scientific periodicals, indicated it could not check the lists, and Lydenberg worked with Asa Don Dickinson, the librarian of the University of Pennsylvania, to suggest a local philanthropist to whom an appeal could be made to underwrite the checking.²³⁹ The New York Academy of Medicine was also regarded as an important possible addition (in this case as a full guarantor), and in the summer of 1924 Lydenberg appealed to the library for its participation, as well as to the Rockefeller Foundation for possible support.²⁴⁰ As noted, the complete record of holdings for the non-guarantor libraries was not automatically included; rare items were, unless judged out-of-scope, but often the committee and editor deemed it sufficient to represent only a single file in a metropolitan area, much to the disappointment of those who wanted the national list entirely to replace local lists. When Frank K. Walter of the University of Minnesota wrote in "vigorous protest" of this policy, noting that "a very large part of the value of this to us would be a record of the possession by neighboring libraries of supplements or duplicates," Lydenberg replied:

The committee wishes to make the list as comprehensive as possible. It has, however, exactly thirty-six thousand dollars (\$36,000) to finish this work. Any reasonable man can see that if we try to print a record of all holdings of all libraries, whether cooperating institutions or research institutions, possessing valuable collections but not rejoicing in funds enough to allow their entering the list of contributors, we should have a work too large to be useful and we should be entering on an enterprise that could not be finished within the limits of the funds in sight.²⁴¹

As the work progressed and it became apparent that expenses were out of control, the committee became increasingly resistant to the participation of additional libraries. In June of 1925 the Kings County Medical Library in Brooklyn, noting that it was probably the "fifth largest Medical Library in the United States," asked to check the lists. Lydenberg felt that the "support received from medical libraries has been so slight that we have not felt justified in adding the expenses that would be incurred by increasing the number of checking libraries," and they were not admitted. Gerould

later reported that Charles Frankenger, the librarian, was “considerably disturbed” at their exclusion and noted that the library had many titles not in other large eastern medical libraries.²⁴²

Early in 1926 Clarence S. Brigham, director of the American Antiquarian Society, wrote asking to check the provisional edition, though noting that it would be a “tremendous task” to prepare a list of their holdings. The problem, however, was financing the inclusion of this additional information; Gregory thought that the order for a single copy would not cover the costs. Lydenberg suggested that the society be allowed to check the first section of the provisional edition as a trial.²⁴³ The society in fact was allowed to check the entire alphabet, and Gregory complained later of the over two hundred unique titles submitted by them for the letters A-I alone, mostly short runs with scattered holdings, and asked Lydenberg if they were “ephemeral” and should be excluded, or if they were “rare” and merited inclusion.²⁴⁴ The eventual decision seems to have been to exclude many of the fragmentary runs, and a note was placed in the introduction to the *Union List* that the Antiquarian Society and several other named libraries were only partially represented due to the many fragmentary runs of highly specialized periodicals. However, all titles were to be listed in a card file at the Library of Congress, available for consultation.²⁴⁵

Of course, whether something is regarded as “ephemeral” or “rare” depends entirely on the needs of the individual researcher, but the editor and the ALA committee were forced into a number of difficult decisions due to the limitations of their funds. The inclusion of the various smaller libraries was a financial drain on the project, but it also made for a more useful list. Andrew D. Osborn, writing in 1957 as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, analyzed several pages of the second edition of the *List* to show that a significant number of serials were uniquely or nearly uniquely reported by a single, less-than-major library.²⁴⁶ Since the second edition had 650 participating libraries as opposed to 225 for the first edition, it is reasonable to assume that many useful titles were omitted simply because the libraries holding them were not represented.

One solution offered was to allow libraries to list holdings that otherwise would not be considered for a fee of five cents a title; Wilson proposed this solution in December of 1925, to counteract the continuing proliferation of local serials lists that the national *Union List* was supposed to supersede, noting that the cost per additional holding would be slightly under five cents. The five cents charge may thus have also been regarded as a modest fund-raising device; Gregory noted of a request to include all

of the holdings of the James Jerome Hill Library under this provision, "I don't like this scheme, but it is true that we need money." It is not clear how many libraries exercised this option, but Lydenberg indicated that the number was not insignificant.²⁴⁷ Wilson was to raise the hope again in 1931, when planning for a supplement to the *Union List*, that funding devices might be found to allow a truly comprehensive national union list to supplant the continuing local efforts.²⁴⁸ Lydenberg's reply was slightly enigmatic, noting that a

. . . national list is in theory advisable. On the other hand I feel that this thesis cannot wisely be extended to the absolute limit. For instance, the preparation of the list of periodicals in special libraries in the vicinity of New York was in my opinion commendable. The kind of material these libraries need is so different from the kind of material reported in the general list that they would have been handicapped if they had been forced to use solely the national list.²⁴⁹

Lydenberg's reply seems on its face to contradict his earlier pursuit of the "rare" periodical in the special library, additions that unquestionably did promote the research value of the *Union List*. Lydenberg in fact made more of an attempt to recruit special libraries than his language here suggests, though only a few were included in the end, partially because of a lack of interest on their part.²⁵⁰ But it would be a mistake to read too much into a reply that was probably intended to pacify a persistent and insistent Wilson. The point is that concerns for efficiency and centralization do not necessarily obviate the need for more specific and focused bibliographic tools. Lydenberg's statement also may be the inevitable rationalization of what is politically, financially, and organizationally possible, despite what contemporary notions of efficiency might have seemed to dictate.

Pursuing Harvard

One library that Lydenberg continued to pursue vigorously, however, was Harvard. Lydenberg's connections with Harvard were not insignificant, as a *magna cum laude* graduate and a member of the visiting committee of the college library. Harvard's concerns stemmed primarily from the vast task of checking such a collection (particularly with no separate serials record, not an uncommon phenomenon at the time), as well as a fear that it would be inundated by interlibrary loan requests. Lydenberg argued against this last point, maintaining that if the *List* were published, many requests formerly sent blindly to Harvard would go elsewhere and Harvard would get requests only for the truly rare items that they alone could supply.²⁵¹ One deterrent for the Boston area libraries was their prior commitment to a union list of currently received periodicals in the Boston area libraries edited by

Thomas Johnston Homer; by the end of 1923, only the State Library had subscribed to the national list, and that fairly late in the process. The Boston list did not contain detailed holdings, but, in Lydenberg's words, "merely a statement that the entry was current and a rough grouping indicated by means of key letters, whereby entries are classed as complete, or practically so, discouragingly incomplete, or something between." Inadequate as it was, the project was tying up the resources of the Boston and Cambridge libraries, and the use by Gregory of the data collected was hindered at first by Homer's view that his work was his private property.²⁵² Also a factor, as soon became evident, was Harvard's sense of self-sufficiency, and a continuing feeling that it was more important to develop its own resources than to participate in cooperative projects.

Another part of Lydenberg's difficulty in dealing with Harvard was the organization of the library. Archibald Cary Coolidge was the director of the University Library, but Coolidge was a scholar and a faculty member, not a librarian. Coolidge's position had been created in 1910 by President A. Lawrence Lowell, displacing William C. Lane, who had the title of college librarian, as the highest-ranking library official at Harvard. The move was prompted by faculty dissatisfaction with Lane, and was widely seen by the library community as the demotion of a professional librarian who had been prominent in the library community, serving as ALA president in 1898–99.²⁵³ Coolidge's position had oversight for both the College Library (which Lane continued to direct) and, much more tenuously, the many departmental libraries, which retained a great deal of autonomy in Harvard's highly decentralized system.

Lydenberg and Gerould had some success in working with Lane early in 1924. Harvard did finally enter a full \$900 subscription in February of that year; although Lane indicated that they were unable to check the initial checking edition, he thought they would probably be able to report the library's holdings when the provisional edition was issued. This meant that, even under the best of circumstances, titles added by Harvard would not be recorded in the provisional edition for other libraries to check. Lane did, however, immediately try to enlist the cooperation of various departmental libraries, though he had no direct authority over them. Several, notably the Law School, the Museum of Comparative Zoology, the Gray Herbarium, and the Peabody Museum, were soon checking. The Harvard Andover Theological Library, however, declined to join; as Lydenberg reported, they declared that they had "all the titles which an intelligent person would expect them to have."²⁵⁴

Lane suggested that an appeal to President Lowell from outside the institution might be more effective than an appeal from himself or Coolidge, noting that they had avoided such an appeal for fear of refusal. Lydenberg acted on Lane's suggestion with a letter to Lowell, emphasizing his own Harvard connections and stressing the importance of Harvard's collections, the research value of the *List*, and the assistance of the *List* in decreasing Harvard's role as a "victim of general fishing expeditions for inter-library loans." Lowell's response confirmed that Coolidge was wiser in being more reticent in approaching Lowell directly. Lowell simply sent the letter to Coolidge noting that "it seems to me that the plan proposed is one that would be mainly of benefit to the libraries that do not contain the periodicals listed, whereas the main expense would be with the libraries that do. Mr Lydenberg, like everybody who gets up a plan, thinks that his is the one important thing." Lydenberg's letter thus remained unanswered for several months, prompting a second appeal (with yet another by Andrews, also a Harvard alumnus). This letter won a brief answer from Coolidge at Lowell's request, apologizing that the earlier letter had been overlooked, but reiterating the same position and indicating that Harvard had been "begging so actively of late and graduates have been so generous that I cannot well turn to people like Mr. Morgan or Mr. James Byrne."²⁵⁵

Lydenberg at this time also tried to sound out T. Franklin Currier, the Harvard College assistant librarian in charge of cataloging and one of the notable catalogers of the day. Currier replied with a frank, cold letter, arguing again that the *List* would be of virtually no use to Harvard, though Harvard's inclusion would benefit the *List*:

Your list is a select list. For the benefit of persons who are geographically not in touch with us a general statement can be made that in fields in which Harvard is collecting the chances are excellent of finding in Cambridge all serials of the type selected by your editors. As to the value of the list to persons here in Cambridge, I presume that eighty per cent of the titles in the "checking" edition are already in our Union Catalogue and judged by their intrinsic value to scholarship the percentage may rise to ninety-eight.

These considerations lead me to believe that Harvard's contribution to scholarship will be greater by completing and making available its own resources than by contributing a detailed statement that it does not possess this and that item in what is after all only a selection of titles.²⁵⁶

Lydenberg made no effort to hide his irritation in writing Andrews:

The attitude of the Harvard Library towards the Union List is more than discouraging. . . . They have frankly confessed their inability to check (a confession which it seems to me if I had to make would bring a blush

of shame to my administrative and individual cheek), and altogether take an attitude of superior indifference.

I do not know where the credit for this attitude must go. I think Lane wants to check, wants to see the college periodicals included, but realizes he lacks the necessary authority to order checking. Coolidge's attitude is mysterious, decidedly in the background, decidedly negative. Currier speaks very frankly, saying that checking, if done, should not be added as a burden to his present staff, admittedly over-worked; that if additional funds for checking should be provided, he would prefer to see them diverted to buying new books—to remain uncatalogued—rather than spend the money on checking this list. It is summed up in his statement that all our inquirer needs to know is just which field Harvard cultivates, and when that is once realized, he may proceed on the calm assumption that Harvard has complete files of all the periodicals of first rate importance in that field. . . .

. . . Oh! I forgot to say that Currier's attitude is frankly that it is up to the Committee to go out and raise funds for Harvard. We did this to remedy the Washington situation and therefore we ought to do it, they say, to help them in Cambridge. Well, I do not mind telling you that when I went to Ruml and fought for money for Washington, I bespoke also help for Cambridge. But I was met with the unanswerable argument that if Harvard did not take sufficient interest in the project and if Harvard lacked sufficient pride in its own holdings to raise the necessary funds by its own efforts, then this outside agency certainly could not be expected to aid. The Washington situation was a horse of an emphatically different color.²⁵⁷

Lydenberg, however, still thought that Harvard could be persuaded:

Personally, I am convinced that it will not require super-human effort to raise the \$2,000 to \$3,000 necessary for checking the list if the administrative head of the library was very anxious to get the feat accomplished.

. . . They are so oppressed by the fear of additional work that they have not stopped to realize how simply this additional work could be absorbed in their current efforts.²⁵⁸

Lydenberg's idea was to persuade Harvard that they might photostat the serials cards from their shelf list, and thus produce a much-needed serial record file while doing the *Union List* work. He vowed to talk to Coolidge about this face-to-face when he next came to New York.²⁵⁹

Lydenberg next approached Langdon P. Marvin, a Wall Street lawyer who was a member of the Harvard Board of Overseers and had served as president of the Associated Harvard Clubs (1922–23), and persuaded him to write Lowell. This was yet another miscalculation; Lowell noted to Coolidge that Marvin

“every little while urges that the University should use for some purpose of greater or lesser importance, funds which I can almost say we do not possess; that is, funds which would have to be taken away from some other purpose, but that is not easy to do for those of us who have to survey the whole field.” Lowell replied to Marvin that funds could not be spared from the other departments and noted that Coolidge “evidently does not consider that the making of this list of periodicals is more important than some other things that would have to be done in the Library.”²⁶⁰

Coolidge, however, in writing to Lowell, does not appear as negative as Lydenberg had assumed. He does admit the enormity of the project for Harvard: “We should have to go to a very considerable expense in return for which we should not gain much of anything. . . . For us the job of hunting up and listing what is desired will be difficult and complicated.” But he also notes the value of the project: “I have no doubt that it will be useful to scholars and students working here and also to the management of the Library. . . . I admit that [our unwillingness to participate] is a purely selfish view and that if everyone took it, no list could be made out, and that it seems shabby that we should profit by what others have done, while unwilling to bear our share of the burden.” His letters to Lowell seem to be those of a cautious administrator, careful about committing to a project for which he had limited resources, and always mindful of Harvard’s need to support its own unique collection, but trying to make some kind of case for the project to an unsympathetic superior.²⁶¹

Finally, late in 1924, Lydenberg managed to talk to Coolidge face-to-face, and obtained an agreement to back up any independent appeal to Harvard donors, as long as no appeal went to Lowell. Lydenberg relied on Marvin and other contacts to gain access to three prominent Harvard donors; in a chatty follow-up letter to James Buell Munn, one of the donors, Coolidge praised the plan but noted Harvard’s difficulties and lamented “the fact that we are crowding the same benefactors pretty hard just at present.” The benefactors, nonetheless, agreed to pledge jointly \$1,200 per year for three years to defray the cost of checking, and to form a photostatic serial catalog at Harvard.²⁶²

Problems with Harvard, however, continued. Harvard still indicated that it would check only the provisional edition and not the checking edition. “Harvard will save money, but it will be a saving at the expense of other libraries,” noted Lydenberg. Gregory also complained of the work of recording fragmentary runs in Harvard branches for titles probably complete in the College Library. Neither, however, thought it worthwhile (in Gregory’s words)

to “butt our head against Harvard’s decisions” yet again.²⁶³ Keyes Metcalf, an early associate of Lydenberg who simultaneously held the positions of director of the Harvard University Library and Harvard College librarian at the time of the work on the second edition of the *Union List*, complained that he was “not sure that [Harvard] put its heart into the work” on the first edition, and that the work was “incomplete and, in some cases, inaccurate.”²⁶⁴ Nonetheless, the archives of the Harvard College Library do reveal the prodigious amount of work that was entailed; detailed time records exist showing the checking of every drawer in Widener’s catalog for serial titles, as well as the voluminous correspondence with Winifred Gregory occasioned by the complexity of Harvard’s holdings. Harvard was not alone in such efforts, but they were obviously much magnified there.²⁶⁵ It is also of worth noting, however, that an analysis of the final *List* revealed that Harvard’s collection, though obviously preeminent, had about 33% of the titles represented, and not the 80% Currier had supposed, based on his review of the checking edition.²⁶⁶

Further Decisions on Size and Scope

It would be a mistake to assume that the project went smoothly once the participating libraries were recruited. The most notable problem was a significant cost overrun resulting from Wilson’s serious underestimation of the number of serials that would be included; Wilson (probably relying on Andrews’s estimates) had assumed 40,000 to perhaps 50,000, and in fact the published *List* contained 75,000, as other estimates had suggested. Wilson had in fact been cautious about his cost estimate: “Of course this so-called estimate can be little more than a guess because no one has ever published a Union List on this basis and we may go far wrong.” Little of this uncertainty, however, had been conveyed to the subscribers, no doubt a prudent course of action. The resultant increase in cost, however, required the chagrined committee to go to the subscribers for a fourth year’s subscription, which most were willing to grant, committed as they were by 1926 to the work of producing the *List*, and with the provisional edition by then more than half published and already in use. The sale price of the final edition was raised from \$50 to \$75.²⁶⁷

Under these circumstances the pressure to restrict the scope of the *List* of course became substantial; all questions of scope and bibliographic format Wilson referred to the committee, preserving professional control over this important gatekeeping function. From the beginning a number of types of publications had been excluded, including administrative serials, annuals, gift books, most newspapers, and (despite Lydenberg’s sympathy for inclusion) publications of state and local trade unions. In the course

of editing, additional decisions needed to be made by the committee, and international congresses, alumni and undergraduate publications, most children's magazines, temperance periodicals, and publications of geological surveys and agricultural experiment stations were all ruled out of scope. Generally decisions were made because of the perceived limited value of the material (alumni publications), or the bibliographic difficulty of inclusion (international congresses), or because they were predictably held by certain types of libraries (law reports), or because strong collections existed at specific locations (temperance periodicals, collected by New York Public), or because other lists existed or were in progress (gift books). The emergence of Clarence Brigham's list of early American newspapers allowed the committee to put to rest any consideration of including these materials.²⁶⁸

Nonetheless, the initial checking edition, after listing the exclusions initially identified, declared that "the list, however, aims to include such titles as are of value for research, and these are included without regard to the form in which they appear." While clearly attempting to maintain the flexibility to create the most useful list possible, this continuing vagueness had its cost. The problem was compounded when Gregory, working far from any library where she could verify titles, listed in the checking edition such things as the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*. Additional complications occurred when the provisional edition was assembled, with many titles suggested by the checking libraries. Gregory at one point complained, "Can not the checking libraries be educated to send in only those titles which have some value? Most librarians, from the results we obtain, seem to rely on the choice of a shelf girl, who of course lists every thing in sight."²⁶⁹ The problem, of course, is that "value" is an impossible criterion to rely upon; presumably all these items had been added to their respective collections because of a perceived value.

