COOPERATION BETWEEN SPECIAL LIBRARIES AND OTHER TYPES OF LIBRARIES

The student of special libraries struggles first with defining them. Special libraries exist in every environment, hence if I define them too broadly, there is no group other than themselves with which they may interact. However, it is obvious that for systems planning purposes, whatever we do about academic and public libraries benefits branches within them that are considered under some definitions to be special libraries. Therefore, I have set these on the "other" side, and have defined the special libraries on which this essay will focus to be those that exist in business, industry, government, museums, societies, and non-profit research agencies. It is in this group that we find several types which are constrained by their parent organizations from responding to normal techniques of promoting cooperative activities, and for examination their isolation should prove useful.

Special libraries form two subsets when analyzed in terms of interagency cooperation, particularly with academic and public libraries. The special libraries in government, museums, societies and non-profit agencies form one subset, those in business and industry another. While none of these libraries has a public responsibility as its primary mission, the former are more frequently considered, and behave more like quasi-public libraries. The latter do not, and can easily draw away from any association with or contribution to the public sector of library service. In other words, the former group may well be considered for planning purposes to be the open sector of special libraries, the latter should be dealt with as the closed sector. The libraries of the industrial and business group are generally categorized as users by the open sector and not generally as partners in public systems.

This situation need not necessarily be perpetuated. The special, closed characteristic of the corporate library has meaning, nevertheless, in terms of
what must be done to capitalize on any semblance of accessibility that the special library in the profit-making sector displays. As many as half of the non-academic and non-public special libraries are in business and industry. This group constitutes a number too large to bypass in systems planning.

In essaying the field of special libraries we are hampered by an annoying dearth of good, sound, research information, including statistical data, relating to almost every aspect of work with these libraries. It is indeed strange that a field of librarianship so prominent, and with both serious problems and examples of excellent solutions to these problems, has itself been so little studied. Most of the literature about special librarianship is descriptive of techniques or argumentative about philosophy. Three theses dealing with various aspects of business and industrial special libraries, and their inter-relationships, a score of state and regional planning documents, the documentation concerning fewer than half-a-dozen on-going service systems, and many articles on the problems and operations of special libraries and services that feed them provided input for this essay. My own work over two decades in special research libraries, and particularly my work for the New York City 3-R’s agency in its efforts to increase access to scientific and technical information, strongly influenced my analysis of the relationships between special and other libraries.

In many respects what I have seen and have to say may not be unique to the relationships between special and other types of libraries. Many of the problems that affect system development in libraries are universal. This was one of the outstanding characteristics of my findings in a New York City study that pointedly and intensely concentrated on a type of library considered “special.” We must consider this fortunate, since many of our proposed solutions to problems of extending library service in general will easily encompass and benefit special libraries. Nevertheless, the special library environment does harbor some peculiarities that are unique, or at least different enough from the norm of public and academic libraries to require exceptional features in systems designed to enhance the power of libraries through cooperation or formalized interaction.

Quite naturally the largest part of the interaction among special libraries and between special and other types of libraries still comes about through informal or non-systematized contacts, with the libraries operating quite independently and under no obligation to participate in the transactions. The chief output of interaction is the sharing of resources through interlibrary lending. Interlibrary cooperation in reference services, except for the normal interchange of courtesies in answering quick reference questions by phone and mail, is minimal.

Only the scantiest of recent evidence can be presented to demonstrate the patterns and the dimensions of the interlibrary lending activity. In a New York State study, corporate special libraries reported that they sought publications from various sources in the following order of preference: other special libraries, federal government agency libraries, college and public libraries (showing no difference in order of preference), research centers, other out-of-state libraries, experts, and the New York State Library.¹

One fourth of the special libraries used other special libraries most frequently; between 15 and 18 percent used federal government, public and the
state libraries most frequently; and about 11 percent used college libraries most frequently. The median number of items received on interlibrary transactions was 100. Books comprised 30 percent of the total items borrowed, 27 percent were photocopies in lieu of interlibrary loan, and 22 percent were serials. Dan Bedsole found that on a nationwide basis, the average number of volumes borrowed by industrial corporation libraries was about 335 per year, with a high of 10,000 reported by one library. This same group of special libraries contributed about fifty-seven volumes a year to the interlibrary lending operation and although the point is not made, we may presume from other experience that most of those volumes were lent to other special libraries. The remainder of the volumes in the interlibrary loan pipeline studied by Bedsole represent a load factor of about 650,000 volumes a year flowing from various sources other than special libraries to the nation’s 2,400 industrial libraries.2

The New York City survey of science library facilities and services calculated that four of the largest public science collections in the city were being tapped for 30,000 photocopy requests a year for journal articles, or about 200 text pages per hour, with as much as 90 percent of the load coming from industry.3 All three of these pieces of evidence indicate that the workload in interlibrary activity is large enough to invite planned accommodation. Although this is skimpy evidence with which to encourage widespread planning, the fact that three studies with different purposes found interlibrary sharing of resources to be big business is not coincidental. The need for planning is real.

