"It is," said the Hoover Commission, "almost impossible to comprehend the organization and management problems of the Federal Government unless one has some concept of its hugeness and complexity. The sheer size, complexity and geographical dispersion of its operations almost stagger the imagination. As a result of depression, war, new needs for defense, and our greater responsibilities abroad, the Federal Government has become the largest enterprise on earth." ¹

How, then, should the editors of this issue of *Library Trends*, devoted to the libraries of the federal government, introduce their readers to the multiplicity of libraries and library systems serving the largest enterprise on earth? Somewhere in this gigantic goldfish bowl there is an eel of trend, pursued by the behemoth of reorganization. How shall we lay hold of him?

Washington (to change the figure) is a crossroads where overseas librarians are frequent visitors. Perhaps in this introduction the editors can do no better than to consider their taxpaying readers as visiting VIP's, and to offer them an explanation of the working of federal libraries similar to that which is given to their colleagues from overseas. This, then, is an introduction to the libraries of the federal government, and more particularly to the motivations and directions of their contemporary development. In keeping with the announced purposes of *Library Trends*, the papers assembled here have attempted to emphasize the dynamic, not the static. Such emphasis, in view of the ever changing aspect of the federal, and hence the federal library, scene, is altogether fitting.

To begin with a constitutional principle early learned but frequently overlooked by visitors to Washington, there are three branches of the federal government: the legislative, the judicial, and the execu-

---

¹ Mr. Clapp is Chief Assistant Librarian of Congress.
Mr. Adams is Librarian of the National Institutes of Health.
tive. The order in which these are listed is the order in which they are equipped with libraries: the Legislative Branch has but five, the Judicial Branch some forty, and the Executive Branch several thousand. The greatest homogeneity is displayed by the libraries of the Judicial Branch, which are all, as might be expected, law libraries. They are also widely dispersed throughout the country, in association with the several United States Courts, and only three are located in Washington. For these reasons they receive comparatively little notice—much less than they deserve—in the articles which follow. Meanwhile, the Executive Branch includes an extraordinary diversity of libraries both in and outside of Washington, while the Legislative Branch includes the library which, from points of view both of size and of variety of services, is the principal of all federal libraries. The subsequent articles deal in consequence chiefly with the libraries of the Executive Branch—such as those of the departments, independent agencies, and commissions—with frequent side-glances to take account of the situation in the Legislative establishment.

Quoting the Hoover Commission again, “In less than 20 years [the federal government’s] civil employment has increased from 570,000 to over 2,000,000. Its bureaus, sections, and units have increased fourfold to over 1,800. . . . Only 10 percent of the over 2,000,000 Federal employees are located in Washington; the balance are in the field service.” The exact number of libraries serving these (plus or minus) 1,800 agencies with their staffs of (plus or minus) 2,000,000 persons of whom (plus or minus) 10 per cent are in Washington—quite apart from other millions in the Armed Services—is not known, and there is no single directory to them. Mr. Mohrhardt’s paper produces certain totals for the field libraries included in federal library systems which exceed the counts given in any published directory. There may well exist single federal departments unaware of the total libraries they harbor, or of librarians they employ. This is especially the case since library activities may exist under other names, such as technical information centers, documents centers, or photographic archives.

Considering the inexactitude of the statistics at all periods it would be hazardous to infer, with Rider and Ridenour, an exponential rate in the establishment of federal libraries; yet the figures in Table 1, which indicate the number of federal libraries at various periods, could easily be interpreted in exponential terms.

Just as the needs, operations, and services of the federal government run the gamut of human activities, so are its libraries variegated. They
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### TABLE 1

**Number of Federal Libraries, 1800-1952**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>In Washington, D.C. and Vicinity</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800†</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876‡</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951§</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


† Two federal libraries (in the State and War Departments) trace their establishment prior to 1800. Two others (Library of Congress and Library of House of Representatives) were established in that year but were inoperative until later.

‡ The figures taken include only libraries marked as governmental and garrison libraries, and omit a few government libraries not so marked, e.g., those of Howard University and the Government Hospital for the Insane, Washington, D.C.