To a great extent it was the committee members, and to a lesser extent other subscribers, who were relied upon to make judgments on what was out of scope. Lydenberg and Gerould were particularly active in this regard, both going over (at Gregory's request) problematic titles suggested by the cooperating libraries before Gregory included them.²⁷⁰ However, the committee did become more tolerant over time of the selective inclusion of annuals of significant research value, announcing their selective inclusion despite a protest from Gregory that "the general order will proceed from the office 'Annuals are now to be included'—and presto—we retire for another six months behind a stack of cards!"²⁷¹ The committee also deliberated

greatly on the issue of government documents, ultimately agreeing that administrative documents were to be excluded, but those which reported on research, and were in the nature of periodicals otherwise included in the *List*, should be listed. Later the exclusion was amended to “administrative and legislative serials.”²⁷² Series were predictably difficult; Gregory at one point tried to press Gerould for a general definition of out-of-scope “publisher’s series” so that she would not have to consult him on specific titles. Gerould refused, noting that “the line between those which we should include and those which we should not is indefinable, and I don’t suppose that any two people would agree that the series should be on one side or the other. I might not agree with myself two days running.” At Harvard, T. Franklin Currier, after examining the provisional edition for patterns in this matter, wrote Lydenberg that “at present my suggestion for a rule would be that monograph series issued by publishers be ordinarily excluded and that monograph series issued by societies and institutions be included.” Lydenberg replied that “your statement seems an admirable expression of about what our decision and practice have crystallized into,” though in fact Currier’s formulation was never officially adopted or communicated.²⁷³ Lydenberg’s continuing attempt to keep the *List* in scope at one point moved Gerould to write Gregory that he was “amused at Mr. Lydenberg’s attempt to eliminate titles beginning Bibliographie. I have frequently found it easy to establish a general principle, but much more difficult to make the facts agree with it.” And some of these titles did remain in the *List*.²⁷⁴

Certain decisions of the committee were controversial; a number of agricultural libraries objected to the exclusion of the publications of agricultural experiment stations, and the matter was discussed by the ALA Agricultural Libraries Section. However, the committee relied on the advice of Claribel R. Barnett, the librarian of the Department of Agriculture Library, who argued that researchers seeking these materials would “turn naturally to the U.S. Department of Agriculture or to the publishing state for any bulletins that they wanted which were not contained in their own college or station libraries rather than to some other library.” The exclusion of geological surveys was the subject of another, if less sustained, protest.²⁷⁵

In at least one case the committee conducted a vote on a specific title, *Ainslee’s Magazine*, which Bostwick had objected to as “of the trashy variety.” Bostwick’s use of the word “trashy” can be traced back to his ALA presidential address, “The Librarian as Censor,” where “trashy” signifies a publication whose “subject matter or the manner in which it is treated may be trivial and worthless.” Bostwick believed that such books and

periodicals had no place in the public library or on open shelves. However, *Ainslee's* remained, signaling, perhaps, some movement in the profession away from this mode of thinking, as well as a more catholic view of the possibilities of resources intended for research.²⁷⁶

It is scarcely a wonder that there was considerable confusion about what titles were to be reported or not. The University of Wisconsin at one point complained:

Would it not be possible for the Committee to formulate a more definite ruling on these points so that the cooperating libraries might be more uniform in their inclusions?

It really seems quite a vital matter when one considers the labor and expense involved in checking, on the part of libraries all over the country, to say nothing of the difference which the omission of these unessential items would make in the eventual size of the list.

An exasperated Lydenberg replied, "I have long appreciated the inadequacy of the English language when I tried to define to myself just what was meant by a serial or a periodical for inclusion in this list. We all realize that we have to cut, but the pressure so far has always tended towards urging extensions rather than exclusions."²⁷⁷ While Lydenberg's pragmatic approach and flexibility probably resulted in a more useful list, it did so at definite costs.

The Conclusion of Work and Quarrels with Wilson

A disagreement that points to a more fundamental tension between the committee and Wilson occurred over a seemingly trivial point, the wording of the title page and preface written by Lydenberg. To help him write the preface, Lydenberg obtained information about the early years of the project from ALA headquarters (mainly a list of references from the *Bulletin of the American Library Association*) and from Malcolm Wyer. The conflicts between the accounts of the history of the project as depicted by Wyer and Lydenberg and as depicted by the Wilson Company have already been enumerated. In September of 1927 Lydenberg sent Wilson the draft of his preface, along with a draft for the wording of the title page differing from one previously approved by Wilson and Gregory. The new title page was one of several Lydenberg suggested to the committee as alternatives to Wilson's and was strongly urged by Bostwick, who at this point was the only active committee member whose involvement dated from the formation of the initial committee in 1913, Andrews having suffered a crisis in his health earlier that year. That draft indicated that the work was "Edited

by / Winifred Gregory / For the American Library Association / under the / Supervision of the following Committee: / ().”²⁷⁸

Wilson was noted for his “rare but devastating outbursts,”²⁷⁹ and it was this bit of wording, along with the account of the project in Lydenberg’s preface and Lydenberg’s failure to credit the Wilson Company with publishing the *List* without a profit, that was to provoke him, though it took him a full month to respond. Wilson’s letter is remarkable enough to quote at length:

Anyone reading the title page you submit would give full credit for this enterprise to the American Library Association and nothing would be left for this Company. From the title page I find also that the former “Advisory” committee has now become a “Supervisory” committee. In the preface I note that all those who have contributed anything are commended with laudatory adjectives or a “Tribute”, all except this Company which has been carefully ignored.

The Union list was conceived, born and bred in this house, and no right, title, or interest was transferred to the American Library Association when we asked for the appointment of an Advisory Committee to represent the interests of the guarantors for whom we proposed to publish this Union List without profit or loss. We realized that if guarantors were to make large annual subscriptions they should have their representatives to see that our proposition was carried out and the accounts audited.

If the Committee has forgotten the part taken in this enterprise by this Company your own files will give you much information and those who were connected with the North Central List can give you more. I think you can hardly fail to acknowledge that there would be no Union List now except for the sixteen years of hard work on the part of this Company. You give a “tribute” to the men who sold paper for the Union List without profit but you do not mention that this Company agreed to publish it without profit (you will find a letter about that in your files). Neither do you mention that we have done the correspondence and bookkeeping for all sums paid by guarantors without any overhead charge (which would ordinarily and unless waived be a charge of about \$15,000). We did in fact say in our correspondence with the Committee that “we might” be able to waive this charge, and we have so far, but you surely would not ask or expect us to waive such a normal and legitimate charge for overhead expenses if this is a publication the credit for which goes to the American Library Association which has ample funds for such purposes, supplied from foundations.

It seems to us appropriate enough for the Advisory Committee to write a title page and preface, because it is in a detached position from which it can do justice to everyone. But we shall not approve any title page or preface which does not do justice to this Company which has done more

work without pay and which has made larger contributions, measured by any standard, than all of the other contributors combined, and to whom you give such fulsome praise. We do not ask for laudatory adjectives and should refuse a "tribute" but we must have a fair and just statement of facts in the preface and a title page that is not misleading.

If all this were merely a matter of pride I should not write one word to you but this large investment has been made by this Company as a demonstration of what can be done in the field of cooperative cataloging and especially what can be done, in cooperation, by this Company. Having made what some consider an extravagant investment (I think your auditor will have to grant that it has a money value of \$20,000) in this demonstration, we cannot see the credit for it transferred to the American Library Association.²⁸⁰

Lydenberg responded cautiously but firmly, letting his irritation show only briefly at the end:

If you had recalled something I told you and Miss Gregory not once but several times you would not have found it necessary, perhaps, to write with the heat and vehemence you did. I tried to make plain to you that what the advisory (you will notice I am careful to avoid any use of supervision) committee submitted, was not deemed final and definitive, but was submitted with assurance that if you had any suggestions to offer they would be considered with pleasure and gratitude.

. . . None of us certainly had any idea of failing to give due credit to the services of yourself or the Wilson Company, nor did I intend to see that the Company had "been carefully ignored."

Or would it make you feel better if the Committee fathered no prefatory matter and left to you the task of insertion in the Introduction satisfactory laudation of the Company?²⁸¹

Wilson's next letter was more subdued, and repeated his earlier position on the appropriateness of a preface authored by the committee; he also enclosed copies of correspondence from the earlier years of the project, noting, "I should have sent these before but we always think everybody else should know everything that we know and you couldn't know what happened in pre committee [*sic*] days."²⁸²

Gregory was at this point anxious to disassociate herself from Wilson, writing to Lydenberg, "I wish I could express in the English language (barring the Profane) how clever the President of this Company seems to me. I think he has dodged this issue deliberately until now, in order to keep you working for the H. W. Wilson Company. For that is what it amounts to, isn't it, if he assumes [*sic*] absolute control of the list? I can't think that A.L.A. would have appointed a committee at all, if they had understood

the situation as he explains it.”²⁸³ Gregory certainly had a notable temper, and was also upset at this time because Wilson did not want her name as editor on the spine; but as a librarian employee of the Wilson Company she obviously felt uncomfortably in the middle of this conflict between her professional community and her employer.

Lydenberg’s next letter was quite conciliatory in tone. “No one connected with the List, at any rate, no one with whom I have ever talked, had the slightest idea of considering this a publication of the American Library Association,” he stated.²⁸⁴ In fact, Lydenberg had come very close to making such a claim when answering librarians skeptical of the Wilson Company’s role in the project, declaring on at least one occasion “the project is a child of the American Library Association, and not of the H. W. Wilson Company. We turned to this Company as our agent because the Company has had more experience in handling such specialized pieces of bookmaking as this will be than has been enjoyed by any other publishing concern that comes to mind.”²⁸⁵ Lydenberg again waived the use of the adjective “supervisory,” tracing it to the committee’s charge to “advise with Messrs. Wilson & Company, and supervise the execution of the plan.” A new preface, revised to meet Wilson’s objections, was submitted.²⁸⁶

Lydenberg’s complaisance obviously encouraged Wilson, who sent drafts for revisions and additions to the new preface. These changes would have emphasized Wilson’s role in the project, particularly his role at the 1921 midwinter meeting, while eliminating any mention of Wyer’s initiative at the 1916 midwinter meeting, Wilson perhaps feeling that his role at that meeting overshadowed Wyer’s. Wilson’s new draft also repeated his statement that general business overhead costs had been forgone on charges made to guarantor libraries.²⁸⁷

Gregory’s anger at these revisions is palpable:

My violent objection to using Mr. Wilson’s paragraph about costs in your Preface was based, first, on my memory of his statements to me that all the Wilson publications paid the same rate of overhead as the Union List. I did not know him well enough to get that in black and white. . . .

My second objection was the knowledge that guarantor’s money has been used as overhead. Waiving the point that it is the same overhead as other Wilson publications, the fact remains that his statement in that paragraph is deliberately misleading.

Gregory also enclosed financial statements showing a charge for overhead

on editorial costs, and noted that an overhead was figured in on printing charges. "There is no earthly reason why Mr. Wilson should lose on this job, but when his statement that he charged no overhead appears in the preface, it is not born [*sic*] out by his financial statements."²⁸⁸

Gregory was in fact confused on the issue of the overhead, though understandably. Wilson figured three overheads: on printing costs; on editorial salaries, to take care of office space and equipment; and a "general business overhead," which covered sales and administrative costs. Only this last had Wilson agreed to forgo, and only on the income from guarantors, a reasonable enough policy, since much of the cost of raising these subscriptions had come from committee efforts; Wilson had on several occasions outlined these charges to the committee.²⁸⁹ Wilson was perhaps guilty of implying too much in this new preface, since few outside of the business community would have understood these distinctions. Whatever the shared values between publisher and professional community, this was the language of the businessman alone. Clearly Wilson does deserve more credit than Gregory was willing to give him, but questions of this kind would continue to surface. The ARL investigation of Wilson's pricing structure during the following decade noted that "in a quarter century we have heard many complaints about Wilson's charges but never any imputations of dishonesty," and went on to conclude that Wilson's overhead charges, though high, were comparable to those of similar publishers.²⁹⁰

Nonetheless, Wilson had misjudged Lydenberg's earlier complaisance in writing the new preface. His insistence on taking credit on the confusing point of overhead, as well as his somewhat self-serving revisions, was enough finally to raise Lydenberg's ire:

But we do feel, however, that as the message contained in your suggestions contains so much material that we know nothing about, so much that lies, or lay in the past, outside our ken, it would be better for all of us if we let the Preface stand just about as sent up to you in our first draft, and then ask you as publisher to include a preliminary statement by the publisher. This would give you a chance to emphasize the fact that the Wilson Company is the publisher, and that the American Library Association has had nothing to do with the work other than to appoint an advisory committee, and in its own feeble way to consider from time to time the advisability of a Union List. It will give you a chance to set forth in your own way with a fullness untrammelled by adaptation to a word from anyone else just what the Wilson Company promised to do, and how it carried out its ideals, intentions, and assurances. It would be difficult for the Committee to make any statement about the fact that the Wilson Company has made no profit on the enterprise, has charged no overhead, or indeed to make any other statement about

the finances of the enterprise unless we had set an accountant to the task of analysing the debit and credit columns from the first receipts down to the last expenditures.²⁹¹

Now it was Wilson's turn to be conciliatory. Surely, whatever his wounded pride and his deep belief in his ownership of the project, he must have realized that a dual preface would be a public relations disaster:

It does not seem to me wise from the standpoint of this Company or the Committee that there should be a publisher's statement which would seem to present matters from a different standpoint from that of the Committee. . . .

. . . It seems to us that if [a statement on overhead charges] is not sufficiently well understood by the Committee to incorporate it in the preface, that it would not be understood by the guarantors who are not so familiar with the matter as are the members of the Committee. Of course this statement was in the future tense and would imply that in due season the Committee would have figures which it would approve.

In general it seems to me that whatever differences of opinion may arise between the Committee and this Company it should be kept there and not be included in the prefatory pages of the *Union List* itself.²⁹²

In fact, the title page preferred by Wilson was used, which simply listed the members of the "Advisory Committee Appointed by the American Library Association" with no further indication of responsibility. Wilson was thanked for agreeing to publish the *List* without a profit if protected from a loss, but no mention of overhead charges was made. Much of Wilson's language describing his role at the 1921 ALA midwinter meeting was inserted into Lydenberg's preface, but the material on Wyer's 1916 initiative was retained. The resulting preface, which has become the source of most subsequent accounts of the origin of the project, somewhat misleadingly emphasized ALA's role prior to 1921, and introduced Wilson primarily as the major player at the 1921 midwinter meeting, a narrative that greatly understates the complexity of the project's early development.²⁹³

The final months of the project were marred by minor disagreements. Lydenberg wrote privately to Gerould about the feasibility of an audit to verify Wilson's charges against the project, wondering what Wilson's reaction would be to such a suggestion. In fact, in May of 1928 Wilson proposed, when his own books were being audited, that his auditors should also make an examination for the committee. Lydenberg, Gregory, and Gerould also became convinced that Wilson was dragging his feet on the production of the volume; Wilson for his part claimed that his presses were

being worked overtime and he was giving the *Union List* priority. When Wilson promised to put two of his presses on the *List*, Lydenberg noted, “He didn’t say so, but I fancy it means that his two hand presses are working on this and his machine-fed press is used for publications on which the Wilson Company makes a profit, nothing of the kind accruing to the house on this enterprise, as you may recall if you scratch your head hard.” Whether or not Wilson, feeling he had not been given his due, was giving the *List* insufficient priority cannot be corroborated—or disproved—through any available evidence. But, trivial as these disputes may seem, they do indicate a level of distrust that had not been evident earlier.²⁹⁴

Writing a few years later in support of continued ALA involvement in a new edition of the *Union List*, Lydenberg noted:

I think it would be just as well to have the A.L.A. have some connection with [the *Union List*] in view of H. W. Wilson’s reluctance to admit any connection with librarians. He feels the idea is his, the child is his, and the credit ought to go to him. Personally I am a bit amused at his attitude as I think back on his willingness to accept library help when it came to raising funds and getting cooperation. I am rather inclined to think he would be willing to undertake the task as a Wilson enterprise. Is it wise, however, to turn the task entirely over to him, or is it better to exercise some such control as we have up to the present time?²⁹⁵

Lydenberg’s comments point accurately to the issue of professional control in a project of such importance to the library community, and for which that community had invested so much in effort and funds. The issue of control would emerge more dramatically during the editing of the second edition of the *Union List of Serials* and clearly contributed to the differing perspectives of librarian and businessman.

PART III: RESULTS

The Final Success

The *Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada* did finally appear in the waning days of 1927, and was greeted with the praise one would expect of such an enterprise. Harvard’s T. Franklin Currier, whose skepticism about the project has been noted, and whose frequent missives to Gregory during the editing of the *List* often contained a strong note of dissatisfaction, wrote Wilson with “congratulations on the excellent appearance of the Union

List of Serials! Of course, it is a Jumbo volume, but what can you expect of a magnum opus? I have already begun to refer to it daily."²⁹⁶ It has "demonstrated a usefulness beyond all expectation," wrote another librarian, and F. K. W. Drury's review of the volume in the *Library Journal* is entitled simply "The Epoch-Making Union List of Serials."²⁹⁷ Its effect on promoting interlibrary loans has been noted earlier; the University of Michigan noticed immediately "a very great change in the character of many of the requests since the publication of the Union List of Serials," adding that "our own borrowings have been made very much more definite and speedy. . . . We no longer write to half a dozen libraries in succession to discover which one has a periodical urgently desired for research work here." One study showed a doubling in the rate of loans from a dozen university libraries in the decade following the publication of the *List*, and Constance Winchell, in her 1930 manual on interlibrary loan, notes that the "publication of the *Union List of Serials in the [sic] Libraries of the United States and Canada* has greatly facilitated the use of the files of [periodical] sets." Even before the final publication, Marilla Wait Freeman of the Cleveland Public Library, referring apparently to work with the provisional edition, noted that "the new Wilson Union serial list, together with the rapid development of the photostat, have brought the whole serial world to our doors, and have placed almost no limit to the reference use of periodical literature of all countries and all languages."²⁹⁸

Sales were reported brisk, and by mid-1928 the initial print run was nearly sold out, much to the surprise of the committee, which had believed that "the smaller libraries would not find this List useful enough to warrant paying the price of \$75.00 which this Committee found it necessary to charge for it." Rather than return the surplus to the guarantor libraries, the committee sought and received permission to use the unexpected surplus to finance one or two supplements. Eventually the income generated from the individual subscriptions and sales would nearly equal that advanced by the guarantors.²⁹⁹

There were a few exceptions to this praise. It is fairly easy to dismiss the criticisms of the Reverend Frank G. Lewis, librarian of the Crozer Theological Seminary and the American Baptist Historical Society. Lewis carried an earlier series of disagreements with Gregory and Lydenberg into print, arguing against the exclusion of the annual reports of state Baptist organizations and also objecting to certain bibliographic conventions, such as the listing of holdings by volume number rather than by date and the use of the plus sign to indicate an open entry. Lewis seems something of a monomaniac, but his argument for the inclusion of the Baptist materials does point to

the fundamental problem with the committee's early promise to include all materials of "value for research" while needing to limit the inclusion of certain kinds of materials of highly focused interest.³⁰⁰ It was, perhaps, a dilemma that reflected the strong and natural desire to create a broadly based, inclusive reference work, when such an ideal work was beyond the means of the committee. Indeed, at one point van Patten, then new to the committee and unacquainted with Lewis's earlier demands (and likely with the project's financial constraints), urged the committee to reconsider its earlier decision to exclude the reports.³⁰¹ It is possible to excuse the committee's difficulty in formulating rules of exclusion, and the acceptance of title estimates that were obviously too low (thus delaying some of the hard decisions), on the ground that this was a pioneering effort. But such errors also betray a desire to produce the most comprehensive and inclusive list possible, or perhaps even one that was really not possible.

A criticism that perhaps deserves more serious consideration is that of Ernest C. Richardson, the father of ALA work on the *Union List*, which was contained in a private memorandum:

I have been very careful to say nothing publicly in the way of dispraise of a very useful result for fear of diminishing the high praise due to Mr. Lydenberg's splendid organizing work on the matter. It would be hard to find superlatives enough to express my admiration for him and his work.

I doubt, too, if the sterling values of the work can be exaggerated.