The tendency for special libraries to cooperate with libraries of similar kinds is strong.4 This is particularly true of medical and law libraries, undoubtedly because of the special features and contents of their literature bases that are used by no one outside of these disciplines. To the extent that libraries in these subject areas exist within organizations of different types (e.g., academic, hospital, county, association and industrial corporations), cooperation among the libraries is a demonstration of how agencies with disparate goals and support can interface in a system. Medical libraries are being even more closely bound into a stratified cooperative structure by the policies and practices of the National Library of Medicine (NLM) in disseminating literature and citations to doctors through libraries, and the strengthening of the structure through the provisions of the Medical Library Assistance Act which places a premium on cooperation.5 NLM itself is purposely planning a hierarchy of libraries and information centers in the extension of MEDLARS.6

Museum libraries and academic libraries appear to have a natural affinity, chiefly because the museum curator conducts research much in the same fashion as a professor, and indeed in a number of fields, such as systematic biology and art history, professors and curators are peers, sharing research resources, joint appointments and professional society affiliations. Except for an attempt to create an automated inventory of some parts of a number of museums’ artifacts through the aegis of the Museum Computer Network in New York City, nothing is yet developing that would tie together museum libraries with those of academies of science, universities, societies and foundations, all of which share many other characteristics in common with museums.7 This situation might change if the National Museum Act can be extended and funded.8
Few societies maintain libraries in the United States, but those that do have, in the main, superb research facilities. Although they exist primarily to serve members, they are most often open for public use on the premises. The Chemists' Club Library in New York City is entirely non-circulating even to members, hence any interaction that takes place is through the medium of the users from various kinds of agencies who come to the library. On the other hand, the Engineering Societies Library (ESL) does lend books to members, and has established a class of membership for corporate libraries which then are entitled to borrow materials just as the members of the societies that support ESL.

Unsystematic interlibrary activity is not sufficient to the task of supplying information and publications in the breadth of subjects and depth of analysis that is demanded by our highly developed intellectual communities of users. The "unsystem" can respond neither quickly nor cheaply enough, even though several recent studies seem to indicate otherwise. Several studies note that special libraries are filling nearly 100 percent of all requests made of them with considerable reliance on other libraries. This is taken by some to indicate a lack of need to improve services. Yet this evidence of satisfaction obscures difficulties that demand attention.

In the unstructured system of libraries with which he operates, the special librarian must often hunt through a sequence of many libraries before finding material he needs and to which he can have access. This is costly and time-consuming communication. Furthermore, even though public and academic libraries may rank third or fourth on the list of most frequently used sources by special libraries, the burden on these libraries has reached the cirsis point in most places. Special library users are demanding. After making the rounds of other kinds of libraries all that may remain of their needs when they come to the public sector are the items most difficult to identify and locate, the obscure, or the heavily used material that no one else can find or will lend them. Regardless of the number of libraries in a region, the biggest part of the burden of inter-library lending usually falls on one or a few large libraries. Thus, among science libraries in the New York City area, four libraries (New York Public Library, ESL, Columbia University and the Chemists' Club) are the most frequently visited, the most frequently called, the most frequently tapped for photocopies, and the most frequently criticized libraries of the scores of units in the public sector.

These are the forces that have influenced the building of systems and networks among libraries. The goal is always the same: to expand the vista of the libraries and their users to take into account more of the region's resources, to increase the probability of success in searching for material, or to decrease the probability of following false leads, and to simplify and speed up communication of information and publications. In a few instances, the goals are expanded to include the increase of the region's resources in a response patterned after need, and the establishment of new public services.