§ The figures in the table are from a page-by-page count in the *American Library Directory, 1951*, Ed. 19 (New York, Bowker, 1951). These differ considerably from those given in its recapitulation, p. ix.

|| The heading here should be “library units” rather than “libraries,” and the count refers only to the five agencies reflected in Table 2 in Mr. Mohrhardt’s paper, *infra*, plus the 87 field libraries of the Judicial Branch (see ref. 3, *supra*, and the text to which the ref. applies).

include on the one hand ivy-clad college and university libraries; on the other, special libraries for music, the graphic arts, archaeology, pure science, medicine, agriculture, and other applied sciences. There are
libraries of maps, of photographs, of private and public papers. They serve on the one hand the most highly specialized nuclear physicist or semasiologist, and, on the other, the unlettered child on an Indian reservation. Between these extremes they serve, in a far-flung network of army camp, navy battleship, air force base, veterans hospital, and State Department information libraries, the recreational, instructional, and informational needs of the fighting forces, of the disabled veterans, and of people in foreign countries with curiosity about the United States. There are working libraries, libraries which attempt to form comprehensive collections within large divisions of the whole field of knowledge, and libraries which specialize in minute sections of one or other of these divisions. Indeed, there was until recently for some years a "deposit library" of the United States government within 22° of the South Pole, in a cache left by Admiral Byrd's U.S. Antarctic Service Expedition! Finally, there are the three giants, which taken together form almost a universality of coverage, the three so-called national collections of the Library of Congress, the Armed Forces Medical Library, and the library of the Department of Agriculture.

It is difficult, among such diversity of size, scope, organizational status, and service, even broadly to categorize the federal libraries. Except for those which are components of the systems described by Mr. Mohrhardt, each almost creates a category in itself. Thus, it is only with some difficulty that Mrs. Hooker, in her table summarizing the federal libraries in the Washington area by type or subject of interest, has been able to reduce these 130 libraries to 14 types.

Both the number and the diversity of federal libraries must be considered in the light of federal bureaucratic growth. Few of them trace their foundation prior to the year 1800, when the government moved to the seat prepared for it in the District of Columbia. Save for the library of the Jesuit college in Georgetown, the District in 1800 was a wilderness devoid of institutionalized book collections. This very fact was to serve as a stimulus to library development, and to have many interesting and useful results. It resulted, for example, in the Library of Congress, founded in that year of 1800. It gave rise to the initial library program of the Smithsonian Institution; and though that program was brief and premature, it made permanent contributions—in two library censuses, in the objective of a national library collection, in experimentation toward national library service, and in the first international conference of librarians. Later, the same stimulus resulted in the bibliographic program of the library of the Surgeon
General of the Army (now the Armed Forces Medical Library), and
in the early printed catalog card operations of the Department of Agri-
culture Library.

By the end of the first century, the area that at its beginning had been almost completely innocent of libraries could rejoice in no less than 68, of which 37 were owned by the government; and the big-wigs of the American Library Association were talking to the Congressional Joint Committee on the Library about ways in which these might be coordinated. 11

“Coordination” both did and did not take place (as so often happens in affairs of government), but in any case the federal libraries con-
tinued to proliferate. By 1930, when the American Library Directory first acknowledged the existence of a category of “federal libraries,” the First World War had intervened, and the number of libraries had doubled since the census of 1876. But 1930 was the eve of a very considerable expansion of governmental agencies, which was to con-
tinue throughout the depression, through the defense mobilization, through World War II, and into the postwar period. This expansion and multiplication would in any case have tended to increase the federal library establishments (though there were simultaneously cer-
tain notable instances of consolidation and reduction of the actual number of libraries by some agencies—see Mrs. Hooker’s and Mr. Mohrhardt’s papers), but there were other factors as well tending to the development.

One of the factors has been the greatly increased recourse to library sources of information in governmental areas of activity, as in others, in the last twenty years. Here one example must suffice: during the fiscal year 1952, the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress received nearly twenty-four inquiries from members of Con-
gress for each one that it received during the fiscal year 1930. 12, 13
Another influence has been the rising interest taken by the federal government in scientific and technological research and development—an interest, computed in dollar expenditures, increasing from $23 million in 1930 14 to some $2.2 billion in fiscal 1953, 15 and which has involved the establishment of so many libraries serving scientific and technological interests that this category now exceeds any of the others in which the federal libraries may be grouped (see Table 1 in Mrs. Hooker’s paper, infra).