On the other hand, there are thousands of research periodicals of definite value not included, important libraries not represented by their unique holdings, and the expense of compilation large enough to have insured these items.³⁰²

Despite Richardson's pre-eminence in the various cooperative bibliographic ventures of the first part of the century, it is difficult to see how the *List* could have been substantially more inclusive at the same price, except perhaps by reducing editorial costs through extreme simplification of the holdings statements, a device used in the Boston union list, and a course recommended at one point by Harvard.³⁰³ Indeed, the pursuit of the "rare" title in the special library undoubtedly was a major factor leading to the budget crisis that required a fourth year's subscription. It is easy, perhaps, to dismiss Richardson as a visionary who often had difficulties making the compromises needed to carry out a particular project (with the notable exceptions of the success of "Project B" at the Library of Congress, and of the earlier union list of historical sets). It is also possible that Richardson's judgment may have been clouded by earlier disagreements

with Gerould.³⁰⁴ But later regrets of the lack of inclusiveness also occur, notably in Herbert Kellar's fine overview of library cooperation, written a decade and a half later.³⁰⁵

Letters in Lydenberg's files from William Warner Bishop and Charles Brown, of Iowa State College, offer further support for Richardson's complaint, each making note of a case where a title not in the *Union List* could be located in one or more libraries not represented in the *List*; and, as Bishop noted, "this instance might be multiplied a thousand fold."³⁰⁶ Lydenberg, in replying to Brown, noted:

The problem constantly before the committee has been to make the list as comprehensive as the funds at our command would permit. Every time we got an additional guarantor we increased our usefulness to a corresponding extent, every time we heard of a collection that ought to be included but declined to come in because of lack of funds or interest we realized we were diminishing the information supply of the list; but if the library in question could not pull its share in the boat and the guarantors had gone their limit so far as their financial resources were concerned, we had, as I see it, to choose between (1) getting more money, and (2) dropping the potential contributor. I can take my place on any witness stand and assert most emphatically that Gerould and I sweat blood in trying to get more money, but when we reached our limit we could do nothing more than recognize the fact and lay our course accordingly.³⁰⁷

The special libraries had been a particularly vexing case; Lydenberg himself, in reacting to a suggestion that a group of special libraries in Boston be included in the first supplement (published in 1931), noted, "If we do include as many of the Boston special libraries as are here listed, then I wonder if we ought not to make an effort to get in some of the special libraries in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco. The San Francisco people, for instance, wrote to Mr. Bostwick more in sorrow than anger complaining because the list had neglected them."³⁰⁸ Yet, as noted, recruiting special libraries had not been easy; Lydenberg complained to Bostwick that "our friends in the special libraries not infrequently took the attitude that their needs, collections, and uses were so special, particular, peculiar, that they preferred not to go into any general list." Lydenberg does go on to praise cooperating libraries such as Eastman Kodak that took a more "enlightened view" than some of their counterparts.³⁰⁹ The differing needs of these libraries are only part of the story, however. The separate organizational worlds of the Special Library Association and the American Library Association certainly hindered their participation, and even, perhaps, the creation of a plan that might have served everyone's needs.

Whatever the real limitations of the *Union List*, the magnitude of the achievement can be seen in comparing the final product with those produced elsewhere. Other important contemporary national serial union list projects were all limited in some significant way: the *British World List of Scientific Periodicals* (1925–27) and *A Catalogue of Scientific Periodicals in Canadian Libraries* (1924) by subject matter, the *Inventaire des périodiques scientifiques des bibliothèques de Paris* (1924–25) by subject matter and location of files, and the *Gesamtverzeichnis der ausländischen Zeitschriften (GAZ)* (1927–29) by country of origin. All reported on substantially fewer titles than the 75,000 in the *Union List of Serials*: the *GAZ* contained 14,573 titles, the *World List* 24,686, the *Inventaire* about 18,000. It is true that the earlier *Gesamt-Zeitschriften-Verzeichnis* (1914) was not limited in the same way as the *GAZ*, but it contained no exact statements of holdings, and in any case reported only slightly more titles—17,190 as opposed to 14,573.³¹⁰

Union lists are sometimes seen as a popular but limited step toward fuller library cooperation. Robert B. Downs, in praising union list efforts, notes much of the reason for their success is that they “do not call for indefinite commitments on the part of the individual library, they do not require the library to give up anything.”³¹¹ They represent a more pragmatic, if limited, solution than do the more elaborate schemes of bibliographic centers and coordinated collection development, however much a claim these may have from the point of view of ultimate efficiency. The commitment they require, however, should not be understated. Many cooperating libraries shared with Harvard an inadequate record of their serials holdings that the *Union List* work helped to put in order, and to acknowledge these benefits is also to acknowledge the magnitude of the task. The University of Michigan noted that “the work of supplying copy to the editors has enabled us to put in order our own records of a peculiarly valuable but likewise unusually difficult class of books,” and Brown University reported that “Mr. [F. K. W.] Drury has . . . checked our holdings on the advance sheets of the great Union List of Serials, a responsible and laborious task and one resulting to the great advantage of our catalogue.”³¹² Wilson noted that in many libraries the project took most of the time of one full-time staff member.³¹³ The work was inexorable; at one point an appeal by Andrews for an extension of a particularly crucial deadline, a date at the end of the summer inconvenient to most libraries, was denied. Lydenberg, supported by the committee, noted that “there is not a month in the year for which perfectly valid arguments could not be urged on the ground of inconvenience.” (However, a separate appeal from E. W. Winker of the University of Texas, who argued that the deadline would require two of his department heads to cancel their vacations, was granted.)³¹⁴ And the *Union List*

did represent the first of a series of cooperative projects; Charles Brown, writing in 1929, noted a shift in group meetings of college and university librarians from general discussion to “work through committees to obtain certain definite results,” a change he attributed to “two unique and definite accomplishments,” the appearance of the *Union List*, and of George Works’s *College and University Library Problems*.³¹⁵

Nonetheless, some of the hoped-for consequences of the *Union List*, such as the exchange of fragmentary sets, never occurred to anything like the extent desired. Ralph Esterquest has complained of the “tradition that interlibrary co-operation is a part-time effort of a committee of busy librarians,”³¹⁶ and there are limits to what can be accomplished under such circumstances, limits determined by the perception on the part of participating institutions that the effort is worth the commitment of resources. There were some modest exchange efforts, but simply noting that such exchanges could result in greater efficiency could not make them happen.³¹⁷

Much more typical was the use of the provisional edition by vendors of back issues (including Wilson) to target libraries to solicit. William Warner Bishop noted that “practically every book-seller I met in Europe . . . had a copy of the Union List on his desk, for very obvious reasons,” and the John Crerar Library lamented that “more of these offers were accepted than the appropriation warranted,” though many more had to be refused. Amherst had even expressed the fear earlier, as checking revealed the gaps in its periodical holdings, that “the competition for needed volumes will speedily exhaust whatever supply there may be.”³¹⁸

The *List* did help to document the extent to which uncoordinated collection development had left serious gaps. Gerould, writing as chairman of the ALA’s Committee on Resources of American Libraries, used the publication of the *List* as an occasion to address the poor representation of many serials in American libraries. Working from samples in two standard foreign bibliographies, he noted that twenty percent of the titles in Lanson’s *Manuel bibliographique de la littérature française moderne* were not represented in the *List*, and that nearly seventy percent of the titles cited in the *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte* were “insufficiently represented.”³¹⁹ Charles W. Smith of the University of Washington found that the *List* showed no complete set of *Collier’s* or *Saturday Evening Post* in the country, along with many other valuable periodicals, and that the sets that did exist were often far from where they were needed. For example, “Seattle has the only school of fisheries in the United States, but the

Pacific Fisherman, a local periodical needed by this school, is found complete only in Washington, D. C. . . . In a number of cases the few complete sets reported are huddled together in one corner of the country while the balance of the territory is unsupplied." Smith believed that the *Union List* would promote a more coordinated approach to the acquisition of such sets: "The lesson of the *Union List* is coordination, but whereas in the past coordination was regarded merely as *desirable* it is now clearly seen to be *possible*."³²⁰ Donald B. Gilchrist of the University of Rochester, speaking in 1926, noted that "the whole problem of regional division of responsibility for collecting has recently been revived, and the publication of the Union List of Serials, which is proving such a marvelous boon to scholarship, will serve to overcome inertia as no amount of talking ever could."³²¹

Others were not so sanguine; Carl L. Cannon of the New York Public Library, speaking at ALA's 1929 Washington conference, introduced a plan for cooperative purchasing of periodicals by region with the caveat that he felt "like a man contributing merely one more solution to an ancient jigsaw puzzle, and the question is not only will it work, but will it ever be tried." In speaking for regional divisions, Cannon reiterated the burden of interlibrary loans when only one or two libraries in the country had key files.³²² Though it is reasonable to assume (but difficult to document) that the information in the *List* did inform collection decisions in individual libraries, plans such as Cannon's remained merely plans, as the sad history of cooperative collection development in this country has shown.³²³ A 1935 report of the ALA Committee on Resources of American Libraries, in calling for a survey of research materials to be made to form the basis of a cooperative collection plan, noted, "It is not to be expected that a loosely formed committee without funds and without an executive head with well-defined duties and powers could successfully secure the necessary information."³²⁴ Yet a "loosely formed committee" was about all that ALA had to offer.

Assessing the benefit of the *Union List* for smaller libraries is more problematic, though obviously many purchased the *List*. The promotion of the provisional edition as a medium of exchange prompted a letter to Lydenberg from William H. Powers, librarian of the South Dakota State College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts, on behalf of smaller libraries:

We are trying to build up a collection of serials in natural history, agriculture, engineering, and science. So far with the exception of one or two German series we have not gone beyond those in the English language. Of those most of our sets are incomplete.

I wonder if there is any way feasible whereby we might have the opportunity to examine lists of duplicates owned by cooperating libraries.³²⁵

A similar, more general appeal by Powers on behalf of smaller libraries was published in the *Library Journal*.³²⁶ Obviously such a scheme was beyond what the committee might have hoped for or had the resources to accomplish. The primary benefit to smaller institutions would be increased access to interlibrary loan, but the weakest of these do not seem to have even benefited here. The 1930 survey of land-grant colleges noted that the *Union List of Serials*, “generally recognized as one of the most useful tools ever published for the professional librarian,” was not owned by fifteen of the forty-eight libraries surveyed.³²⁷ The challenges faced by many smaller libraries is attested to by a letter from Central College of Fayette, Missouri, to the University of Michigan, seeking to obtain one of their copies of the provisional edition: “This letter is prompted by the College librarian . . . who realizes the value of the ‘Union List’ and its usefulness to the Faculty in particular. The Library cannot afford to pay the price asked for the final edition, but would be willing to pay, if requested, a moderate sum for an old, unbound set, one that had seen service in your library.”³²⁸ The limitations for poorer institutions in realizing the benefits of library cooperation were too often masked by the general rhetoric of efficiency and cooperation.

Wilson and the ALA during the 1930s, and Beyond

Gerould, upon receiving Princeton’s copies of the *Union List*, told Lydenberg that he had “just written to Wilson congratulating him, as I think he deserves. I have omitted any reference, however, to certain episodes in recent history which it may be perhaps well to forget.”³²⁹ In the following decade, in fact, ALA worked to put into place a structure that would assure that the Wilson Company would continue to act in the interest of the library community after Wilson’s retirement. Wilson had always sold the company’s stock by preference to librarians, employees, and (in early days) professors at the University of Minnesota, as a way of assuring that the company was free to act in the best interests of the library community. In 1932, the company was made a limited-dividend corporation in response to ALA concern that it might fall under the control of an investor less altruistic than Wilson, and in 1934 stock distribution to employees began, in time making the company almost entirely employee-owned. In 1937 an ALA representative was placed on the Wilson board.³³⁰ Much of this work occurred during Lydenberg’s tenure as ALA president.

Wilson's cooperation in this effort is a tribute to his genuine altruism, as well as to the need for organizational continuity shared by Wilson and the library community. These efforts, however, also can be seen as indicative of a growing uneasiness that tools essential to the profession were under the control of a private corporation. This uneasiness is suggested by Wilson's need to offer to publish the *Union List* without the profit he might legitimately have claimed in order to sell the project to the library community. Lydenberg, speaking to the executive board as ALA president, posed the question: "What is going to happen to the Wilson Company when Wilson goes? How important is it for the library world of this country to continue this very important, this unique service that Wilson has developed. We certainly are in a situation that is not matched by any other country. I have wondered about that many times."³³¹

Wilson did consider his company to be in a partnership with the library community, agreeing to structure the company as a limited-dividend corporation because "it would not seem fair to us to ask libraries to pay for publications on a service basis, or a system of taxation, and not have the entire funds expended in their service but dispensed as a profit."³³² Yet any attempt to institutionalize such a working relationship was necessarily fragile; as one member of the executive board noted, "The H. W. Wilson Company is, after all, a printing and publishing business, and while the A.L.A. is interested and willing to help and desirous of being informed, the Wilson Company must, after all, be run on business principles. Its success or failure will inevitably be due, it seems to me, to the person in direct charge, just as it has been in all these years due to the personality and business ability of Mr. H. W. Wilson."³³³ Nor was everyone in the profession enthusiastic about the proposed cooperation; Chalmers Hadley of the Cincinnati Public Library wrote:

The Company has been able to pay large dividends—large as compared to many other concerns, partly, I believe, through the gratuitous services given it by numerous librarians and the resources of their institutions. . . .

Aside from the particular resentment against a company which has such financial relations with libraries, I believe it highly unwise for the A.L.A. to own stock or become financially interested in any concern but in its own. Commercialism has gone far but surely we have not abandoned professionalism to the extent that such relations as suggested between the A.L.A. and the Wilson Company will be considered seriously.³³⁴

The 1930s were also marked by a lengthy quarrel between the ARL and Wilson on the "service basis" for pricing. Wilson cooperated by providing information and opening his books, but persistently refused to change his policy.³³⁵ Nor did the work on the second edition of the *Union List of*

Serials,³³⁶ finally published in 1943, proceed without controversy, as issues of ownership of the *Union List* emerged again: was it the property of the libraries that provided the content and underwrote the cost, or of the Wilson Company, which promoted it and published it without a profit? These matters came to a head when the ALA advisory committee for the second edition, chaired from 1937 by Donald B. Gilchrist of the University of Rochester, decided that editorial work (again under Winifred Gregory) should be done at the Library of Congress, where a wide range of periodical sets and bibliographic resources could be used to verify information without having to rely on the cooperating libraries to catch mistakes, as had been done when editing the first edition. The avoidance of Wilson's editorial overhead charge was also cited in favor of the move to LC. Wilson's ire was guaranteed when the committee hired Gregory and began editorial work at LC without informing him, probably because they were certain of his strong opposition. Wilson's opposition certainly did follow, as he insisted that the work be carried on in the Bronx under his supervision, averring that the *Union List* was owned by the Wilson Company and that Gregory was his employee. "The Wilson Company was under no obligation to request the appointment of a committee [for the first edition] and, for that matter, was under no obligation to request the appointment of the present committee," he fumed. The dispute was taken up by the ALA Executive Board, and eventually Wilson had to back down on the location of the editorial work. No doubt a major factor was the Rockefeller Foundation, which furnished a substantial subvention for the second edition and supported the committee's position.³³⁷ But the need of the profession to maintain control over its own work, as outlined by Andrew Abbott, makes it clear why the committee could not have allowed the editing to continue at the Wilson offices against its clear professional judgment.³³⁸

It may be appropriate to add a brief note here about the third and final edition, the version most likely to be encountered in libraries today. It was also published by the H. W. Wilson Company, in 1965, but guided by a Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, whose members included the ALA, the NRC, the Special Library Association, the Bibliographical Society of America, and other associations, along with the Wilson Company. The Joint Committee did provide input from a broader community of libraries than had been the case for the first two editions, though major departures from the practice of the second edition were not practicable. The third edition was edited at the Library of Congress by a small staff led by Edna Mae Brown Titus, and well funded in its final stages by the Council on Library Resources. It conflated the content of Gregory's second edition and its supplements, but 12,000 new entries were added, many of them

taken from the National Union Catalog. Much of the work was thus still Gregory's, but there were no major disputes over ownership, the battles having been played out earlier and Wilson himself having died in 1954, so as to deprive the story of his colorful and energetic personality.³³⁹

The Achievement of the Union List

The process hammered out by Lydenberg, Wilson, and the library community during the 1920s was certainly not the tidiest, but it is also hard to argue with its achievement in producing the largest union list of its era. And it set a precedent for additional cooperation and accelerated the sharing of resources. It is tangible representation of the increased legitimization of research in twentieth-century America. Ultimately the *Union List* succeeded in the 1920s rather than a decade earlier because of the maturation of the system of research universities and libraries that would fund it, and of the community of librarians that was increasingly organized to support the work of researchers. Funding of ambitious bibliographic projects to support research was finally possible, if the right combination of resources could be brought together; the one resource largely lacking here, which would come into play in later cooperative projects, was the support of the foundations, still only emerging at the time. Rockefeller money, used only to help with the checking of the Washington libraries, would not only help finance the second edition of the *Union List*, but also "Project B" at the Library of Congress, a project that would begin in the fall of 1927 as the pages of the *Union List* were being typeset.

It is also critical not to lose sight of the people who made the project work. The success of these various organizational structures does depend on the good will and shared values of the various participants, and on their willingness to do the considerable work necessary in an environment that treats cooperative projects as an added and voluntary activity. Wilson, though occasionally proud and irascible, never lost sight of his need to cooperate with the library community, even when that community minimized the extent of his contribution. He was able to place the health of that community above any short-term advantage for his company. That such an attitude was of great value to the library community, and that it was furthermore a very fragile resource, is evident from the attempts in the 1930s to institutionalize this working relationship. Inevitably, such attempts were doomed to failure. New enterprises and larger corporations have now redefined the role of the Wilson Company within the library community. The need to cooperate with private entities remains, but the

library community is hardly assured of as sympathetic a partner as Wilson. Lydenberg's contribution, also, is difficult to overstate, not only in the prodigious amount of work represented in the hundreds of letters still extant in the New York Public Library archives from this project, but in the considerable political skill needed to bring such a project to its conclusion. It is difficult to imagine the prickly and opinionated Andrews producing such a broadly inclusive list; a narrower, NRC-sponsored list of scientific periodicals seems the most likely outcome had Andrews's leadership continued. The *Harvard Library Notes* credits Lydenberg's "persistent initiative" in assuring Harvard's place among the cooperating libraries.³⁴⁰ Surely it was also Lydenberg's "persistent initiative" that helped assure the ultimate success of the *Union List of Serials* itself.

The project reflected the need to bring into some working relationship a variety of interests. It needed to pull in many of the smaller institutions, needed both for their financial support and for their specialized holdings, along with a skeptical and difficult Harvard. Thus the emerging community of librarians in institutions devoted to research had to enlist the support of much of the broader community of public and college libraries, and did, despite the differing priorities of the ALA as a whole. The failure to elicit comparable cooperation from special libraries is a reminder of the fragility of all inter-library relationships. As a result the project needed to appeal both to those who wanted to see the access to collections become more democratically accessible, and to those whose primary interest was in the provision of resources for research. The tensions emerged in various ways during the project. Cooperation with private agencies like the H. W. Wilson Company has often been a productive and necessary part of the solutions to the common problems of research libraries, particularly in the United States. These relationships are replete with issues of control and ownership that continue to this day, arguably with greater intensity.

The messiness of the process may have disappointed those who would want a more rational process, and the limitations of the final product certainly disappointed some, as did the failure of the *List* to lead to a fuller sharing of resources through exchanges and cooperative collecting efforts. The *List* could not replace local lists, and could not list every specialized publication that might at some point be useful to research. It was the product of a pragmatism that crafted realistic solutions that pushed but did not exceed the limits of what was possible. The abstract claims of rationality and efficiency ultimately need to give way to reality, a reality that included both the resources available and differing goals of each cooperating party.

There are sufficient examples of failed projects to remind us of this; the history of the first *Union List of Serials* reminds us how complex the path to success can be.