Organizational structures, services, and system facilities vary among the regions in which cooperation has been formalized as would be expected given the variation in influences in various regions and metropolitan areas. The publication by local libraries of lists with their collections specialties, accessibility to
the public and service offerings is a minimum, and frequently invoked, technique of systematization. A list of special libraries of all kinds has been available in New York City for decades.¹⁰ A similar but smaller list is the only real product of the Associated Science Libraries of San Diego, a group of industrial, academic, government, and museum libraries.¹¹

Stronger links—usually involving positive commitments by several libraries to serve as the core of a system and as some kind of dedicated communication circuit—have been created or are being recommended by planners who hope these links will be innovative and instrumental in initiating continued developments and refinements. Again patterns of operation vary, and we have no analysis of the reasons for, or the comparative success of, the various patterns. In Dallas the pool of resources of the Industrial Information Service, established to serve business and industry, has been created by the holdings of a number of academic libraries backed up by the holdings of Southern Methodist University where the service is located.¹² The same is true in Houston for the Regional Information and Communication Exchange headquartered at Rice University.¹³ Users in Dallas including corporate libraries tap the system through the headquarters office of the Industrial Information Service. In the Gulf area, members of RICE, and others in business and industry, tap the system wherever a core library is located. The core libraries in both systems are linked by teletype. A proposed plan for Connecticut would link pre-identified libraries together with teletype, but would tie the network to a statewide library research center where an automated union catalog would be maintained.¹⁴ Participating libraries, among which are eighteen corporate and many academic libraries, would insert cataloging copy in machine-readable form as their collections grew. Presumably other libraries could query the system, perhaps for a fee.

In New York City, the establishment of a system of core libraries to serve as a public resource in science and technology, including public, government, society, academic, association, and museum libraries where strong collections in various subjects are already maintained has been proposed.¹⁵ The subjects covered by the collections are complementary, with some redundancy. Users would access the system in normal ways, and through network communication facilities yet to be developed, would be given a number of physical access points to the entire system.

But of even greater importance, the core libraries would be subsidized so that the growth of the collections in specified subject areas which serve the public interest would be guaranteed and not left to the unilateral decisions of libraries operating independently. Furthermore, the subsidy would compensate the libraries for the adoption of a public function that might lie somewhere beyond its normal responsibility, thereby protecting its own resources which are to be directed to its basic missions and clientele.

I have already mentioned the hierarchies of libraries being developed into an inter-agency system by the National Library of Medicine. The mixture of medical libraries one finds in various regions have been the most active in creating a new environment for library service. In New York City most of the hospital, academic, research and institutional medical libraries operate a cooperative storage and delivery system and maintain a union list of serials.¹⁶
Several regional groupings of libraries based on units of the State University of New York are demonstrating network capabilities for locating and sharing resources. In Detroit a group of nine academic and institutional medical libraries have formed a strong federation with their technical services being performed by Wayne State University. Wayne State has long been the chief contributor to interlibrary loans among medical libraries, and continues to be the depth resource. This system operates within a larger, but more loosely knit, group of nearly thirty medical libraries, including academic, institutional and industrial libraries, that have for years been researching problems of mutual concern in medical library operation, and have contributed to a union list of serials that Wayne State produces for the group.

At this point let me turn away from the cataloging of cooperative ventures, for obviously there are many. In many instances they are the reverse images of some of the cooperative programs that have already been mentioned. Let us now examine some of the factors which influence the planning improvements in the quality of experiences in contacts between special and other kinds of libraries.

The aspect of “specialness” of these libraries that ultimately brings to bear the strongest influences on making plans for their incorporation into viable systems and networks derives from the mission of their parent agencies. Subject content and kind of materials in the collections of special libraries are important considerations in systems planning, as are the geographical location of special libraries and their information and service orientation. Nevertheless in the final analysis it is not these elements but those that are determined by whether the agency that pays for the special library is profit or non-profit, is in research, manufacturing, education or business, that determines what alternatives we must select in building a conglomerate system of libraries of varying types. System design is severely constrained, therefore, by influences determined by the nature of the agency and not necessarily by its information and library needs and its resources.

One of the most difficult administrative problems of providing for interaction between special and other types of libraries is the financing of such operations. Corporate libraries as a category are frequently excluded from programs that are funded by the state since it is not usually state policy to subsidize, at least directly, industrial corporations for what are considered normal operations. In New York State, funds distributed by the State Library to the 3-R’s regional agencies may go only to incorporated non-profit cultural or educational institutions (including public libraries) which provide reference and research library service. Funds cannot be further distributed to profit-making agencies. It is not even clear yet whether corporate libraries can participate in special programs to aid libraries that are funded with 3-R’s money. A “corporate” library membership category has recently been established by the New York City 3-R’s agency (METRO). These libraries will receive at least their pro-rata share of service upon the payment of dues, if not the full services from METRO.