Still other factors have contributed. One is the official recognition

[7]
of libraries as agencies for instruction and recreation in the Armed Services (compare with the situation in World War I, when the army camp library services were provided through the American Library Association), and of recreation and rehabilitation in the hospitals of the Veterans Administration and other government agencies. Another, of course, is the discovery that libraries are potent instruments of occupation and foreign policy, with the resultant establishment of the network of Amerika Hausers, Civil Information and Education Libraries, and U.S. Information libraries around the world. Of the extensive library systems, with accompanying central services, that have resulted, more is to be found in the papers of Mr. Mohrhardt and Mr. Lacy.

In general, then, the rise of federal libraries parallels the twentieth-century growth of federal agencies, representing their broad variety of interests. They are very unlike in establishment from agency to agency, and even within an agency. They represent a multiplicity of subjects and purposes, and in this they differ widely one from another. However, by virtue of the fact that they are federal libraries, they have a certain homogeneity.

The editors apprehend that their readers might be disappointed with this issue if the paper curtain of Bureaucracy—with a big “B”—were not momentarily twitched aside to permit a few intimate glances at the Washington wonderworld. For this is what the libraries have in common: they all are constituent units of the greatest bureaucracy on earth.

In the first place, federal libraries necessarily exist in a climate which is to an extent legalistic. Each must be prepared to answer the question, “What is your authority for doing what you’re doing?” A Congress anxious to control potential mushrooming of governmental functions, a Bureau of the Budget charged with the responsibility of seeing that those things which are legally authorized are efficiently done, a General Accounting Office alert to guard against the misexpenditure of federal funds—these and other agencies continuously question the statutory and regulatory authority under which the units and their libraries operate.

In descending order of importance, the federal libraries are governed by

1. Public laws.
2. Executive orders (in the Executive Branch; but these orders are
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not infrequently followed, for the sake of uniformity, by agencies in other branches).

3. Decisions and regulations of regulatory officers and bodies, e.g., the Attorney General, the Comptroller General, Bureau of the Budget, Civil Service Commission, Loyalty Review Board, General Services Administration.

4. Departmental (commission, independent agency) regulations.

5. Bureau (or other component agency) regulations, orders, and procedures, including special regulations affecting field service (i.e., service outside the District of Columbia).

Thus Congress may pass a law affecting recruitment of federal employees. The Civil Service Commission issues a directive interpreting the law; the department concerned incorporates the directive with interpretation in a manual sheet; the sponsoring bureau sends the department’s sheet with a transmittal letter, and the library is brought into line.

Working back through the levels of printed authority to discover what courses of action are permissible requires either special skills, or acquaintance with experts. The authorities are not so often contradictory as absent or anachronistic. For example, the sole citation to the Armed Forces Medical Library by name (under the heading “Libraries—Surgeon General’s Office”) in the 1946 edition of the U.S. Code refers to an authorization extended to that library to bind books in “half Turkey” when these books are for its exclusive use.

In addition to public laws and departmental regulations, however, the federal libraries are governed by the regulations of other mandatory servicing agencies. The Civil Service Commission’s regulations concerning recruitment, position standards, qualification standards, and many other matters affecting terms of government employment, are binding on all but a very few units. Mr. Dunbar’s paper describes these conditions in detail. Similarly, the General Services Agency establishes a number of blanket procurement contracts for periodical subscriptions and book purchases which are mandatory on all except exempted agencies. All printing and binding of the government is required by law to be done at the Government Printing Office, except for those units removed from Washington to whom the Public Printer may grant waivers. While the use of these mandatory servicing agencies has been created for government economy, the smaller libraries have frequently raised questions of their effectiveness.

[9]
Apparently, this legalistic orientation is all a matter of acclimatization; the federal libraries do thrive, and those nonfederal librarians who have passed through the Ordeal by Trial (Form 57, Application for federal employment), and the Ordeal by Vigil (waiting for clearances) and have taken the Oath, have generally managed to adapt themselves successfully (cf. again Mr. Dunbar's article).

There are two more facets of bureaucratic life which are common to the federal libraries: security and intelligence. By virtue of the fact that the libraries are agencies of the federal government, and that each employee has sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States, these considerations take on seriousness.

Necessity for security in government is patent and rests upon two simple principles: (1) certain aspects of the business of government must be conducted in confidence, and (2) the giving of help and comfort to an enemy or potential enemy is to be avoided. The first principle is supported by regulatory, and the second by statutory, authority.