The profession of librarianship has often been seen as limited by its lack of control over the production of the intellectual capital—the books and journals—that constitutes its claim to legitimacy, a limitation particularly acute in an era when many academic librarians did not even have control over what went into their collections. The consequent concentration on technique has been noted; Wayne Wiegand’s statement that the profession’s “members did not constitute a community of inquiry, but a community of methodists” comes to mind.³⁴¹ Certainly the limited control over intellectual capital is an important defining characteristic of the profession. Yet at the same time the *Union List of Serials* shows the profession going well beyond technique, important as that may be; after all, the compilation the *Union List* did depend upon the standardization of serials cataloging practices. What it also shows is the profession responding productively, creatively, and knowledgeably to effect a solution to the complex problems that were within its scope.

NOTES

- ¹ Gregory, *Union List of Serials* (1927).
- ² M. O. Young, 17; Drury, "Epoch-Making Union List," 14; "Editorial Notes," *Booklist*, 228.
- ³ Lydenberg et al., Preface to *Union List of Serials*, unpagged.
- ⁴ Bolton, *Catalogue of Scientific and Technical Periodicals* (1885); Bolton, *Catalogue of Scientific and Technical Periodicals* (1897).
- ⁵ Baird, iv.
- ⁶ Richardson to Andrews, 3 February 1913, in LCA.
- ⁷ For a bibliography of these union lists, see Daniel C. Haskell, 1581–1588.
- ⁸ "Code of Practice for Inter-library Loans," 27.
- ⁹ Quote from Wolf, 109. See also Charles H. Brown, "Review of Group Meetings," 13–14. For a history of these various projects, see Zubatsky, 123–141, 200–240, 267–276, 290–426. Until the so-called "Project B" began in 1927, the Library of Congress union catalog consisted primarily of that library's printed cards, and printed cards from those institutions exchanging cards with the Library of Congress, notably Harvard, Michigan, John Crerar, Illinois, and Chicago. The ALA publishing projects from the 1930s include Gregory, *List of Serial Publications of Foreign Governments*; Gregory, *American Newspapers*; Gregory, *International Congresses and Conferences*; American Library Association, Committee on Resources of American Libraries, *Resources of American Libraries*; Downs, *Resources of Southern Libraries*.
- ¹⁰ Veysey, *Emergence of the American University*, 21–56; Bledstein, 203–247; Rudolph, 44–240; Bestor, 9–12; Shils, 19–21.
- ¹¹ Kunoff, 1–28, 64–90; Ben-David, 19–24; Veysey, *Emergence of the American University*, 125–133.
- ¹² Veysey, *Emergence of the American University*, 121–179; Ben-David, 19–26, 59–67; Shils, 21–40.
- ¹³ Veysey, *Emergence of the American University*, 15, 57–380; Shiflett, 63–84; Ben-David, 24–26, 59–67, 78–87, 108–113; Ringer, 409–429; Hawkins, 285–303; Daniels, 1699–1705.
- ¹⁴ Geiger, 2; see also Shils, 37–40.
- ¹⁵ Geiger, 43–47; Barrow, 82–123.
- ¹⁶ Ben-David, 110.
- ¹⁷ Ogg, 17.
- ¹⁸ Klein, 1:659–660. See also, in a different field, Jernegan, 5–6, 10–12.
- ¹⁹ Ogg, 155–322.
- ²⁰ Geiger, 59–61; Rossiter, 211–248.
- ²¹ Ogg, 281–300; Rae, 258–266; Rothstein, 65.
- ²² Geiger, 142–149, 228–233.
- ²³ Shils, 22–26, quote 24–25. Also, see Kellogg, "The University and Research," 19–23.
- ²⁴ Charles Rosenberg, 448–449; Rae, 258–266.
- ²⁵ Shils, 19–21; Veysey, "Plural Organized Worlds," 51–106.
- ²⁶ United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States*, 1:762–773; Downs, "Growth of Research Collections," 55; a similar example of the libraries of Philadelphia is used by Bestor, 10–12.
- ²⁷ Shiflett, 26–32; Hamlin, 87–92; Eugene R. Hanson, 180–188; Canfield, 248.
- ²⁸ Edelman and Tatum, 34–41, 50–55; Dorn, 367.
- ²⁹ Works, 124A.
- ³⁰ Works, 3.
- ³¹ Klein, 1:654–659, quote 659.
- ³² Powell, 191. Powell's data are a bit overstated by choosing strong midwestern institutions such as Illinois and Michigan, while omitting weaker institutions such as Indiana and Ohio State.
- ³³ Charles W. Smith, "Early Years of PNLA," 70.
- ³⁴ Carlson, *Development and Financial Support*, iii, 59.
- ³⁵ Examples of several that have ceased to exist as independent entities in the intervening years include the John Crerar in Chicago, the Howard in New Orleans, the Peabody in Baltimore, and the Grosvenor in Buffalo.

- ³⁶ Dain, "Scholarship, Higher Education, and Libraries," 22–24.
- ³⁷ For such an enumeration, see Ogg, 362–383.
- ³⁸ Bishop, "Our College and University Libraries," 215, 217.
- ³⁹ Richardson, "Co-operation in Lending," 32.
- ⁴⁰ Richardson, *Union list of Collections*, unpagged preface.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*; American Library Association, Committee on Bibliography, "A Restatement of the A.L.A. Plan"; Gould, "Regional Libraries," 218–219; Works, 51–62; Zubatsky, 98–135; Wagner, 24–26, 31–52; Brough, 90–97.
- ⁴² Brough, 84–97; Bentinck-Smith, 105–109; Ford, 40–42.
- ⁴³ Thomas L. Haskell, *Emergence of Professional Social Science*, 18.
- ⁴⁴ Abbott, 222.
- ⁴⁵ On the growth of the professions, see Bledstein, 80–128; Haber, *Quest for Authority*, 193–358; Larson, *Rise of Professionalism*, 145–158. For an account emphasizing the rise of the scientific spirit and the ascendancy of the professoriat, see Kimball, 198–300.
- ⁴⁶ Hale, "Origin and Development of the Association," 33–34.
- ⁴⁷ Hale, "The College Library Section," 81–91; Shiflett, 167–212; "College Library Section" (1893), 90–91; "College and Reference Section" (1899), 156–157.
- ⁴⁸ Foreman, 69. The number aimed specifically at public libraries was 35.
- ⁴⁹ Wiegand, *Politics of an Emerging Profession*, passim, esp. 234–235.
- ⁵⁰ Wiegand "Library Politics," 133; Kaser, 219–221. Charles E. Hale, however, maintains that large library concerns dominated College and Reference Section discussions, in "Origin and Development of the Association," 51.
- ⁵¹ Wiegand, "Library Politics," 135–136; Wiegand, *Politics of an Emerging Profession*, 159–161.
- ⁵² "Reorganization of the College and Reference Section," 592.
- ⁵³ Pings, 2–6.
- ⁵⁴ "Code of practice for Inter-library Loans," 27. The language of clause (a) is lifted from an earlier policy statement of the Library of Congress, quoted in Bishop, "Inter-library Loans," 528.
- ⁵⁵ Stuart-Stubbs et al., 27–28, 34–35.
- ⁵⁶ "Code of practice for Inter-library Loans," 28, 27n.
- ⁵⁷ Bishop, "Inter-library Loans," 528–529.
- ⁵⁸ Lane, "Harvard College Library Rules," 67.
- ⁵⁹ M. O. Young, 21–22; Dickinson, "Golden Rule," 39.
- ⁶⁰ Charles W. Smith, "Vanishing Supply," 117–119. These restrictions are tied to gatekeeping functions by Geller, 131.
- ⁶¹ American Library Association, *Survey of Libraries*, 2:221.
- ⁶² Boyer, 114, 117–119. These figures may understate actual practice, since some of the 203 libraries responding to this survey as not lending were so small they had never received a request for a loan.
- ⁶³ Bostwick, *American Public Library*, 80.
- ⁶⁴ Boyer, 113.
- ⁶⁵ Leupp to Lydenberg, 19 January 1923, in NYPLA.
- ⁶⁶ M. O. Young, 23.
- ⁶⁷ Gillis, 99.
- ⁶⁸ Hollinger, 142–156.
- ⁶⁹ Marie L. Radford and Gary P. Radford, 254–259; Larson, "Production of Expertise," 28–80; Abbott, 52–57, 218–219; Bledstein, 86–99.
- ⁷⁰ Hawkins, 300–301; Harris, 434–436; Shils, 31–32; Hofstadter, 197–213.
- ⁷¹ Information on the early history of interlibrary loan can be found in Pings, passim; Stuart-Stubbs et al., 1–35; Zubatsky, 283–305; Luther, 297–316.
- ⁷² Hamlin, 212.
- ⁷³ Tweedell, 22–23.
- ⁷⁴ Winchell, 18.
- ⁷⁵ University of California, Berkeley, *University Library*, 1926/27, p. 5 and 1928/29, p. 6; Detroit Library Commission, *Annual Report*, 1926/27, p. 10; Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, *Annual Reports*, 1920, p. 59; New York Public Library, *Report*, 1933, p. 29. Also see Rhodes and Streeter, 159–160; Binkley, 71–79.

- ⁷⁶ Willison, 87.
- ⁷⁷ Jane Aikin Rosenberg, 66–68, 76–79; Wiegand “Library Politics,” 137–147; Brough, 134–136; Josephson, *Proposition for the Establishment of a Bibliographical Institute*; W. Dawson Johnston, 63–67; Lane, “Central Bureau of Information,” 429–433; Gould, “Regional Libraries,” 218–219; Gould, “Co-ordination,” 122–128; Bishop, “Inter-library Loans,” 530–532; “Symposium on Coördination or Affiliation of Libraries,” 103–108, 195–198. On Putnam’s style of management, see Jane Aiken Rosenberg, 26–27.
- ⁷⁸ Robert Kendall Shaw, 279. Quotation is from abstract of paper.
- ⁷⁹ For information on Putnam’s work, see Jane Aikin Rosenberg, *passim*; John Y. Cole, 18–25.
- ⁸⁰ Wagner, 40–41.
- ⁸¹ Higham, 14–15. The best summary of Wilson’s life and work is Lawler, *The H. W. Wilson Company*.
- ⁸² Thomas L. Haskell, “Professionalism *versus* Capitalism,” 180–225; Haber, *Efficiency and Uplift*, 75–98; Durkheim, 1–41; Lippmann, 27–49.
- ⁸³ Galambos, “Emerging Organizational Synthesis,” 279–290; Haber, *Efficiency and Uplift*, 51–74; Larson, *Rise of Professionalism*, 136–158; Hays, 1–15; Parsons, 34–49. On the interest in efficiency in librarianship, see Casey, 265–279.
- ⁸⁴ Hawley, 45–55, 66–71, 80–104; Sealander, 18–42; Galambos, *Public Image of Big Business*, 191–221; Link, 843–844; Nelson and Campbell, 1–16; Nardini, 121–128.
- ⁸⁵ H. W. Wilson to J. C. M. Hanson, 10 December 1921, in UCLR.
- ⁸⁶ Sealander, 177. It is also true that the traditional notion of the “self-made man,” heavily influenced as it was by the protestant ethic, emphasized moral character as an attribute, and morality and social responsibility as, in essence, a divine requirement. Wyllie, 75–93.
- ⁸⁷ Haber, *Efficiency and Uplift*, 55–59.
- ⁸⁸ Weber, 54. Weber was, of course, also concerned with the way in which the notion had become stripped of its religious bearings in modern times. However, in the case of explaining the motivations of such businessmen as Wilson, the religious origin Weber posits for the professional, or indeed, the “missionary” spirit, may still be a useful concept.
- ⁸⁹ Quoted in Lawler, 139.
- ⁹⁰ Miles O. Price and Fannie E. Price, 101.
- ⁹¹ For another notable example of Wilson’s pursuit of a goal without reference to profit, see McGowan, 119–130.
- ⁹² Peet, 26.
- ⁹³ Marchand, *Creating the Corporate Soul*, 134, 164–201.
- ⁹⁴ Schumpeter, 57–94, especially 90–94; quotes 93. Wilson perhaps does not fit other of Schumpeter’s characteristics, particularly the separation of risk-taker or capitalist from entrepreneur. However, Schumpeter notes that in the case of the small enterprise the figure of entrepreneur and capitalist may in fact be combined (p. 77). It may also be worth noting that the printing and publishing industry was largely resistant to the trends in integration and centralization common at that time, benefiting as it did little from economies of scale or newer methods of marketing, and thus was much more open to small enterprises and traditional entrepreneurs. Chandler, 337–339, 346–348, 364. On the “missionary spirit,” see Garrison, 36–63; Nardini, 117–118; Hodgson, 532–534. I don’t want to minimize the part that social control played among the “deeper values” represented by efficiency—Wilson, though a generous employer by the standards of his day, could be as paternalistic as Henry Ford or John H. Patterson. But I’m not sure that it is especially relevant to his relationship with the library community, unless it is reflected in the persistence with which he pursued his objectives.
- ⁹⁵ Arthur H. Cole, 9.
- ⁹⁶ “Wilson Company Subscription Rates,” 14–19; Lawler, 115–135; McGowan, 88–98.
- ⁹⁷ Miles O. Price and Fannie E. Price, 79–140. The report did question the fairness of the practice, particularly as applied to the *Cumulative Book Index*, where pricing was determined by book budget, and remained so as long as that publication existed.
- ⁹⁸ Abbott, 1–3, 35–85, 150–157.
- ⁹⁹ These projects included the incorporation of the successor publications to the *Coöperative Index to Periodicals* and the ALA analytics on cards into the *Readers’ Guide* and the *International Index*, Wilson’s role in publishing the *Union List of Serials* (which at one

- point had been seen as purely a cooperative project), the continuation of the *ALA Index to General Literature* as the *Essay and General Literature Index* (1931), and the continuation of the cooperatively-produced *Library Literature* (1936).
- ¹⁰⁰ Wheeler to Miller, 11 May 1928, in ALAA.
- ¹⁰¹ Louis N. Wilson to Lydenberg, 6 August 1923, in NYPLA.
- ¹⁰² Quote from Drury, "Epoch-Making Union List," 14. See also Levine, 45–67; Hawley, 80–99; Haber, *Efficiency and Uplift*, 155–159.
- ¹⁰³ "A.L.A. Publishing Board" (1913), 6.
- ¹⁰⁴ Richardson to Andrews, 3 February 1913, in LCA.
- ¹⁰⁵ On Richardson's work, see Zubatsky, 98–113, 162–178, 200–212; Putnam, "Project B," 105–115; and Branscomb, 37–55.
- ¹⁰⁶ Several variant names appear for the committee in the ALA literature of the period. After 1914 it seems to have reported to Council rather than to the Publishing Board. Andrews, "Report" (1914), 187; "Special Committees, 1914–15," 428.
- ¹⁰⁷ Chicago Library Club, comp., *List of Serials*; John Crerar Library, *Supplement to the List of Serials* (1903); Andrews, ed., *Supplement to the List of Serials* (1906).
- ¹⁰⁸ On Bostwick's interest in efficiency, see Casey, 269–270; Nardini, 128.
- ¹⁰⁹ Andrews to Richardson, 11 February 1913; Richardson to Andrews, 13 February 1913; both in LCA. Windsor to H. W. Wilson, 22 January 1912, quoted in H. W. Wilson Co., "Union List of Serials, 1912–1921," 30 September 1938, exhibit in AEBM 10:173. On subscription publishing, see Tebbel, *Expansion of an Industry*, 511–534; and Tebbel, *Golden Age between Two Wars*, 256–259.
- ¹¹⁰ Richardson to Andrews, 13 February 1913, in LCA.
- ¹¹¹ Richardson, "University Library Co-operation," 27–39, esp. 38.
- ¹¹² Putnam to Andrews, 20 February 1913; Andrews to Putnam, 17 February 1913; both in JCLR.
- ¹¹³ Putnam, draft of letter to Richardson, [1913], in LCA. I have not located a final copy of this letter. In fairness to Putnam, Richardson at times had a way of proceeding with "impetuous assurance" and interpreting a difference of opinion as opposition.
- ¹¹⁴ Andrews to Putnam, 25 February 1913, in JCLR.
- ¹¹⁵ Andrews to Putnam, 2 April 1913, in JCLR.
- ¹¹⁶ Putnam to Andrews, 26 March 1913, in JCLR; Jane Aiken Rosenberg, 82–83.
- ¹¹⁷ Putnam to Andrews, 4 December 1913, in JCLR.
- ¹¹⁸ "Council" (1914), 18. I have not been able to locate a copy of Putnam's letter of inquiry, but have inferred its contents from the Council minutes and from Andrews to Putnam, 13 February 1914, in JCLR.
- ¹¹⁹ Putnam to Andrews, 13 February 1914; Slade to Putnam, 26 February 1914; both in LCA. The final *Union List*, produced a decade later, totaled 75,000 titles. It did, however, contain some annuals. J. David Thompson of the National Research Council placed the estimate as high as 100,000–150,000 if everything contemplated at that time would in fact be included. Thompson to H. W. Wilson, 7 July 1922, in NYPLA.
- ¹²⁰ Andrews, "Report" (1914), 187.
- ¹²¹ "A.L.A. Publishing Board" (1915), 13.
- ¹²² Putnam to Andrews, 20 October 1915, in LCA.
- ¹²³ Andrews to Putnam, 18 October 1915, in LCA.
- ¹²⁴ Andrews, "Report" (1916), 44.
- ¹²⁵ Andrews to Putnam, 8 January 1916; Putnam to Andrews, 10 January 1916; both in LCA.
- ¹²⁶ Jane Aiken Rosenberg, 83–84.
- ¹²⁷ Andrews to Putnam, 9 February 1916, in JCLR. Bolton included serial titles in anthropology, psychology, geography, and commerce and industry, but not titles in areas such as political science, sociology, and (for the most part) economics. Some general titles (particularly from the early nineteenth century and before) are listed, presumably because they routinely included reports of scientific research.
- ¹²⁸ Veysey, "Plural Organized Worlds," 53–54.
- ¹²⁹ The lists are the British *World List of Scientific Periodicals*; Lomer and Mackay, *Catalogue*

- of *Scientific Periodicals in Canadian Libraries*; and Lacroix and Bultingaire, *Inventaire de périodiques scientifiques des bibliothèques des Paris*.
- ¹³⁰ "Council" (1916), 390.
- ¹³¹ Windsor to J. C. M. Hanson, 18 October 1911, in UCLR.
- ¹³² Jane Aikin Rosenberg, 82. Rosenberg finds some evidence that the Midwest College Librarians had discussed the project as early as 1910, but Windsor's 1911 memorandum suggests that the topic was first seriously discussed in 1911, and in any case Windsor did not make inquiries of Putnam until late in 1911.
- ¹³³ Windsor to H. W. Wilson, 22 January 1912, quoted in H. W. Wilson Co., "Union List of Serials, 1912–1921," in AEBM 10:173.
- ¹³⁴ H. W. Wilson Co., "Union List of Serials, 1912–1921," in AEBM 10:173–174; Lawler, 72–73.
- ¹³⁵ Quote from Lydenberg et al., Preface to *Union List of Serials*, unpagged; Malcolm G. Wyer to Lydenberg, 18 July 1927, in NYPLA.
- ¹³⁶ Rovelstad, Preface to *Union List of Serials*, unpagged; Rovelstad, *Final Report*, 1.
- ¹³⁷ H. W. Wilson Co., "Union List of Serials, 1912–1921," in AEBM 10:173–174; Lawler, 72–73.
- ¹³⁸ "Development of the Plan," in *National Union List of Serials*, checking ed., section 1, unpagged.
- ¹³⁹ Malcolm G. Wyer, Drury, and Austen, circular letter "University Librarians of the Middle West," 30 December 1916, in UIA.
- ¹⁴⁰ H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 20 October 1927; H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 12 December 1927; both in NYPLA.
- ¹⁴¹ Levine, 23–32; see also Geiger, 101–107, and Barrow, 124–138. It is of course possible to overemphasize the impact of the war on enrollment growth; David K. Brown's persuasive analysis of the growth of enrollment makes little or no mention of the war, seeing simply a continuing tendency of business and government to hire from the ranks of college graduates for the most desirable positions. David K. Brown, *passim*.
- ¹⁴² Jarausch, "Higher Education and Social Change," 16; Burke, 108–130; Levine, 115–119. According to one estimate, the percentage of college-age white youths attending college rose from 5.6% in 1910 to 15% in 1928, doubling in absolute numbers in the decade following World War I. Burke, 111.
- ¹⁴³ Geiger, 94–101; Rae, 264–266; Noble, 150–166; Barrow, 138–153.
- ¹⁴⁴ Hofstadter, 213; Hawley, 156–160.
- ¹⁴⁵ Kohler, 135–164; Geiger, 140–173.
- ¹⁴⁶ Geiger, 214.
- ¹⁴⁷ Data collected from fourteen institutions by George Works show that on average library budgets in 1925 were 243% of what they were in 1919 (the average is my calculation). In the great majority of these institutions the 1919 figure was higher than in the immediate pre-war years. Works, 122A–122B.
- ¹⁴⁸ Arthur P. Young, "Aftermath of a Crusade," 191–193. On the war experience, see Arthur P. Young, *Books for Sammies*, esp. 96–99; and Kelly, 378–388.
- ¹⁴⁹ Hale, "Origin and Development of the Association," 72–84.
- ¹⁵⁰ Ring, 263–264; Edward G. Holley, 12–15; Thomison, 63–86; Sullivan, 88–91; Zubatsky, 94–98; Arthur P. Young, *Aftermath of a Crusade*, 204–205.
- ¹⁵¹ Andrews, "Report" (1917), 337–338.
- ¹⁵² Barr, 303.
- ¹⁵³ Jane Aiken Rosenberg, 83–84, 91–98.
- ¹⁵⁴ H. W. Wilson Co., "Union List of Serials, 1912–1921," in AEBM 10:173, quotes from the contract but gives no date; Lawler (p. 73) gives the summer of 1917 as the date when the project was finally begun.
- ¹⁵⁵ For details on Peterson, see Malcolm G. Wyer, "Mr. Peterson's Devotion," 404–407.
- ¹⁵⁶ Andrews to Bishop, 30 March 1918 and 4 April 1918; Bishop to Andrews, 8 April 1918; Bishop to Ranck, 15 April 1918; Rank to Bishop, 18 April 1918; "University of Michigan: General Library Subscribers to the Union List of Periodicals," undated typescript (probably 1918); all in UMLR.
- ¹⁵⁷ Lawler, 73.