Special libraries benefit from government-subsidized programs that tend to improve public and academic libraries, and indeed, a number of programs of this
type have been funded that have been of immediate importance to corporate libraries. For several years, the National Science Foundation and the Department of Commerce joined forces to finance a dozen regional technical report centers, mostly in universities throughout the country (except in Illinois where the John Crerar Library was the depository). The Department of Commerce provided microfilm copies of technical reports from its Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information and the National Science Foundation paid for staff and equipment to manage the centers’ operations. The idea, of course, was to improve access to technical reports, a service of vital importance to many industrial libraries among others. State Technical Services Act funds have provided seed money for the Regional Information and Communication Exchange in Houston, the Industrial Information Service in Dallas, and a program in California that links the State Library, UCLA, and public libraries in the Fresno County area—all to serve industry.

Surprisingly, in spite of much talk among academic and public libraries, few of them charge corporate users for their services. Stanford and M.I.T. have established technical information service divisions or departments to which local corporate agencies pay fees for service, and some libraries such as the University of California at Berkeley have user’s or borrower’s fees, although these are usually quite nominal—as are the services offered. There is still a strong feeling among many such libraries that corporations are entitled to access to publicly supported libraries (including those in academic institutions) as their right for having paid their taxes. Robert Muller has rather succinctly disposed of this argument and other basic premises under which free services are offered to industry. Basically, his point is that corporate libraries and their users are entitled to, and do receive, whatever level of library service can be offered for the funds appropriated for public and academic libraries. Corporate libraries need more specialized services, however than can be justified for the public good. On this point Muller says:

If the public interest requires that service be given to all those needing it, a governmental agency is likely to be set up, and subsidization can be justified. On the other hand, where service does not clearly relate to the public interest, justification is needed if service is supplied below cost or free. A publicly supported institution is even more subject to criticism than a privately supported one when it gives things away. The “thing” given away by a university library is often not conspicuously visible, but is just as real: It is staff time paid for by appropriated funds that might have been better spent on service to students and faculty.

The Engineering Societies Library and the John Crerar Library both offer special services such as compilation of bibliographies and the provision of translations, priced at cost. Perhaps all libraries with attractive resources such as these should be more mercenary in dealing with those who need exceptional services. The federal government very pointedly recognizes the value of information in its various technology transfer programs. According to one recent analysis by NASA:

Technical information is a marketable commodity. True transfer programs add value to that information by abstracting, categorizing,
separating out the significant, dividing the relevant from the non-
relevant, and by interpretation, analysis, repackaging, and provision of
local access. The user of a system should therefore be expected to share
in the cost of its operation.\textsuperscript{24}

Lest you get too optimistic that we have found the key to the coffers, let
me warn you that there are some limits. For example, the experience of those
libraries and information centers that sell bibliographic search services indicates
that users, including corporations, are willing under normal circumstances to buy
searches for which the cost is not more than a few hundred dollars. The average
cost of a search at the Engineering Societies Library in a recent year was $124.
On the other hand, at least one corporation pays up to $1,000 a month for a
special service from one of these libraries for which it receives filmed copies of
articles and punched cards for processing and announcement services within the
company.\textsuperscript{25} Furthermore, services for sale must be pertinent, of high quality,
and vigorously promoted.

There are other dysfunctional aspects of special libraries in public systems.
Competitiveness among business firms, the proprietary value of information, and
industrial security prevent any large-scale agreements among corporation
libraries for cooperation. As a matter of fact, these factors may preclude even
small-scale formal programs of interaction. Even when corporate librarians seek
the open literature—journal articles and monographs—they must at times be
somewhat circumspect, lest they reveal information of value about their work to
their competitors through the chance association of ideas. It is not unknown for
a corporate library to spread its requests for interlibrary loan and information
among many libraries in order to conceal potentially useful correlations, even
though all their material might well be available in one or a few libraries. Special
libraries might well benefit from the services of more third-party agents who can
help them use each other and the rest of the public sector, to map out search
strategies, and to front for them in gathering sensitive information. These
agencies might also be most effective mechanisms for tapping special libraries for
the public, by extracting materials from busy industrial and corporate offices
which cannot accommodate direct public access.