From the first of these principles derive two types of security practices. The first, and one generally obnoxious to the gentlemen of a free press, is mere administrative security. Documents issued in preliminary editions for comment, organization plans, and similar "not-for-publication" items are commonly labeled "Restricted" or "For Administrative Use Only." These cause but minor problems to libraries; their use must be controlled, and as a rule they are quickly superseded or published.

The third type of administrative confidentiality represents a special case: agencies awarding development contracts believe that they have a responsibility to protect the commercial or patent rights of their contractors, and have invented protective mechanisms governing the distribution of project reports. This practice, originating at the Central Air Documents Office, has necessitated extra controls in libraries receiving such reports.

The third type of security practice, national security, flows from the second principle stated above, and is serious business. The grades of "classification" into categories of confidentiality, with the provisions for safekeeping and distribution, are meticulously prescribed by Executive Order of the President, and libraries having anything to do with classified documents must follow them. Certain assurances are essential. First, all members of the staff handling classified documents must receive security clearances based on exhaustive FBI inquiry. Second, the library must be equipped with steel lock-files, safes, or vaults for secure storage. Third, the library must provide a secure
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handling system, including receipting mechanisms, and verification both of the clearance status of a potential user and of his official need for the document. Needless to say, any catalogs of classified documents are themselves classified.

All this costs time and money. It also has hidden costs; eternal vigilance against laxity in security regulations, or infringement of them, harasses many a custodian. The librarian trained in a spirit of free inquiry frequently makes adjustments to security consciousness with personal and professional malaise, since the traditional techniques and objectives of library service do not find classified documents truly compatible. By and large, the libraries handling them occur mainly in the defense agencies, and even there such papers tend to concentrate in secure document rooms. It is significant to note that federal librarians have actively participated in the down-grading and open dissemination of documents where the classified character had become anachronistic. After World War II, librarians advising on the President’s Publication Board promoted the general circulation of wartime research reports and captured documents. Nevertheless, if in these days a federal library is to provide the unpublished reports its official clientele needs, it can only with difficulty escape the storing of some security classified material.

Perhaps the foregoing will explain partially the position of District of Columbia librarians taken during debate in meetings of the American Library Association on the “Use” versus “Abuse” of loyalty oaths. As a group, the federal librarians have day-to-day responsibility for actions whose very essence is loyalty to the government, and to the Constitution which they swore to defend when they were employed.

The incidental provision of “intelligence” for government agencies primarily concerned with the national security is another function which a number of federal libraries perform. “Intelligence” in this sense is not information on the tactical disposition of enemy troops, but economic, social, cultural, scientific, and technical facts on a global scale—the data needed in order to estimate accurately the state of world affairs. General William Donovan, wartime Chief of the Office of Strategic Services, is reported to have said that 95 per cent of the materials of intelligence lie buried in libraries. While this may have been stated deliberately to deglamorize the cloak-and-dagger concept of intelligence operations, and to bestow credit upon that group of analysts which patiently gathered statistics revealing Nazi industrial
potentials, it is nonetheless true that in a century of total war all scientific, technical, economic, and social information, wherever stored, has a strategic potential. During World War II the intelligence agencies discovered libraries.

This lent a significance to library collections, particularly those with substantial holdings of foreign publications, which they had not theretofore enjoyed. Depending on the degree of their political sophistication, the federal librarians reacted to this new turn of events with romantic excitement, with inquietitude, or with realistic determination. While most of them are content to leave the acquisition of data to the intelligence agencies, all of them are aware that in the event of war the information they have added to their libraries will become a national intelligence resource.

The point should be made that the dissimilarities of federal libraries derive from the varying programs of their parent agencies, while their similarities are associated with common control mechanisms. This may explain why coordination of federal library activities, which, as previously remarked, has been the subject of recommendation at least since 1896, has made so little progress. In addition to the varying directions of their program activities, there exists no machinery for that coordination. Such machinery would probably need to involve the responsible officers for the several libraries, and this presents manifold difficulties where three of the libraries are quasi-independent agencies, one has bureau status, while the others are offices, sections, or even smaller and less autonomous units of larger establishments. There is also the fact that the libraries to be coordinated are scattered among all of the three branches of government, and it would be a unique authority indeed which could run to all three.