- 158 "Council" (1920), 321; Hicks, 49.
- 159 Bishop to Windsor, 22 November 1920, in UIA.
- 160 Quote from Andrews to Windsor, 14 December 1920, in UIA; Lawler, 73; "Development of the Plan," in *National Union List of Serials*, checking ed., section 1, unpagged.
- 161 Zubatsky, 252–253; Hicks, 46–47, 50.
- 162 Andrews, "Report" (1917), 337–338; "Development of the Plan," in *National Union List of Serials*, checking ed., section 1, unpagged; "Agricultural Library Section," 374. Several of these lists were published: David Eugene Smith and Caroline Eustis Seely, *Union List of Mathematical Periodicals* (1918); Thomas Johnston Homer and Edith Loud Shufelt, *A Guide to Serial Publications Founded Prior to 1918 and Now or Recently Current in Boston, Cambridge, and Vicinity* (1922–1956); Drury, *Technical and Scientific Serials in the Libraries of Providence, 1920*.
- 163 H. M. Lydenberg et al., Preface to *Union List of Serials*, unpagged.
- 164 Lipman to Meyer, 16 August 1922; Meyer to Lipman, 10 October 1922; both in LCA.
- 165 H. W. Wilson Co., "Union List of Periodicals," unpagged pamphlet, [1921].
- 166 "New Committees," 39.
- 167 Metcalf, "Six Influential Academic and Research Librarians," 135. A good overview of Lydenberg's work is Dain, "Harry M. Lydenberg," 451–469. On geographic location as a reason for Lydenberg's chairmanship, see Lydenberg to Jennings, 28 August 1923, in NYPLA.
- 168 H. W. Wilson, "Suggestions for National Union List Serials," typescript, [1922], in NYPLA.
- 169 Lydenberg to the Members of the ALA Committee on a Union List of Periodicals, [1922], in NYPLA. Hereafter "Committee" will be used without further specification when a letter is addressed to this committee.
- 170 H. W. Wilson, "Suggestions for National Union List Serials," [1922]; Bishop to H. W. Wilson, 10 January 1922; both in NYPLA.
- 171 Lydenberg to Committee, [1922], in NYPLA.
- 172 Austen to Lydenberg, 7 April 1922, in NYPLA.
- 173 Bostwick to Lydenberg, 7 April 1922, in NYPLA.
- 174 Lydenberg to Committee, [1922], in NYPLA.
- 175 Lydenberg to Committee, 4 May 1922; Lydenberg to Bostwick, 19 April 1922; H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 17 April 1922; all in NYPLA.
- 176 H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 23 September 1924, in PLR.
- 177 Andrews to Lydenberg, 24 May 1922, in NYPLA.
- 178 Bostwick to Lydenberg, 18 May 1922, in NYPLA.
- 179 Draft of letter to subscribers, 1922. This draft actually allowed for the sale of copies by subscribers, but this practice was later strongly discouraged; see, for example, H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 30 March 1923 and 7 August 1923, or Lydenberg to Leete, 30 June 1923. The committee, however, lacked the legal authority to disallow the practice; see Lydenberg to Libraries contributing to the Union List, 29 July 1927. All in NYPLA.
- 180 Extra copies of this packet can still be found in NYPLA.
- 181 Austen to Lydenberg, 6 December 1922, in NYPLA.
- 182 Lydenberg to Bostwick, 2 December 1922, in NYPLA.
- 183 Lydenberg to Louis R. Wilson, 14 June 1923, in NYPLA.
- 184 Quoted in Gilchrist, "Memo on the Union List of Serials Proposed Second Edition," presented to the ALA Committee on the *Union List of Serials*, 9 September 1938, exhibit in AEBM 10:165.
- 185 Austen to Lydenberg, 26 February 1923 and 22 February 1923, both in NYPLA.
- 186 Works, 45.
- 187 Karl Brown, 657. The Southern California list was a second edition of an earlier 1925 list.
- 188 Higham, 13–14.
- 189 Lydenberg to Perry, 20 June 1923, in NYPLA.
- 190 Hollingsworth, 277. On the Los Angeles Public Library and the Southern California list, see Los Angeles Public Library, *Annual Report*, 1925/26, pp. 19–20.
- 191 Bishop to H. W. Wilson, 10 January 1922; Bostwick to Lydenberg, 7 April 1922; Lydenberg

- to Bostwick, 11 April 1922; all letters in NYPLA. A similar suggestion was offered by H. H. B. Meyer of the Library of Congress, in a document called "A Union Catalogue of Serials," in LCA.
- ¹⁹² Kofoid to Lydenberg, 2 March 1923; Thompson to H. W. Wilson, 7 July 1922; both letters in NYPLA.
- ¹⁹³ "Comments from Letters," typescript, 10 March 1922, in NYPLA.
- ¹⁹⁴ McHugh, 143–149; quote from J. I. Wyer to Lydenberg, 18 June 1926, in NYPLA.
- ¹⁹⁵ Hollingsworth, 278. Strictly speaking this is not true; the 1914 *Gesamt-Zeitschriften-Verzeichnis* does list popular periodicals to the extent that they were held in German libraries. However, such titles were much less evident in the collections listed there.
- ¹⁹⁶ On the issue of the breadth of collection in American research libraries, see Danton, 28–29, 105–112.
- ¹⁹⁷ Lydenberg to Livingston, 16 May 1923, in NYPLA.
- ¹⁹⁸ Lydenberg to Kofoid, 8 March 1923, in NYPLA; Lydenberg enclosed a copy of his earlier letter to Kofoid with his letter to Livingston, 16 May 1923.
- ¹⁹⁹ Lydenberg to Bostwick, 11 April 1922, in NYPLA.
- ²⁰⁰ Munthe, 6; Charles W. Smith, "Vanishing Supply," 117. See also Works, 36–41, 51–62; Bishop, "Record of Science," 289–292.
- ²⁰¹ Lydenberg's letters to libraries are far too voluminous to cite individually; one good example is Lydenberg to Hepburn, 20 June 1923. The quotation is from Lydenberg to J. I. Wyer, 9 May 1923. See also Lydenberg to Committee, 24 February 1923. All letters in NYPLA.
- ²⁰² Lydenberg et al., "Union List of Periodicals" (1923), 204–205; Bostwick to Lydenberg, 23 February 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²⁰³ Lydenberg to Livingston, 3 May 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²⁰⁴ Lydenberg to Douglass, 18 July 1923; see also Lydenberg to Louis R. Wilson, 14 June 1923; both in NYPLA.
- ²⁰⁵ Gerould to J. C. M. Hanson, 11 April 1923, in UCLR.
- ²⁰⁶ For example, Gerould to J. C. M. Hanson, 11 April 1923, in UCLR; Gerould's correspondence is discussed in Gerould to H. W. Wilson, 17 April 1923, in PLR. Also, see Lydenberg to Committee, 24 February 1923; Bishop to Lydenberg, 24 January 1923; Lydenberg to Bishop, 27 January 1923; and Lydenberg to Andrews, 5 March 1923; all in NYPLA. In the last Lydenberg calls on Andrews to assist with the Newberry Library and the University of Chicago.
- ²⁰⁷ Lydenberg to Livingston, 28 May 1923; for the letter see Livingston to Lydenberg, 7 June 1923; both in NYPLA.
- ²⁰⁸ Lydenberg to Rush, 30 June 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²⁰⁹ Lydenberg to Karlake, 4 June 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²¹⁰ Burnet to Livingston, 23 August 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²¹¹ J. C. M. Hanson to Gerould, 13 April 1923, in UCLR.
- ²¹² Wilder to National Union List of Serials, 3 November 1925; Raney to H. W. Wilson, 11 December 1922 and 4 January 1923 (contents of second letter from notes supplied by Kenneth Carpenter); Louis R. Wilson to Gerould, 8 June 1923; H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 1400+1400+7 May 1923 (Jones paraphrased in this letter); J. I. Wyer to Gerould, 4 May 1923; Lydenberg to Ranck, 21 August 1923; all in NYPLA. On the role of faculty in building library collections, see Danton, 61–82; Shiflett, 229–236.
- ²¹³ Manchester to Lydenberg, 12 August 1925, in NYPLA. The other AAU institutions not among the guarantors were the Catholic University of America, Clark University, Indiana University, and the University of Virginia. Certain AAU institutions were part of group subscriptions (Iowa, Wisconsin). Indiana and Catholic did contribute holdings under other arrangements.
- ²¹⁴ H. W. Wilson to Gerould, 19 April 1923, in PLR. Lydenberg et al., "Union List of Periodicals" (1923), 205. "Guarantors of the Union List of Serials April 10 1923," typescript (this document has the six libraries that pledged at the 1923 ALA conference penciled in at the bottom); Leupp to Lydenberg, 19 January 1923; quote from Lydenberg to Bishop, 27 January 1923; all three in NYPLA.
- ²¹⁵ "List of Subscribers to the Union List," typescript, [April 1924]; "Union List Subscribers as

- of May 29 1925," typescript, May 1925; Locke to Lydenberg, 13 November 1924; Wellman to Lydenberg, 28 May 1923; Committee, Minutes, 2 January 1925; Andrews to Lydenberg, 15 January 1925; all in NYPLA. The Pacific Northwest group comprised libraries in Oregon, Idaho, and Montana. The University of Wisconsin is on the 1924 list as a subscriber, but in 1925 appears as part of a Madison group.
- ²¹⁶ H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 31 May 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²¹⁷ Godard to Lydenberg, 12 June 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²¹⁸ Lydenberg to Lane, 30 August 1924, in PLR.
- ²¹⁹ "Union List Subscribers as of May 29 1925"; "List of Subscribers to the Union List," [April 1924]; Lydenberg to Burnham, 23 July 1924; H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 8 December 1925; H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 7 August 1923; all in NYPLA. H. W. Wilson to Gerould, 10 October 1923, in PLR. A \$200 subscription was also allowed to the Illinois State Library.
- ²²⁰ Quote from Lydenberg to Jennings, 28 August 1923; also, Lydenberg to H. W. Wilson, 5 April 1923; Lydenberg to Bishop, 27 January 1923; draft of letter, Lydenberg to Kellogg, [May 1923]; Gerould to Lydenberg, 9 May 1923; all in NYPLA. Lydenberg to Gerould, 3 January 1923, in PLR.
- ²²¹ Lydenberg to Jennings, 28 August 1923; Keogh to Lydenberg, 14 September 1923; Lydenberg to Keogh, 25 July 1923; Jennings to Ruml, 4 September 1925; Jennings to Lydenberg, 4 September 1923; Jennings to Bogle, 17 September 1923; Gerould to Jennings, 13 September 1923; Gerould to Jennings, 28 September 1923; Anderson to Jennings, 6 October 1923; Jennings to Gerould, 12 October 1923; Jennings to Anderson, 12 October 1923 (Jennings quote from this letter); Bogle to Jennings, 21 September 1923; all in NYPLA. On ALA's work with the Carnegie Corporation, see Sullivan, 147–158 and Nancy Becker Johnson, 422–436. Gerould certainly could be stubborn; William Warner Bishop once complained, "no one can tell him anything." Bishop to Keppel, 6 July 1932, quoted in Neil A. Radford, *Carnegie Corporation*, 143.
- ²²² Lydenberg to Gerould, 22 November 1927, in NYPLA.
- ²²³ Lydenberg to Keogh, 25 July 1923; Keogh to Lydenberg, 14 September 1923; both in NYPLA.
- ²²⁴ Lydenberg to Jennings, 28 August 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²²⁵ Coolidge to Lydenberg, 12 September 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²²⁶ Lydenberg to Keogh, 15 September 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²²⁷ H. W. Wilson to Gerould, 20 September 1923; H. W. Wilson to Gerould, 10 October 1923; Gerould to H. W. Wilson, 24 October 1923; Gerould to H. W. Wilson, 14 November 1923; all in PLR. Lydenberg to Committee, 12 September 1923, in NYPLA. Gerould, "A.L.A. National Union Serials List Assured," 1062. H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 12 January 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²²⁸ H. W. Wilson to Gerould, 13 November 1923; Gerould to H. W. Wilson, 30 November 1923; both in PLR.
- ²²⁹ Gregory, *Bibliography of Minnesota Mining*; Gregory, "Improvement of the Upper Mississippi."
- ²³⁰ Rovelstad, *Final Report*, 13. For more on Gregory's role, see McHugh, 156–162.
- ²³¹ "Committee Rulings Needed. Checking Edition," typescript, [December 1924], in NYPLA. McHugh, 62–63.
- ²³² Bishop to H. W. Wilson, 10 January 1922, in NYPLA.
- ²³³ Lydenberg to H. W. Wilson, 14 February 1925; H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 16 February 1925; both in NYPLA.
- ²³⁴ Malcolm G. Wyer to Lydenberg, 10 November 1925; Lydenberg to Malcolm G. Wyer, 14 November 1925; both in NYPLA.
- ²³⁵ Gerould to subscribers to the *Union List of Serials*, 11 March 1924, in NYPLA. Gerould to Lydenberg, 16 June 1924 (includes first quote); Gerould to Lydenberg, 14 July 1924 (includes second quote); both in PLR.
- ²³⁶ H. W. Wilson to Gerould, 16 April 1924, in PLR.
- ²³⁷ H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 25 November 1924, in NYPLA; "Union List of Serials Expense

- Accrued and Estimate of Cost to Complete Final Edition," 1 June 1927, in PLR. The actual figures are \$59,606.30 and \$7,259.25. Most individual sales occurred after publication; the same document shows \$10,304.26 due from subscribers upon publication.
- ²³⁸ Leach to H. W. Wilson Company, 8 July 1925, in NYPLA.
- ²³⁹ Lydenberg to Dickinson, 19 June 1924; Dickinson to Lydenberg, 24 June 1924; both in NYPLA.
- ²⁴⁰ Lydenberg to Brownne, 16 June 1924, in NYPLA; Lydenberg to Gerould, 9 July 1924, in PLR; Gerould to Lydenberg, 8 October 1925, in NYPLA.
- ²⁴¹ Walter to H. W. Wilson, 17 September 1924; Lydenberg to Walter, 24 September 1924; both in PLR.
- ²⁴² Frankenberger to H. W. Wilson, 15 June 1925; Lydenberg to H. W. Wilson, 17 June 1925; Gerould to Lydenberg, 8 October 1925; all in NYPLA.
- ²⁴³ Brigham to Lydenberg, 15 February 1926; Gregory to Lydenberg, 19 February 1926; Lydenberg to Brigham, 24 March 1926; all in NYPLA.
- ²⁴⁴ Gregory to Lydenberg, 11 February 1927; Lydenberg to Gregory, 15 February 1927; both in NYPLA.
- ²⁴⁵ Gregory, Introduction to *Union List of Serials* (1927), unpagged. Also mentioned were many titles on music at the Library of Congress, the collection of the Day Mission Library at Yale, and Columbia University's collection of periodicals on anarchy.
- ²⁴⁶ Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, *Permanent Program*, 6–7.
- ²⁴⁷ Quote from Gregory to Lydenberg, 24 March 1926; also, H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 4 December 1925; Gregory to Lydenberg, 19 February 1926; Lydenberg to J. I. Wyer, 19 June 1926; all in NYPLA.
- ²⁴⁸ H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 12 August 1931, in NYPLA.
- ²⁴⁹ Lydenberg to H. W. Wilson, 13 August 1931, in NYPLA.
- ²⁵⁰ Lydenberg to Bostwick, 2 November 1929, in NYPLA.
- ²⁵¹ Lydenberg to Andrews, 24 February 1923; Lydenberg to Keogh, 25 July 1923; both in NYPLA.
- ²⁵² Lydenberg to Livingston, 16 May 1923, in NYPLA; Chase to Currier, 19 August 1924, in HUA.
- ²⁵³ Bentinck-Smith, 24–34; Brough, 165; Byrnes, 116–119.
- ²⁵⁴ Lane to H. W. Wilson Co., 29 February 1924, in PLR; Lane to Gerould, 18 March 1924, in NYPLA; quote from Lydenberg to Livingston, 21 August 1924, in NYPLA. It is not clear why Lane emerges at this time as the primary figure dealing with *Union List* matters at Harvard. Perhaps Coolidge felt he had nothing further to contribute at the time, or perhaps he was absent.
- ²⁵⁵ Lane to Lydenberg, 3 April 1924; Lydenberg to Lowell, 7 April 1924 (includes Lydenberg quote); Lydenberg to Lowell, 4 August 1924; Lydenberg to Andrews, 5 August 1924; Andrews to Lydenberg, 15 August 1924; Coolidge to Lydenberg, 13 August 1924; all in NYPLA. Lowell to Coolidge, 16 April 1924, in HUA. Coolidge's strong aversion to fundraising is noted in Winship, 162.
- ²⁵⁶ Currier to Lydenberg, 1 August 1924, in NYPLA.
- ²⁵⁷ Lydenberg to Andrews, 5 August 1924, in NYPLA.
- ²⁵⁸ Lydenberg to Andrews, 20 August 1924, in NYPLA.
- ²⁵⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁶⁰ Lydenberg to Marvin, 27 August 1924; Marvin to Lowell, 2 September 1924; Lowell to Marvin, 4 September 1924; all in NYPLA. Lowell to Coolidge, 4 September 1924, in HUA.
- ²⁶¹ Coolidge to Lowell, 10 April 1924 and 11 September 1924, both in HUA. Quote from first letter. For a sympathetic view of Coolidge's role, see Byrnes, 121; Bentinck-Smith, 154; and Currier, "A Sheaf of Memories," 169–170.
- ²⁶² Lydenberg to Marvin, 2 December 1924; Lydenberg to Perkins, 6 May 1925; Lydenberg to Coolidge, 15 May 1925; all in NYPLA. Coolidge to Munn, 21 May 1925, in HUA. The three donors initially approached were Munn, Norton Perkins, and Charles Chauncey Stillman. A news item in the *Harvard Library Notes* credits Munn, Stillman, and J. P. Morgan. Untitled