I am not at all certain that any regions with access to strong library
resources in what I call the open sector would gain much by arranging to include
corporate libraries in systems for cooperative sharing of resources on behalf of
the public. Most corporate libraries are small and though they may develop
subject collections in great depth, they are in essence duplicates of parts of the
university and many public libraries that form the backup for public service in
cooperative programs already. Perhaps some regions could obtain value from
using material in these collections as added copies in case of great demand. But
the geographical dispersion of the many corporate libraries that exist in various
regions suggests that the logistics of getting these materials to the public would
be most costly and difficult. This may be a situation where facsimile transfer of
text would have significant application, but I am not too optimistic about the
prospects of being able to design a facsimile communication system, given the
almost complete lack of files of material in libraries in a format ready to be
scanned by facsimile transmitters.
As a matter of fact, though, I would say we would be remiss if plans to improve the quality of library resources and services on a regional basis did not make every possible attempt to encompass the unique and the exceptional holdings of special libraries and the information retrieval capabilities of special librarians—at least for reasonable use by qualified people. Let me remind you, however, that collections of special libraries are very carefully tailored to suit highly specific goals for usually well-defined and delimited kinds or groups of people. To a large extent special libraries contain what would best be termed research materials. In size and content these collections are not suited to serve general public use by any and all comers. Thoughtful planners should be able to find ways of feeding certain kinds of data and information from special libraries into public reference service networks.

One of our greatest needs, if we are to learn how to use small, special libraries, is a better technique than is now used to describe and evaluate collections of library materials. We do not have universally understood and easy-to-apply standards or even criteria for grading depths of collections. It is difficult for compilers of collections inventories to interfile subject analyses of the many libraries involved because of the variations in subject terminology and depth of analysis: it is too costly for the libraries to redescribe their collections according to one standard subject classification. Proponents of centralized processing involving computers pose the automatic creation of a union catalog as an advantage. While union catalogs allow us to locate specific titles, they do not lead us to subject strengths in response to generalized requests for such guidance.

Systems planners are reluctant, also, to incorporate too much reliance on these special libraries because their viability cannot be guaranteed. Whereas academic and public libraries seldom, if ever, shut down, scale-down their level of effort, move out of the area, or change drastically the scope of their collections, this is not unusual in industry. Even the largest and most stable corporations have made such major changes as a result of administrative decisions that cannot be made to accommodate the influences of the public need for social resources such as libraries.

The efficiency of interlibrary cooperation is reduced by incompatibilities in operational characteristics attributable to conflicts in missions of the libraries of various types. Different kinds and sizes of collections and staffs, and different basic assumptions about the kinds of services that should be offered occur among academic, institutional, research, corporate and public libraries. The industrial library is oriented towards information and the librarian towards extracting the information, while the academic library is oriented towards the literature and the guidance of users who must extract the information in it for themselves.

A large research library serves its purpose best when materials do not circulate and can thus be readily available for use: the small industrial library serves best when it puts documentation in the hands of users in their offices and laboratories. Thus, when the industrial librarian calls or contacts a large research library for loans of copies of material, or assistance in tracking down difficult bits of information, he is invited to come to the library to look at literature that does not circulate and to extract the information he needs himself. Whether or
not he can do this is a function of travel time to the large collection. Some special libraries maintain staff at nearby large research libraries (e.g., Shell Development Corporation at the University of California and the Smithsonian Institution at the Library of Congress) but this practice is severely restrained by the lack of space in large libraries to accommodate extra staff. There are other conflicts due to variation in missions but these suffice to illustrate the point. The existence of different missions is seldom denied, but there is considerable misunderstanding when librarians and users meet at the interface between libraries of different types.

A number of generalized solutions suggest themselves. One is to provide a buffer—a third-party service between libraries of different types—to do the work that neither the corporate or the public and academic librarian has the time to do. Another is to increase the public resource by building an independent, public research library facility strictly for the purpose of interfacing specialized users. Still another is to build an overlay on the existing system—that is, to recognize that certain large public or quasi-public libraries are attractive to people who wish to make special use of them and to add sufficient people and resources to these libraries to allow them to take on an additional mission. This is cheaper than building the same kind of attractive library in duplicate from the ground up. It is the technique recommended for New York City in science.26

Management in corporate and institutional agencies has been largely passive in the midst of their agencies' information problems. The impetus, the work, and even the struggle to arrange financing for cooperative systems and networks serving the interests of special libraries has come from the librarian group. As with academic institutions, management in industry and business apparently views libraries as increasingly costly. As long as librarians cooperate voluntarily, serving each other for nothing, management feels little pressure to seek actively an even more expensive extension of library service, regardless of the potentially greater return for its money through expanded access to useful information.