- note, *Harvard Library Notes*, 154. Perkins is doubtless not listed by *Harvard Library Notes* because of his death in the year following the initial contribution; see Lane to Lydenberg, 25 May 1926, in NYPLA.
- ²⁶³ Lydenberg to Gregory, 15 September 1925; Gregory to Lydenberg, 14 September 1925; both in NYPLA.
- ²⁶⁴ Metcalf, *My Harvard Years*, 38. In fairness, it may also be noted that Metcalf, unlike Coolidge, was able to obtain Carnegie Corporation money for the project.
- ²⁶⁵ Though records of hours worked exist in HUA, they are cryptic. One record of twenty-seven hours for "research work" on the letter "C" does not seem to have included the work of actually checking that letter. During the week of October 24, 1925, twenty-three and a quarter hours were spent checking twenty-three pages of the provisional edition and thirty-five trays of the shelf list. A detailed handwritten log notes various decisions and complications; Currier for example decided that titles under "Great Britain," "Handbook," and "Handbuch" (notes on February 10 and February 20, 1926) be "omitted in selecting" (presumably not examined to identify additional titles lacking from the provisional edition). Given the exclusion of much of this material from the *List*, these seem reasonable decisions. On November 4, 1926, is found the note: "Mr. Currier, Miss Wilde and Miss Adams had a conference today concerning titles that MH [Harvard College Library] has but that do not get into the list because they are not catalogued as in the list. Mr. Currier suggests that with the completion of each letter Miss Adams scan the list for titles that Harvard should have and that she look in every possible place for a record of holdings. Use the public catalogue for subject headings etc." A note on June 6, 1927, acknowledges the receipt of a complaint from Gregory of the exclusion of annual reports from Harvard's checking, a lack doubtless stemming from Currier's dissatisfaction on the vagueness of the guidelines concerning which of these to include. See Lydenberg to Currier, 24 September 1925, in NYPLA; Gregory to Currier, 6 October 1925, in HUA.
- ²⁶⁶ Untitled note, *Harvard Library Notes*, 155.
- ²⁶⁷ McHugh, 168–183; quote from Wilson to Lydenberg, 30 March 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²⁶⁸ McHugh, 64–67, 76–89; also, Gerould to Lydenberg, 27 August 1924, in NYPLA; Lydenberg to Committee, 22 May 1925, in PLR.
- ²⁶⁹ McHugh, 64–65, 69–71; "Explanations," in *National Union List of Serials*, checking ed., section 1, unpagged; Gregory to Lydenberg, 22 December 1924, in NYPLA. In part Gregory was objecting to publications such as publisher's series that are not useful to consider as serials, but her objection also seems more general.
- ²⁷⁰ McHugh, 70–71.
- ²⁷¹ Gregory to Lydenberg, 24 February 1926, in NYPLA; Lydenberg, "Union List of Serials: Last Call," 492; McHugh, 103–105.
- ²⁷² Committee, Minutes, 2 January 1925, in NYPLA; "Explanations," in Gregory, *Union List of Serials*, provisional ed. A, back cover; McHugh, 77–79.
- ²⁷³ Gerould to Gregory, 29 January 1925, in PLR. Currier to Lydenberg, 12 September 1925; Lydenberg to Currier, 24 September 1925; both in NYPLA.
- ²⁷⁴ Gerould to Gregory, 7 December 1926, in PLR.
- ²⁷⁵ McHugh, 81–89; Barnett to Green, 17 May 1924, in NYPLA.
- ²⁷⁶ Bostwick to Lydenberg, 15 April 1924, in NYPLA; Bostwick, "Librarian as Censor," 262. See also Geller, 79–90, and Cunningham, 59–60. It was of course always easier to justify the inclusion of questionable materials in research collections, a point even Bostwick acknowledged. But the influence of the collecting interests at the New York Public Library may also account for the difference in perspective; Phyllis Dain quotes an unspecified librarian noting that, from the 1910s and 1920s forward, that library began actively collecting materials that "might be called trash," i.e., popular culture materials not then widely collected. Dain, *The New York Public Library*, 37.
- ²⁷⁷ Coddington to Walter M. Smith, 16 June 1925; Lydenberg to Walter M. Smith, 22 June 1925; both in PLR.
- ²⁷⁸ Milam to Lydenberg, 26 July 1927; Malcolm G. Wyer to Lydenberg, 18 July 1927; Lydenberg to Gregory, 20 September 1927; all in NYPLA. Lydenberg to Committee, 24 August 1927 and 29 August 1927, both in PLR. Quote from August 29 letter.
- ²⁷⁹ Haycraft, 55.

- ²⁸⁰ H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 20 October 1927, in NYPLA.
- ²⁸¹ Lydenberg to H. W. Wilson, 22 October 1927, in NYPLA.
- ²⁸² H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 24 October 1927, in NYPLA.
- ²⁸³ Gregory to Lydenberg, 27 October 1927, copy in PLR.
- ²⁸⁴ Lydenberg to H. W. Wilson, 3 November 1927, in NYPLA.
- ²⁸⁵ Lydenberg to Tower, 5 November 1925, in NYPLA. Another example is in Lydenberg to Lane, 30 August 1924, in PLR, where he states, "The Wilson Company acts as our agent in this enterprise and we do not act as a representative of the Wilson Company."
- ²⁸⁶ Lydenberg to H. W. Wilson, 3 November 1927, in NYPLA.
- ²⁸⁷ H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 17 November 1927, in NYPLA.
- ²⁸⁸ Gregory to Lydenberg, 21 November 1927, in NYPLA.
- ²⁸⁹ For example, H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 30 March 1923, in NYPLA.
- ²⁹⁰ Miles O. Price and Fannie E. Price, 83, 112n.
- ²⁹¹ Lydenberg to H. W. Wilson, 1 December 1927, in NYPLA.
- ²⁹² H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 12 December 1927, in NYPLA.
- ²⁹³ H. M. Lydenberg et al., Preface to *Union List of Serials*, unpagged.
- ²⁹⁴ Lydenberg to Gerould, 22 November 1927; H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 3 May 1928; Gregory to Lydenberg, 21 October 1927; H. W. Wilson to Gerould, 16 November 1927; all in NYPLA. Quote from Lydenberg to Gerould, 18 November 1927, in PLR. McHugh, 204–208.
- ²⁹⁵ Lydenberg to Milam, 16 December 1930, in NYPLA.
- ²⁹⁶ Currier to H. W. Wilson, 14 January 1928, in HUA.
- ²⁹⁷ Charles W. Smith, "Periodicals and Future Scholarship," 229; Drury, "Epoch-Making Union List," 14–16.
- ²⁹⁸ University of Michigan, "The General Library," 1928/29, pp. 185–186; White, 31–35; Winchell, 18; Freeman, 270. See also Boyer, 130, 134. Interpretation of interlibrary loan statistics from the period is problematic, since they typically do not include reproductions of articles through Photostat, but only actual loans.
- ²⁹⁹ Quote from Lydenberg to Esdaile, 19 June 1928, in NYPLA; Lydenberg et al., "Union List of Periodicals" (1929), 143–144; McHugh, 224–228; "Union List of Serials: Income and Expenses to March 31, 1937," exhibit in AEBM 9:258. The actual figures are \$58,750.00 and \$56,384.90. The supplements are Malikoff, *Union List of Serials, Supplement* (1931); and Malikoff, *Union List of Serials, Supplement* (1933).
- ³⁰⁰ Lewis, "Union List and Religion," 354–355; Lydenberg, "An Objection Answered," 492; Lewis, "Union List Again," 662; Lewis, "Limitations of the Union List," 178–179; McHugh, 90–103, 208–209.
- ³⁰¹ Van Patten to Lydenberg, 3 February 1927, in NYPLA. It should be noted that the committee also did not allow Lewis to pay for their inclusion on the grounds that similar reports of other denominations would have to be included. Lydenberg to van Patten, 7 February 1927, in NYPLA.
- ³⁰² Richardson to Putnam, 20 February 1929, in LCA.
- ³⁰³ Lane to Gregory, 17 October 1924, in NYPLA. Or of course the preliminary edition could have been eliminated, since exchanges were few, but only at the cost of losing broad checking on the substantial number of titles missing from the checking edition and suggested by the subscribers, and of allowing for the fuller statements in the final edition of runs acquired from vendors, who made quotes based on the information in the provisional edition.
- ³⁰⁴ They first quarreled at Princeton, where Gerould had been brought in as "librarian" and Richardson's title changed to "director" (but with no real role in managing the library). They later quarreled over the jurisdiction of their two ALA committees. Branscomb, 29–33, 43–53; Zubatsky, 108–113, 129–130. It is notable that an unpublished appendix to the Report of the College and Reference Section dated June 1931, states that "no very marked interest was shown in most of the propositions in Dr. Richardson's pamphlet." (Typescript in ALAA, p. 9.) The pamphlet in question is American Library Association, Committee on Bibliography, "Restatement." The pamphlet is often regarded as a summation of Richardson's bibliographic thought and work.
- ³⁰⁵ Kellar, 5.

- ³⁰⁶ Bishop to Lydenberg, 27 November 1929; Charles H. Brown to Lydenberg, 30 November 1929; both in NYPLA.
- ³⁰⁷ Lydenberg to Charles H. Brown, 14 December 1929, in NYPLA.
- ³⁰⁸ Lydenberg to Malikoff, 20 November 1929, in PLR.
- ³⁰⁹ Lydenberg to Bostwick, 2 November 1929, in NYPLA.
- ³¹⁰ *A World List*; Lomer and Mackay; Lacroix and Bultingaire; Auskunftsbureau der Deutschen Bibliotheken, *Gesamtverzeichnis der ausländischen Zeitschriften*; Auskunftsbureau der Deutschen Bibliotheken, *Gesamt-Zeitschriften-Verzeichnis*. The *GAZ* did contain reports from substantially more libraries than the *Union List of Serials*, 1,100 as opposed to 225, though this number primarily reflects the many separately reported institute and seminar libraries in German universities. There were other national or semi-national union lists during the 1920s, of course, as listed in Daniel C. Haskell, 1584–1587, and Karl Brown, 658–660, but none would change this conclusion. They were either limited to scientific titles (Argentina, Belgium, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland), or to foreign titles (Japan), or to files in the capital or other major center (lists of scientific titles in Dublin, Milan, and Leningrad; of foreign titles in Lisbon; and a general list for Budapest).
- ³¹¹ Downs, “American Library Cooperation,” 407.
- ³¹² University of Michigan, “The General Library,” 1926/27, p. 189; Brown University, “Report of the Librarian,” 1925/26, p. 74. In calling for a second edition, Charles J. Shaw of the Wilson Company noted that the cooperating libraries “will . . . remember the benefits which were derived from a systematic survey of their serial collections.” Charles J. Shaw, 598.
- ³¹³ H. W. Wilson to R. H. Johnston, 5 September 1924, in NYPLA.
- ³¹⁴ Andrews to Lydenberg, 19 July 1926; quote from Lydenberg to Committee, 2 August 1926; Winkler to Lydenberg, 19 June 1926; Lydenberg to Winkler, 29 June 1926; all in NYPLA.
- ³¹⁵ Charles H. Brown, “Review of Group Meetings,” 13–14.
- ³¹⁶ Esterquest, “Co-operative Control of Library Resources,” 370.
- ³¹⁷ On the lack of exchange, see Schwab, 604–605; also, Esterquest, “Co-operation in Library Services,” 74. For an attempt to use the *List* for exchange, see Gerould to Lydenberg, 17 January 1925, in PLR.
- ³¹⁸ Bishop to Lydenberg, 2 December 1929, in NYPLA; Bay, 149; Amherst College, Converse Memorial Library, *Annual Report*, 1923/24, p. 14. The Cleveland Public Library noted that “the Union List of Serials is causing a great deal of difficult buying,” (Cleveland Public Library Board, *Annual Report*, 1926, p. 102), and examples could be multiplied. Erickson to Princeton University, 2 March 1927, in PLR, is an example of an offer from the H. W. Wilson Company to sell periodicals in order to fill in gaps recorded in the provisional edition.
- ³¹⁹ Gerould, circular letter, 26 April 1928, in NYPLA.
- ³²⁰ Charles W. Smith, “Periodicals and Future Scholarship,” 230; see also Charles W. Smith, “Periodical Resources of American Libraries,” 534–535.
- ³²¹ Gilchrist, “Evolution of College and University Libraries,” 296.
- ³²² Cannon, “Regional Grouping of Libraries: Plan Suggested for Periodical Purchasing Areas,” unpublished paper delivered at the Periodicals Round Table at the ALA Washington annual conference, 1929, in ALAA. Summary published in Beem, 331–32.
- ³²³ On the challenges of cooperative collection development, see Carlson, “Cooperation,” 5–13; Stevens, 405–412; Hewitt, 109–115; and Robert P. Holley, 19–35.
- ³²⁴ American Library Association, Committee on Resources of American Libraries, *Resources of American Libraries*, 12.
- ³²⁵ Powers to Lydenberg, 21 February 1925, in PLR.
- ³²⁶ Powers, “Union List of Periodicals,” 505.
- ³²⁷ Klein, 1:656.
- ³²⁸ Hager to Goodrich, 14 December 1928, in UMLR.
- ³²⁹ Gerould to Lydenberg, 6 January 1928, in PLR.
- ³³⁰ Williamson to Lydenberg, 8 March 1933; Lydenberg to Milam, 23 August, 1933; “Resumé

of Action and Correspondence with Regard to Mr. H. W. Wilson's Proposal that the American Library Association Act as Trustee for the Proposed New Common Stock of the H. W. Wilson Company," typescript, 15 December 1932; H. W. Wilson to Milam, 8 July 1936; "Plan for Cooperation between the H. W. Wilson Company and American Library Association," typescript, 9 December 1936; all documents in ALAA. Also, see Lawler, 142-144; "A.L.A. and The Wilson Company," 45; "A.L.A. Represented on Wilson Board," 1499.

³³¹ "Discussion at Executive Board Meeting- Dec. 31, 1932," p. 7, typescript in ALAA.

³³² H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 28 August 1933, in ALAA. The wording here actually refers to a proposal that would ensure that an earlier decision to remain a limited-dividend corporation could not be reversed by a future board of directors.

³³³ Prouty to Dudgeon, 10 March 1937, transcript in ALAA.

³³⁴ Hadley to Milam, 13 March 1937, in ALAA.

³³⁵ McGowan, 88-98; David and McCombs, 11-16.

³³⁶ Gregory, *Union List of Serials*, 2nd ed. (1943).

³³⁷ Zubatsky, 261-267; Committee on the Union List of Serials to Executive Board of the American Library Association, 23 September 1938, copy as exhibit in AEBM 10:57-64; H. W. Wilson to Milam, 23 February 1937, copy as exhibit in AEBM 10:158-160; H. W. Wilson to Gilchrist, 27 July 1938, copy as exhibit in AEBM 10:161-162; Gilchrist, "Memo on the Union List of Serials Proposed Second Edition (Presented to the Committee at its meeting September 13, 1938)," copy as exhibit in AEBM 10:163-172. Wilson's quotation is from H. W. Wilson Company, "Union List of Serials, 1922-1932," in AEBM 10:175. The Committee noted that the first edition "wasn't a bibliographic job, it was a jig-saw puzzle. . . . Only the simplest sources of exact information were available, the sort of tools a small college library would have on its order department shelves. Contributing libraries were relied on to correct the entries." (AEBM, 10:61). Gerould was initially named chair of the advisory committee for the second edition, but soon had to resign due to ill health.

³³⁸ Abbott, esp. 59-85, 155-157.

³³⁹ Titus, *Union List of Serials*, 3rd ed. (1965); Rovelstad, *Final Report*, iii, 3-5, 11-14.

³⁴⁰ Untitled note, *Harvard Library Notes*, 154.

³⁴¹ Wiegand, *Politics of an Emerging Profession*, 234; see also Shiflett, 271-277; Wiegand, "Development of Librarianship," 99-109.

WORKS CITED

- "A.L.A. and The Wilson Company Approve Joint Agreement." *Wilson Bulletin for Librarians* 12 (September 1937): 45.
- "A.L.A. Publishing Board." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 7 (January 1913): 4-6.
- "A.L.A. Publishing Board." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 9 (January 1915): 11-14.
- "A.L.A. Represented on Wilson Board." *Publishers' Weekly* 132 (October 9, 1937): 1499.
- Abbott, Andrew. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- "Agricultural Library Section." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 13 (July 1919): 373-375.
- American Library Association. *A Survey of Libraries in the United States*. 4 vols. Chicago: American Library Association, 1926-27.
- . Committee on Bibliography. *A Restatement of the A.L.A. Plan for the Promotion of Research Library Service by Cooperative Methods*. Washington, DC, 1930.
- . Committee on Resources of American Libraries. *Resources of American Libraries: A Preliminary Study of Available Records and of Efforts toward the Coordination of the Resources of American Libraries*. Mimeograph. Chicago: American Library Association, 1935.
- Amherst College. Converse Memorial Library. *Annual Report, 1923/24*. Issued with *Annual Reports* for 1922/23 and 1924/25.
- Andrews, Clement W. "Report of Committee on a Union List of Serials." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 8 (July 1914): 187.
- . "Report of Committee on Union List of Serials." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 10 (January 1916): 44.
- . "Report on Union List of Periodicals." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 11 (June 1917): 337-8.
- , ed. *Supplement to the List of Serials in Public Libraries of Chicago and Evanston*. 2nd ed. Chicago: John Crerar Library, 1906.
- Auskunftsbureau der Deutschen Bibliotheken, Hrsg. *Gesamt-Zeitschriften-Verzeichnis*. Berlin: Königliche Bibliothek, 1914.
- , Hrsg. *Gesamtverzeichnis der ausländischen Zeitschriften (GAZ), 1914-1924*. Berlin: Preussische Staatsbibliothek, 1927-1929.
- Baird, Spencer F. "Advertisement." In Bolton, *Catalogue of Scientific and Technical Periodicals* (1885), iii-iv.
- Barr, Charles J. "College and Reference Section." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 12 (September 1918): 303-304.
- Barrow, Clyde W. *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928*. History of American Thought and Culture. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.
- Bay, J. Christian. *The John Crerar Library, 1895-1944: An Historical Report Prepared under the Authority of the Board of Directors*. Chicago, 1945.
- Beem, Blake. "Periodicals Round Table." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 23 (August 1929): 330-334.
- Ben-David, Joseph. *Centers of Learning: Britain, France, Germany, United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.
- Bentinck-Smith, William. *Building a Great Library: The Coolidge Years at Harvard*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Library, 1976. Reprinted, with additions, from *Harvard Library Bulletin* 21 (1973) and 22 (1974).
- Bestor, Arthur E., Jr. "The Transformation of American Scholarship, 1875-1917." In *Librarians, Scholars and Booksellers at Mid-Century: Papers Presented before the Sixteenth Annual Conference of The Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago*, edited by Pierce Butler, 8-23. University of Chicago Studies in Library Science. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953. Previously published in *Library Quarterly* 23 (July 1953): 164-179.

- Binkley, Robert C. *Manual on Methods of Reproducing Research Materials: A Survey Made for the Joint Committee on Materials for Research of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies*. Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1936.
- Bishop, William Warner. "Inter-library Loans." *Library Journal* 34 (December 1909): 527–532.
- . "Our College and University Libraries—A Survey and a Program." In Bishop, *The Backs of Books and Other Essays in Librarianship*, 202–225. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1926. Previously published in *School and Society* 12 (September 18, 1920): 205–214.
- . "The Record of Science." In Bishop, *The Backs of Books and Other Essays in Librarianship*, 270–303. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1926. Previously published in *Science*, n.s., 56 (August 25, 1922): 205–216.
- Bledstein, Burton J. *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1976.
- Bolton, Henry Carrington. *A Catalogue of Scientific and Technical Periodicals (1665 to 1882), Together with Chronological Tables and a Library Check-List*. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections 29. Smithsonian Publication 514. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1885.
- . *A Catalogue of Scientific and Technical Periodicals. 1665–1895. Together with Chronological Tables and a Library Check-List*. 2nd ed. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections 40. Smithsonian Publication 1076. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1897.
- Bostwick, Arthur E. *The American Public Library*. 3rd ed. New York: D. Appleton, 1923.
- . "The Librarian as Censor: Address of the President, American Library Association, Lake Minnetonka Conference, 1908." *Library Journal* 33 (July 1908): 257–264.
- Boyer, Kenneth J. "Interlibrary Loans in College and University Libraries." *Library Quarterly* 2 (April 1932): 113–134.
- Branscomb, Lewis C. *Ernest Cushing Richardson: Research Librarian, Scholar, Theologian*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1993.
- Brough, Kenneth J. *Scholar's Workshop: Evolving Conceptions of Library Service*. Illinois Contributions to Librarianship 5. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953.
- Brown, Charles H. "Review of Group Meetings of University, College and Reference Librarians, July 1927–July 1928." *College and Reference Library Yearbook* 1 (1929): 13–22.
- Brown, David K. *Degrees of Control: A Sociology of Educational Expansion and Occupation Credentialism*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1995.
- Brown, Karl, comp. "A Bibliography of Union Lists of Serials. Supplement." In Malikoff, ed., *Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada, Supplement, January 1925–June 1931*, pp. 657–660.
- Brown University. "Report of the Librarian." In *Annual Report of the President to the Corporation, 1925/26*, pp. 71–75.
- Burke, Colin B. "The Expansion of American Higher Education." In Jarusch, *Transformation of Higher Learning*, 108–130.
- Byrnes, Robert F. *Awakening American Education to the World: The Role of Archibald Cary Coolidge, 1866–1928*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982.
- Canfield, James H. "The Reading Public as I Know it, I: The College Library." *Outlook* 71 (May 24, 1902): 248–250.
- Carlson, William H. "Cooperation: An Historical Review and a Forecast." *College and Research Libraries* 13 (January 1952): 5–13.
- . *The Development and Financial Support of Seven Western and Northwestern State University Libraries*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1938.
- Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. *Annual Reports to the Board of Trustees*, 1920.
- Casey, Marion. "Efficiency, Taylorism, and Libraries in Progressive America." *Journal of Library History* 16 (Spring 1981): 265–279.
- Chandler, Alfred D., Jr. *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1977.
- Chicago Library Club. *A List of Serials in Public Libraries of Chicago and Evanston, Corrected to January 1901*. Chicago, 1901.

- Cleveland Public Library Board. *Annual Report*, 1926.
- "Code of Practice for Inter-library Loans." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 11 (January 1917): 27–29.
- Cole, Arthur H. "An Approach to the Study of Entrepreneurship: A Tribute to Edwin F. Gay." *The Journal of Economic History*. 6 suppl. (1946): 1–15.
- Cole, John Y., ed. *The Library of Congress in Perspective: A Volume Based on the Reports of the 1976 Librarian's Task Force and Advisory Groups*. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1978.
- "College and Reference Section." *Library Journal* 24, no. 7 (July 1899): 154–157.
- "College Library Section." *Library Journal* 18, no. 9 (September 1893): 90–91.
- "Council." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 8 (January 1914): 7–19.
- "Council." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 10 (July 1916): 389–405.
- "Council." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 14 (July 1920): 321–324.
- Cunningham, Larry Lee. "Contributions of Arthur Elmore Bostwick to the Library Profession." Master's thesis, Indiana University, 1962.
- Currier, Thomas Franklin. "A Sheaf of Memories from the Cataloguers." *Harvard Library Notes* 2 (April 1928): 165–171.
- Dain, Phyllis. "Harry M. Lydenberg and American Library Resources: A Study in Modern Library Leadership." *Library Quarterly* 47 (October 1977): 451–469.
- . *The New York Public Library: A Universe of Knowledge*. London: New York Public Library in Association with Scala Publishers, 2000.
- . "Scholarship, Higher Education, and Libraries in the United States: Historical Questions and Quests." In *Libraries and Scholarly Communication in the United States: The Historical Dimension*, edited by Phyllis Dain and John Y. Cole, 1–44. Beta Phi Mu Monograph 2. New York: Greenwood, 1990.
- Daniels, George H. "The Pure-Science Ideal and Democratic Culture." *Science*, n.s., 156 (June 30, 1967): 1699–1705.
- Danton, J. Periam. *Book Selection and Collections: A Comparison of German and American University Libraries*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.
- David, Charles W. and Charles F. McCombs. "Service Basis Pricing." *A.L.A. Bulletin* 40 (January 1946): 11–16.
- Detroit Library Commission. *Annual Report*, 1926/27. Also numbered as *Library Service* 11, no. 2 (November 1927).
- Dickinson, Asa Don. "The Golden Rule and Interlibrary Loans." In McMillen, *Selected Articles on Interlibrary Loans*, 37–40.
- Dorn, Richard W. "Otto Harrassowitz Buchhandlung-Verlag-Antiquariat: The First Century." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 21 (October 1973): 365–374.
- Downs, Robert B. "American Library Cooperation in Review." *College and Research Libraries* 6 (September 1945): 407–415.
- . "The Growth of Research Collections." *Library Trends* 25 (July 1976): 55–80.
- . *Resources of Southern Libraries: A Survey of Facilities for Research*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1938.
- Drury, Francis K. W. "The Epoch-Making Union List of Serials." *Library Journal* 53 (January 1, 1928): 14–16.
- , ed. *Technical and Scientific Serials in the Libraries of Providence, 1920*. Providence, RI, [1920].
- Durkheim, Emile. *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals*. Translated by Cornelia Brookfield. International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957. Originally published as *Leçons de sociologie: physique des mœurs et du droit* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1950).
- Edelman, Hendrik and G. Marvin Tatum, Jr. "The Development of Collections in American University Libraries." In Johnson, *Libraries for Teaching*, 34–57. Previously published in *College & Research Libraries* 37 (May 1976): 222–245.
- "Editorial Notes." *Booklist* 24 (March 1928): 227–230.
- Esterquest, Ralph T. "Co-operation in Library Services." *Library Quarterly* 31 (January 1961): 71–89.
- . "Co-operative Control of Library Resources: A Symposium. The Realities of Co-operation." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 47 (October 1959): 369–374.

- Ford, Guy Stanton. "The Library and the Graduate School." Association of American Universities, *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Fifteenth Annual Conference Held at the University of Illinois, November 7 and 8, 1913*, pp. 38–46.
- Foreman, Carolyn. "An Analysis of Publications Issued by the American Library Association, 1907–1957." Master's thesis, University of Texas, 1959.
- Freeman, Marilla Waite. "Reference Work with Periodicals in the Cleveland Public Library." *Libraries* 32 (June 1927): 265–270.
- Galambo, Louis. "The Emerging Organizational Synthesis in Modern American History." *Business History Review* 44 (Autumn 1970): 279–290.
- . *The Public Image of Big Business in America, 1880–1940: A Quantitative Study in Social Change*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.
- Garrison, Dee. *Apostles of Culture: The Public Librarian and American Society, 1876–1920*. New York: Free Press, 1979.
- Geiger, Roger L. *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900–1940*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Geller, Evelyn. *Forbidden Books in American Public Libraries, 1876–1939: A Study in Cultural Change*. Contributions in Librarianship and Information Science 46. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1984.
- Gerould, James Thayer. "A.L.A. National Union Serials List Assured." *Library Journal* 48 (December 15, 1923): 1062.
- Gilchrist, Donald B. "The Evolution of College and University Libraries." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 20 (October 1926): 293–299.
- Gillis, J. L. "Inter-library Loans." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 6 (July 1912): 99–101.
- Gould, Charles H. "Co-ordination, or Method in Co-operation." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 3 (September 1909): 122–128.
- . "Regional Libraries." *Library Journal* 33 (June 1908): 218–219.
- Gregory, Winifred, ed. *American Newspapers, 1821–1936: A Union List of Files Available in the United States and Canada*. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1937.
- . *Bibliography of Minnesota Mining and Geology*. Minnesota School of Mines Experiment Station, Bulletin 4. Minneapolis, 1915.
- , comp. "Improvement of the Upper Mississippi River: A Bibliography." *Bulletin of the Affiliated Engineering Societies of Minnesota* 3 (December 1918): 218–240.
- , ed. *International Congresses and Conferences, 1840–1937: A Union List of Their Publications Available in Libraries of the United States and Canada*. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1938.
- , ed. *List of Serial Publications of Foreign Governments, 1815–1931*. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1932.
- , ed. *Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada*. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1927.
- , ed. *Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada*. 2nd ed. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1943.
- , ed. *Union List of Serials in the Libraries of the United States and Canada*. Provisional ed. New York: H. W. Wilson, December 1924–December 1926.
- H. W. Wilson Co. "Union List of Periodicals." Unpagged pamphlet, [1921].
- Haber, Samuel. *Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890–1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- . *The Quest for Authority and Honor in the American Professions, 1750–1900*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Hale, Charles Edward. "The College Library Section, 1889–1923: Predecessor to the Association of College and Research Libraries." In *Academic Librarianship, Past, Present, and Future: A Festschrift in Honor of David Kaser*, edited by John Richardson, Jr., and Jinnie Y. Davis, 81–96. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited, 1989.
- . "The Origin and Development of the Association of College and Research Libraries, 1889–1960." Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1976.
- Hamlin, Arthur T. *The University Library in the United States: Its Origins and Development*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

- Hanson, Eugene R. "College Libraries: The Colonial Period to the Twentieth Century." *Advances in Library Administration and Organization* 8 (1989): 171–199.
- Harris, Neil. "The Lamp of Learning: Popular Lights and Shadows." In Oleson and Voss, *Organization of Knowledge*, 430–439.
- Haskell, Daniel C., comp. "A Bibliography of Union Lists of Serials." In Gregory, *Union List of Serials* (1927), 1581–1588.
- Haskell, Thomas L., ed. *The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory*. Interdisciplinary Studies in History. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- . *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977.
- . "Professionalism versus Capitalism: R. H. Tawney, Emile Durkheim, and C. S. Peirce on the Disinterestedness of Professional Communities." In Haskell, *Authority of Experts*, 180–225.
- Hawkins, Hugh. "University Identity: The Teaching and Research Functions." In Oleson and Voss, *Organization of Knowledge*, 285–312.
- Hawley, Ellis W. *The Great War and the Search for a Modern Order: A History of the American People and Their Institutions, 1917–1933*. New York: St. Martin's, 1979.
- Haycraft, Howard. "'Mr. Wilson'—An Informal Reminiscence." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 29 (September 1954): 52–57.
- Hays, Samuel P. "Introduction: The New Organizational Society." In *Building the Organizational Society: Essays on Association Activities in Modern America*, edited by Jerry Israel, 1–15. New York: Free Press, 1972.
- Hewitt, Joe A. "Interlibrary Cooperation." In *Academic Librarianship: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*, edited by Robert Stueart, 97–117. New York: Neal-Schuman, 1982.
- Hicks, Frederick C. "Cooperation with the Institute of International Education." *American Library Institute, Papers and Proceedings, 1920*, 46–51.
- Higham, John. "The Matrix of Specialization." In Oleson and Voss, *Organization of Knowledge*, 3–18.
- Hodgson, James G. "The Missionary Spirit of Librarianship." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 30 (March 1956): 532–534.
- Hofstadter, Richard. *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
- Holley, Edward G. "ALA at 100." *ALA Yearbook* (1976): 1–32.
- Holley, Robert P. "Cooperative Collection Development: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow." *Collection Management* 23, no. 4 (December 1998): 19–35.
- Hollinger, David A. "Inquiry and Uplift: Late Nineteenth-Century American Academics and the Moral Efficacy of Scientific Practice." In Haskell, *Authority of Experts*, 142–156.
- Hollingsworth, Josephine B. "The Making of a Union List." *Special Libraries* 17 (October 1926): 277–280.
- Homer, Thomas Johnston and Edith Loud Shufelt, comps. *A Guide to Serial Publications Founded Prior to 1918 and Now or Recently Current in Boston, Cambridge, and Vicinity*. Boston: Trustees of the Public Library and the Cooperating Committee, 1922–1956.
- Jarusch, Konrad H. "Higher Education and Social Change: Some Comparative Perspectives." In Jarusch, *Transformation of Higher Learning*, 9–36.
- , ed. *The Transformation of Higher Learning 1860–1930: Expansion, Diversification, Social Opening, and Professionalization in England, Germany, Russia, and the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983. Originally published as *Historisch-Sozialwissenschaftliche Forschungen* 13 (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1983).
- Jernegan, Marcus W. "Productivity of Doctors of Philosophy in History." *American Historical Review* 33 (October 1927): 1–22.
- John Crerar Library. *Supplement to the List of Serials in Public Libraries of Chicago and Evanston, Corrected to April, 1903*. Chicago: John Crerar Library, 1903.
- Johnson, Nancy Becker. "A Chronicle of Men, At Least Two Women, and Money: Sarah C. N. Bogle and the Carnegie Corporation of New York." *Libraries & Culture* 31 (Spring 1996): 422–436.
- Johnson, Richard D. *Libraries for Teaching, Libraries for Research: Essays for a Century*. ACRL Publications in Librarianship 39. Chicago: American Library Association, 1977.

- Johnston, W. Dawson. "The Work of the Division of Bibliography, Library of Congress." *Library Journal* 27, no. 7 (July 1902): 63–67.
- Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials. *A Permanent Program for the Union List of Serials*. Washington: Library of Congress, 1957.
- Josephson, Aksel G. S. "Proposition for the Establishment of a Bibliographical Institute." Chicago, 1905.
- Kaser, David. "A Century of Academic Librarianship as Reflected in Its Literature." In Johnson, *Libraries for Teaching*, 219–236. Previously published in *College & Research Libraries* 37 (March 1976): 110–127.
- Kellar, Herbert A. *Memoranda on Library Cooperation*. Library of Congress, Experimental Division of Library Cooperation, Publication 1. Washington: Library of Congress, September 1941.
- Kellogg, Vernon. "The University and Research." *Science*, n.s., 54 (July 8, 1921): 19–23.
- Kelly, Melody Sprecht. "Revisiting C. H. Milam's *What Libraries Learned from the War* and Rediscovering the Library Faith." *Libraries & Culture* 38 (Fall 2003): 378–388.
- Kimball, Bruce A. *The "True Professional Ideal" in America: A History*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1995.
- Klein, Arthur J., director. *Survey of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities*. 2 vols. United States Office of Education Bulletin, 1930, no. 9. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1930.
- Kohler, Robert E. "Science, Foundations, and American Universities in the 1920s." *Osiris*, 2nd series, 3 (1987): 135–164.
- Kuhlman, A. F., ed. *College and University Library Service: Trends, Standards, Appraisal, Problems. Papers Presented at the 1937 Midwinter Meeting of the American Library Association*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1938.
- Kunoff, Hugo. *The Foundations of the German Academic Library*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1982.
- Lacroix, Alfred and Léon Bultingaire, eds. *Inventaire des périodiques scientifiques des bibliothèques de Paris*. 4 fascicles. Paris: Masson et Cie for the Académie des Sciences de L'Institut de France, 1924–1925.
- Lane, William Coolidge. "A Central Bureau of Information and Loan Collection for College Libraries." *Library Journal* 33 (November 1908): 429–433.
- . "Harvard College Library Rules on Interlibrary Loans and a Statement of Its Policy." In McMillen, *Selected Articles on Interlibrary Loans*, 66–68.
- Larson, Magali Sarfatti. "The Production of Expertise and the Constitution of Expert Power." In Haskell, *Authority of Experts*, 28–80.
- . *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.
- Lawler, John. *The H. W. Wilson Company: Half a Century of Bibliographic Publishing*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1950.
- Levine, David O. *The American College and the Culture of Aspiration, 1915–1940*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- Lewis, Frank Grant. "Limitations of the Union List of Serials." *Library Journal* 53 (February 15, 1928): 178–179.
- . "The Union List Again." *Library Journal* 52 (June 15, 1927): 662.
- . "The Union List and Religion." *Library Journal* 52 (April 1, 1927): 354–355.
- Link, Arthur S. "What Happened to the Progressive Movement in the 1920s?" *American Historical Review* 64 (July 1959): 833–851.
- Lippmann, Walter. *Drift and Mastery: An Attempt to Diagnose the Current Unrest*. New York: Mitchell Kennerly, 1914.
- Lomer, Gerhard R. and Margaret S. Mackay, comps. *A Catalogue of Scientific Periodicals in Canadian Libraries*. Montreal: McGill University, 1924.
- Los Angeles Public Library. *Annual Report of the Board of Directors, 1925/26*.
- Luther, W. M. "Interlibrary Loan in den U.S.A.: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des amerikanischen Leihverkehrs." *Libri* 5 (1955): 297–334.
- Lydenberg, H. M. "An Objection Answered." *Library Journal* 52 (May 1, 1927): 492.
- . "Union List of Serials: Last Call and Warning." *Library Journal* 52 (May 1, 1927): 492.