There are exceptions, and they are worth noting. Several industrial agencies in the Dallas area have been active in leading efforts to improve the quality of graduate educational facilities in the area. Library service is prominent among these facilities, hence when the notion of the Industrial Information Service (IIS) arose, it was actively pursued. Subsequently, the enthusiasm and the ingenuity of the manager of the service has extended its popularity in industry to the point where at least thirty-six firms now support IIS, paying membership fees of up to $9,600 per year. In Houston, the Chamber of Commerce, Rice University, and several industrial organizations likewise actively sought solutions to the problems of gaining access to technical and business information. It was this effort that led finally to the formation of the Regional Information and Communication Exchange. Now fifteen business and industrial leaders serve on its advisory board. Nevertheless, there is a wide variation in "information mindedness" among the managements of firms. Library systems planners should place high priority on the tasks of gaining active support from corporate managers, and of involving them in the management of the systems.
The impetus given to the joining of several kinds of libraries into cooperative systems by the policies and programs of federal agencies is likely to grow stronger. The National Agricultural Library is setting the foundations of a plan for a network of agricultural libraries and information services that will involve a mixture of academic, government, public and industrial organizations.\textsuperscript{27} A national information and document handling system for ecology has been proposed in Congress, and although insufficient support was marshalled to create it in the recent session, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs continues to gather arguments and ideas to support the idea.\textsuperscript{28} The National Science Foundation is actively encouraging societies to develop national information programs in the disciplines they encompass. Nearly 15 percent of Chemical Abstracts Service's budget this year is derived from government sources. Information programs that will in essence produce all-encompassing discipline-based knowledge networks are under consideration and development in biology, the earth sciences, botany, engineering, mathematics, psychology and the social sciences. The articulation of libraries as operators in these networks designed to serve researchers in various settings, is an endemic characteristic of the premises under which these national information systems are being formed.

In any event, reference and research libraries will inevitably be drawn into joint use of resources and facilities by knowledge networks. These networks will involve the use of highly expensive and sophisticated data bases and communication equipment. This will drive up the total costs of acquisition of information and data to a point higher than many individual libraries will be able to afford. Cooperation for access, or at least joint ownership of data bases and communication and searching facilities will be required.

The grid of communication systems that is developing is not a simple one. It involves reference sources on magnetic tapes, national and somewhat closed-circuit communication systems, and the ability to talk in highly technical terms with information analysis centers. Reference services of the highest quality in the future will require far more than shelves of books to which one can reach for answers. The experience of the Industrial Information Service is clear evidence of a new configuration of reference networks. Through its office, local libraries may tie into a number of networks and information centers, such as the NASA Technology Center at the University of New Mexico; the TEXTAN Network funded by the State Technical Services Act in Texas; COSMIC—the Computer Software Management and Information Center of NASA at the University of Georgia; and the Regional Information and Communication Exchange at Rice University in Houston.\textsuperscript{29} We can predict—indeed we must plan—for more of this.

It is obvious that a plurality of library agencies and libraries are going to exist in the United States, and that a number of organizational patterns for library systems, frequently with several kinds in one region, will have to exist in order to gain full power from the contribution that can be made by both special and the more public libraries. Because of the complexities and peculiarities of any viable consumers' region, we are bound to have different solutions to problems of library organization, operation and use. Our chief concern now should be that we have insufficient understanding and knowledge of each local
community so as to find the best configuration of elements to make serviceable systems.

Fortunately after many years of quiescence, state library agencies are awakening to the problems and prospects of their helping improve reference and research library facilities and services, particularly in metropolitan areas. In the past, state libraries have all too readily acquiesced in situations where large city libraries ignore them, and have put their efforts into other territory. They derive support from these non-city areas, hence serve them. This "pattern of state library policy-making prevents the development of conditions necessary for consideration of intergovernmental metropolitan problems." 30 Monypenny recommended that the states should "take steps to provide greatly enriched reference and research services in the entire state. . . . linking. . . strong collections by interlibrary loan and reference systems." 31 This, it appears, is what we are up to.
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