- Lydenberg, H. M., C. W. Andrews, Willard Austen, Arthur E. Bostwick, James T. Gerould, and Nathan van Patten. Preface to Gregory, *Union List of Serials* (1927), unpagged.
- . "Union List of Periodicals." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 23 (July 1929): 143–144.
- Lydenberg, H. M., J. T. Gerould, Willard Austen, C. W. Andrews, and A. E. Bostwick. "Union List of Periodicals." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 17 (July 1923): 204–205.
- McGowan, Frank M. "The Association of Research Libraries, 1932–1962." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1972.
- McHugh, William A. "The Publication of the First Edition of the Union List of Serials." Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1984.
- McMillen, James A., comp. *Selected Articles on Interlibrary Loans*. The Librarians' Round Table. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1928.
- Malikoff, Gabrielle E., ed. *Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada. Supplement, January 1925–June 1931*. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1931.
- . ed. *Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada. Supplement, July 1931–December 1932*. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1933.
- Marchand, Roland. *Creating the Corporate Soul: The Rise of Public Relations and Corporate Imagery in American Big Business*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Metcalf, Keyes DeWitt. *My Harvard Years, 1937–1955: A Sequel to Random Recollections of an Anachronism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard College Library, 1988.
- . "Six Influential Academic and Research Librarians." In Johnson, *Libraries for Teaching*, 127–140. Previously published in *College & Research Libraries* 37 (July 1976): 332–345.
- Munthe, Wilhelm. *American Librarianship from a European Angle: An Attempt at an Evaluation of Policies and Activities*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1939.
- Nardini, Robert F. "A Search for Meaning: American Library Metaphors, 1876–1926." *Library Quarterly* 71 (April 2001): 111–140.
- National Union List of Serials*. Checking ed., section 1. New York: H. W. Wilson, March, 1924.
- Nelson, Daniel and Stuart Campbell. "Taylorism Versus Welfare Work in American Industry: H. L. Gantt and the Bancrofts." *Business History Review* 46 (Spring 1972): 1–16.
- "New Committees." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 16 (March 1922): 39.
- New York Public Library. *Report*, 1933.
- Noble, David F. *America by Design: Science, Technology, and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.
- Ogg, Frederic Austin. *Research in the Humanistic and Social Sciences: Report of a Survey Conducted for the American Council of Learned Societies*. New York: Century, 1928.
- Oleson, Alexandra and John Voss, eds. *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860–1920*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- Parsons, Talcott. "The Professions and Social Structure." Chap. 2 in *Essays in Sociological Theory*. Rev. ed. New York: Free Press, 1954. Originally published in *Social Forces* 17 (May 1939): 457–467.
- Peet, Creighton. "Profiles: A Mousetrap in the Bronx." *New Yorker* 14, no. 37 (October 29, 1938): 25–28.
- Pings, Vern M. "Interlibrary Loans: A Review of the Library Literature, 1876–1965." Wayne State University, School of Medicine Library, Biomedical Information Service Center, Report 23. Detroit, 1966.
- Powell, Benjamin Edward. "The Development of Libraries in Southern State Universities to 1920." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1946.
- Powers, William H. "The Union List of Periodicals and the Small Library." *Library Journal* 50 (June 1, 1925): 505.
- Price, Miles O. and Fannie E. Price. "The 'Service Basis' Method of Pricing Certain Book and Periodical Indexes: A Preliminary Statistical Study of Some of Its Economic Aspects." Type-script report compiled for a Committee of the Association of Research Libraries, 1938.
- Putnam, Herbert. "Project B—Increase of the Bibliographical Apparatus. From the Report of the Librarian of Congress, December 3, 1928, pp. 238–250." In Richardson, *General Library Co-operation*, 105–115.

- Radford, Marie L. and Gary P. Radford. "Power, Knowledge and Fear: Feminism, Foucault and the Stereotype of the Female Librarian." *Library Quarterly* 67 (July 1997): 250–266.
- Radford, Neil A. *The Carnegie Corporation and the Development of American College Libraries, 1928–1941*. ACRL Publications in Librarianship 44. Chicago: American Library Association, 1984.
- Rae, John. "The Application of Science to Industry." In Oleson and Voss, *Organization of Knowledge*, 249–268.
- "Reorganization of the College and Reference Section." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 31 (September 1937): 589–601.
- Rhodes, Barbara and William Wells Streeter. *Before Photocopying: The Art & History of Mechanical Copying, 1780–1938*. N.p.: Oak Knoll and Heraldry Bindery, 1999.
- Richardson, Ernest Cushing. "Co-operation in Lending Among College and Reference Libraries." *Library Journal* 24, no. 7 (July 1899): 32–36.
- . *General Library Co-operation and American Research Books*. Yardley, PA: F. S. Cook & Son, 1930.
- , comp. *A Union list of Collections on European History in American Libraries*. Trial ed. Compiled for the Committee on Bibliography of the American Library Association. Princeton, NJ, 1912.
- . "University Library Co-operation and Business Engineering." In Richardson, *General Library Co-operation*, 27–39. Previously published in *Library Journal* 47 (May 15, 1922): 443–449.
- Ring, Daniel F. "Some Speculations on Why the British Library Profession Didn't Go to War." *Journal of Library History Philosophy and Comparative Librarianship* 22 (Summer 1987): 249–271.
- Ringer, Fritz K. "The German Academic Community." In Oleson and Voss, *Organization of Knowledge*, 409–429.
- Rosenberg, Charles. "Toward An Ecology of Knowledge: On Discipline, Context, and History." In Oleson and Voss, *Organization of Knowledge*, 440–455.
- Rosenberg, Jane Aikin. *The Nation's Great Library: Herbert Putnam and the Library of Congress, 1899–1839*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Rossiter, Margaret W. "The Organization of the Agricultural Sciences." In Oleson and Voss, *Organization of Knowledge*, 211–248.
- Rothstein, Samuel. *The Development of Reference Services through Academic Traditions, Public Library Practice and Special Librarianship*. ACRL Monographs 14. Chicago: Association of College and Reference Libraries, 1955.
- Rovelstad, Howard. *Final Report of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials on the Project under Grants CLR-69 and CLR-267 from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., for the Publication of a Third Edition of the Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada*. Washington: Council on Library Resources, 1966.
- . Preface to Titus, *Union List of Serials*, 3rd ed. (1965), unpagged.
- Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. Knopf Publications in Education. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*. Translated by Redvers Opie. Harvard Economic Studies 46. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934. Originally published as *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung: Eine Untersuchung über Unternehmergewinn, Kapital, Kredit, Zins und den Konjunkturzyklus*, 2. Aufl. (München: Dunker & Humblot, 1926).
- Schwab, Eugene L. "The Union List of Serials and Further Cooperation." *Library Journal* 60 (August 1935): 604–605.
- Sealander, Judith. *Grand Plans: Business Progressivism and Social Change in Ohio's Miami Valley, 1890–1929*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988.
- Shaw, Charles J. "The Union List of Serials—Revised Edition." *Wilson Bulletin for Librarians* 11 (May 1937): 598–599, 627.
- Shaw, Robert Kendall. "Is the Establishment of a Central Reference Bureau Desirable?" *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 6 (July 1912): 278–280.
- Shiflett, Orvin Lee. *Origins of American Academic Librarianship*. Libraries and Librarianship: An

- International Series. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1981.
- Shils, Edward. "The Order of Learning in the United States: The Ascendancy of the University." In Oleson and Voss, *Organization of Knowledge*, 19–47.
- Smith, Charles W. "The Early Years of PNLA: The First Decade." *PNLA Quarterly* 13 (January 1949): 70–76.
- . "The Periodical Resources of American Libraries." *Library Journal* 54 (June 15, 1929): 534–535.
- . "Periodicals and Future Scholarship." *Wilson Bulletin for Librarians* 7 (December 1932): 229–232, 271.
- . "The Vanishing Supply of Research Periodicals." *Library Journal* 49 (February 1, 1924): 117–119.
- Smith, David Eugene and Caroline Eustis Seely. *Union List of Mathematical Periodicals*. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1918, no. 9. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918.
- "Special Committees, 1914–15." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 8 (September 1914): 427–428.
- Stevens, Norman D. "Library Networks and Resource Sharing in the United States: An Historical and Philosophical Overview." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 31 (November 1980): 405–412.
- Stuart-Stubbs, B., K. Nichol, M. Friesen, and D. McInnes. *A Survey and Interpretation of the Literature of Interlibrary Loan*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Library, 1975.
- Sullivan, Peggy. *Carl H. Milam and the American Library Association*. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1976.
- "Symposium on Coördination or Affiliation of Libraries." *Library Journal* 35 (March 1910): 103–108 and (May 1910): 195–198.
- Tebbel, John. *The Expansion of an Industry 1865–1919*. Vol. 2 of *A History of Book Publishing in the United States*. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1975.
- . *The Golden Age between Two Wars 1920–1940*. Vol. 3 of *A History of Book Publishing in the United States*. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1978.
- Thomison, Dennis. *A History of the American Library Association 1876–1972*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1978.
- Titus, Edna Brown, ed. *Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada*. 3rd ed. 5 vols. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1965.
- Tweedell, Edward D. "The Use of the Cameragraph in the John Crerar Library." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 15 (1921): 22–23.
- United States Department of the Interior. Bureau of Education. *Public Libraries in the United States of America: Their History, Condition, and Management*. 2 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1876.
- University of California, Berkeley. *University Library*. Preprint from the *Annual Report of the President of the University*, 1926/27 and 1928/29.
- University of Michigan. "The General Library." In *President's Report for the Year*, 1926/27, pp. 185–198, and 1928/29, pp. 175–195.
- Untitled note. *Harvard Library Notes*, 2 (April 1928): 154–156.
- Veysey, Laurence R. *The Emergence of the American University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- . "The Plural Organized Worlds of the Humanities." In Oleson and Voss, *Organization of Knowledge*, 51–106.
- Wagner, Ralph D. *A History of the Farmington Plan*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2002.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930. Originally published as "Die protestantische Ethik, und der Geist des Kapitalismus," in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1920) 1:17–205.
- White, Carl M. "Trends in the Use of University Libraries." In Kuhlman, *College and University Library Service*, 15–39.
- Wiegand, Wayne A. "The Development of Librarianship in the United States." *Libraries & Culture* 24 (Winter 1989): 99–109.

- . "Library Politics and the Organization of the Bibliographical Society of America." *Journal of Library History Philosophy and Comparative Librarianship* 21 (Winter 1986): 131–157.
- . *The Politics of an Emerging Profession: The American Library Association, 1876–1917*. Contributions in Librarianship and Information Science 56. New York: Greenwood, 1986.
- Willison, Ian R. "The National Library in Historical Perspective." *Libraries & Culture* 24 (Winter 1989): 75–95.
- "Wilson Company Subscription Rates." *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 11 (January 1917): 14–19.
- Winchell, Constance M. *Locating Books for Interlibrary Loan, with a Bibliography of Printed Aids which Show Location of Books in American Libraries*. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1930.
- Winship, George Parker. "Archibald Cary Coolidge." *Harvard Library Notes* 2 (April 1928): 157–164.
- Wolf, Estella. "What the Various States are Doing in Cooperative Regional Bibliography." In Kuhlman, *College and University Library Service*, 109–119.
- Works, George Alan. *College and University Library Problems: A Study of A Selected Group of Institutions Prepared for the Association of American Universities*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1927.
- World List of Scientific Periodicals Published in the Years 1900–1921*. 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press and Humphrey Milford, 1925–1927.
- Wyer, Malcolm G. "Mr. Peterson's Devotion." *Library Journal* 80 (February 15, 1955): 404–407.
- Wyllie, Irvin G. *The Self-Made Man in America: The Myth of Rags to Riches*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1954.
- Young, Arthur P. "Aftermath of a Crusade: World War I and the Enlarged Program of the American Library Association." *Library Quarterly* 50 (April 1980): 191–207.
- . *Books for Sammies: The American Library Association and World War I*. Beta Phi Mu Chapbook 15. Pittsburgh: Beta Phi Mu, 1981.
- Young, M. O. "Theory and Practice of Interlibrary Loans in American Libraries." In McMillen, *Selected Articles on Interlibrary Loans*, 13–24.
- Zubatsky, David Samuel. "'No Book Should be Out of Reach': The Role of the American Library Association in the Sharing of Resources for Research, 1922–1945." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1982.

NAMES OF CORRESPONDENTS AND AUTHORS OF MEMOS
AND UNPUBLISHED PAPERS CITED IN THE TEXT

Edwin Anderson	Harry S. Green	Norton Perkins
Clement Andrews	Winifred Gregory	Everett R. Perry
Willard Austen	Chalmers Hadley	William H. Powers
Claribel R. Barnett	Frank L. Hager	Louise Prouty
William Warner Bishop	J. C. M. Hanson	Herbert Putnam
Sarah Bogle	William M. Hepburn	Samuel H. Ranck
Arthur E. Bostwick	Judson T. Jennings	M. Llewellyn Raney
Clarence S. Brigham	R. H. Johnston	Ernest Cushing Richardson
Charles H. Brown	W. J. Karslake	Beardsley Ruml
John Smart Brownne	Vernon Kellogg	Charles E. Rush
Duncan Burnet	Andrew Keogh	William A. Slade
Mary Burnham	Frederick Paul Keppel	Walter M. Smith
Carl L. Cannon	C. A. Kofoid	J. David Thompson
Frank H. Chase	William Coolidge Lane	Ralph W. Tower
Hester Coddington	H. S. Leach	Nathan van Patten
Archibald Cary Coolidge	John H. Leete	Frank K. Walter
T. Franklin Currier	Harold Leupp	Hiller C. Wellman
Asa Don Dickinson	Charles B. Lipman	Joseph L. Wheeler
M. H. Douglass	Burton E. Livingston	G. G. Wilder
F. K. W. Drury	George H. Locke	C. C. Williamson
Matthew S. Dudgeon	A. Lawrence Lowell	H. W. Wilson
E. O. Erickson	H. M. Lydenberg	Louis N. Wilson
Arundell Esdaile	Gabrielle E. Malickoff	Louis R. Wilson
Milton J. Ferguson	Earl N. Manchester	Phineas L. Windsor
Charles Frankenberger	Langdon P. Marvin	E. W. Winkler
James Thayer Gerould	H. H. B. Meyer	J. I. Wyer
Donald B. Gilchrist	Carl H. Milam	Malcolm G. Wyer
George S. Godard	Emily V. D. Miller	
F. L. D. Goodrich	James B. Munn	

ABBREVIATIONS OF ARCHIVAL REPOSITORIES CITED

- AEBM ALA Executive Board Minutes, ALA Library, American Library Association Library, Chicago, Illinois
- ALAA American Library Association Archives, located in University Archives, University Library, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois
- HUA Harvard University Archives, Pusey Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Courtesy of the Harvard University Archives.
- JCLR John Crerar Library Records, Special Collections Research Center, Joseph Regenstein Library, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
- LCA Library of Congress Archives, Manuscript Division, James Madison Memorial Building, Library of Congress, Washington, DC
- NYPLA Lydenberg, Hopper and Beals General Correspondence, The New York Public Library Archives, The New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations, New York, New York
- PLR Princeton University, Library Records, Seeley G. Mudd Library, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Published with permission of Princeton University Library.
- UCLR University of Chicago Library Records, Special Collections Research Center, Joseph Regenstein Library, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
- UIA University of Illinois Archives, University Library, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois
- UMLR University of Michigan, Library Records, Bentley Historical Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan
- All archival materials quoted with the permission of the repository.

Other Abbreviations

- AAAS American Association for the Advancement of Science
- AAU Association of American Universities
- ALA American Library Association
- ARL Association of Research Libraries
- GAZ *Gesamtverzeichnis der ausländischen Zeitschriften*
- LC Library of Congress
- NRC National Research Council

APPENDIX

Guarantor Libraries for the *Union List of Serials* (1927)**1. Subscribers as of February 24, 1923**

Cleveland Public Library
 Cornell University Library
 Dartmouth College Library
 Detroit Public Library
 New York Public Library
 Northwestern University Library
 Oberlin College Library
 Ohio State University Library
 Princeton University Library
 St. Louis Public Library
 Stanford University Library
 University of California Library
 University of Michigan Library
 University of Minnesota Library
 University of Pennsylvania Library
 University of Texas Library
 University of Washington Library

2. Additional subscribers by April 10, 1923

Free Library of Philadelphia
 John Crerar Library
 Johns Hopkins University Library
 Washington University Library, St. Louis

The Ohio State University and the University of California are not on this list; this may reflect a conditional pledge or a pledge without a formally entered subscription.

3. Additional subscribers at Hot Springs conference, April 23–28, 1923

Columbia University Library
 Grosvenor Library / Buffalo Group¹
 Peabody Institute Library
 University of Illinois Library
 University of Nebraska Library
 Yale University Library

4. Additional subscribers by May 14, 1923

Carnegie Library, Pittsburgh
 Iowa Group²

The Ohio State University returned to the list of subscribers as one of several libraries with the note "official order has not been received yet."

5. Additional subscribers by June 1923

Connecticut State Library
 Massachusetts State Library
 Providence Group³
 University of Chicago Library
 University of North Carolina Library
 University of Wisconsin Library / Madison Group⁴

The Carnegie Library, Pittsburgh, not on this list.

6. Additional subscribers by November 8, 1923

Amherst Group⁵
 New York State Library
 Newberry Library
 University of Missouri Library
 Vassar College Library / Upstate New York Group⁶
 Wesleyan University Library

The University of California and the Carnegie Library, Pittsburgh, returned to the list of subscribers.

7. Additional subscriber by April 1924

Harvard College Library

8. Additional subscribers by May 29, 1925

Brooklyn Public Library
 Canadian Group⁷
 Library of Congress
 Pacific Northwest Group⁸
 Rochester Group⁹

Partial Subscription:
 Illinois State Library (\$200)

9. Later subscribers

(May not be a complete list, particularly of partial subscribers. Dates are approximate.)

Oct. 1925: California State Library
 Oct. 1925: New York Academy of Medicine Library
 Nov. 1925: Boston Public Library

Partial Subscriptions:
 June 1925: Mayo Clinic Library (\$150)
 Dec. 1925: University of Maine Library¹⁰ (\$150)

Sources: Lydenberg to Committee, 24 February 1923; "Guarantors of the Union List of Serials April 10, 1923"; Wilson to Gerould, 14 May 1923, in PLR; "Practically valid assurances of subscriptions from the following libraries," [June 1923]; H. W. Wilson to Lydenberg, 7 August 1923; H. W. Wilson to Gerould, 10 October 1923, in PLR; Wilson to Gerould, 8 November 1923, in PLR; "List of Subscribers to the Union List," [April 1924]; "Union List Subscribers as of May 29 1925"; H. W. Wilson Co. to Lydenberg, 25 June 1925; Ferguson to Lydenberg, 10 October 1925; Lydenberg to Wilson, 5 November 1925; Wilson to Lydenberg, 8 December 1925; "Guarantors Not Having Pledged Increase," 1 September 1926. All documents in NYPLA except as noted.

¹ The Grosvenor Library is shown as a full subscriber on all earlier lists, but the May 1925 list shows Grosvenor, \$450; Buffalo Society of Natural Sciences, \$99.99. Apparently the subscription was to be shared with the Buffalo Public Library.

² Iowa State College Library, \$450; State University of Iowa Library, \$450.

³ Brown University Library, \$300; Providence Public Library, \$300; Rhode Island State Library, \$300.

⁴ The University of Wisconsin is shown on all earlier lists as a full subscriber, but the May 1925 list shows University of Wisconsin Library, \$600; Wisconsin State Historical Society Library, \$300.

⁵ Amherst College Library, \$150; Jones Library, Amherst, \$150; Massachusetts Agricultural College Library, \$150; Forbes Library, Northampton, \$150; Smith College Library, \$150; Mt. Holyoke College Library, \$150.

- ⁶ Vassar is shown on all earlier lists as a full subscriber, but the May 1925 list shows Vassar College Library \$150; Colgate University Library, \$300; Syracuse University Library, \$150. It is not clear what library or libraries were intended to complete this group.
- ⁷ Queens University Library, \$150; Toronto Public Library, \$300; University of Toronto Library, \$300; University of Western Ontario Library, \$150.
- ⁸ University of Idaho Library, \$150; University of Montana Library, \$150; Oregon Agricultural College Library, \$300; University of Oregon Library, \$300.
- ⁹ Rochester Public Library, \$300; Rochester Theological Seminary Library, \$300; University of Rochester Library, \$300.
- ¹⁰ Originally sought as part of a Maine group.