In spite of the lack of machinery for it, coordination itself has been far from entirely lacking. Among those libraries which attempt to maintain comprehensive collections there are understandings regarding acquisition, e.g., in the matter of veterinary medicine between the Armed Forces Medical Library and the library of the Department of Agriculture, and among the Library of Congress and the National Gallery of Art, the Office of Education, and the National Archives in the matter of fine arts, education, and motion pictures respectively. Exchange of unneeded materials among the various libraries has proceeded for years to their great advantage. A certain coordination in the acquiring of foreign publications is effected through the facilities of the Department of State, and is especially highly developed with respect
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to certain classes of materials, such as maps. Further interrelation of foreign exchanges has been thought to be desirable, and has been explored, but not implemented. Much coordination is almost automatically effected through the fact of interlibrary loan, and as well by its limitations. Cooperative cataloging arrangements are in effect. A Union List of Periodicals, Transactions and Allied Publications Currently Received in the Principal Libraries of the District of Columbia was issued by the Library of Congress as long ago as 1901 in a preliminary edition, listing some 13,000 titles, but the definitive edition was never published; nor have the catalogs of the other federal libraries, with the exception of that of the Armed Forces Medical Library, though copied, ever been filed into the National Union Catalog. These defects are symptomatic of a situation which directly affects the possibilities of long-term federal library coordination—namely, that federal libraries are no more static than the agencies which they serve, and collections may be consolidated or divided in accordance with over-all governmental reorganization.

When all is said and done, it is perhaps as well that there is no machinery for federal library coordination. Its effect might be to reduce the services to the lowest common denominator; whereas now each federal librarian is, as far as his abilities, his status, and the climate of his agency allow, capable of responding either individually or in informal group action to situations which are susceptible of improvement. Certainly there is considerable initiative, experimentation, and at times ingenuity shown by federal libraries—as is described in Mr. Gull's paper—which might be repressed by coordination.

The federal libraries differ, then, principally in those activities which reflect the variegated functions of their sponsoring agencies; their common interests are touched by over-all governmental regulatory authority, and by their involvement, as federal agencies, with questions of security. In professional matters their librarians perhaps have more in common with their nonfederal colleagues in similar types of work than they do with each other.

For example, it may be significant that there is no professional association of federal librarians, as there is of federal lawyers; and that federal librarians are found active most frequently in those professional groups which correspond to the type of service in which their libraries are engaged—special, public, law, medicine, music, hospital, college and reference, and so on. The nearest approximation to a professional association of federal librarians is one devoted to the
interests of the librarians of the Armed Forces—but this is organized within the bosom of the American Library Association. As Mr. Dunbar's paper indicates, those federal librarians located in the Washington area find outlets for their group professional energies in the Washington Chapter of the Special Libraries Association, the District of Columbia Library Association, and in other local or regional sections of various national library associations.

This is all probably as it should be, and were it otherwise would possibly reflect an unhealthy situation—one in which the inbred problems arising from a common employment would predominate in interest over those of profession-wide concern. The hope that this situation will never occur need not obscure the fact, however, that there are numerous and indeed weighty problems arising from the common employment which require consideration. These receive attention in informal groups and ad hoc committees, even though a federal library council has never come into being.

The affairs of federal libraries and librarians touch in many respects on the affairs of the profession as a whole. There was once a time when a principal federal librarian could absent himself from professional meetings. The following colloquy between a congressman and the Librarian of Congress a half century ago illustrates this:

Representative Quigg [a member of the Congressional Joint Committee on the Library]: Are you a member of the American Library Association?

Mr. Spofford [the Librarian of Congress]: I am; yes, sir . . .

Representative Quigg: You have attended most of the meetings of the American Library Association, have you not?

Mr. Spofford: Not of late years. I did attend the first meeting in Philadelphia in 1876, and meetings since in New York, and twice in Washington, but I can not find time to leave this onerous business of copyrights. I should like to do so very much.35

Today the situation is quite altered, and the conditions in libraries are such that participation by federal librarians in the work of professional organizations is a practical necessity for keeping the work up to date, for recruitment, for finding sources of assistance, and even for guiding customers to the product. In 1900–01, for example, the name of only one federal librarian—that of Herbert Putnam—was to be found in the list of officers, board members, and committee chairmen of the American Library Association; in 1953–54 there are twelve,
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and this degree of participation is just as marked in the other library associations devoted to special interests.

The areas of common interest among the federal librarians and their nonfederal colleagues include almost the whole range of professional concerns. Perhaps those in which they have had and will continue to have the most to contribute are the cooperative building of library resources, including participation in the Farmington Plan; the development of common practices in cataloging and classifications; and the planning and executing of bibliographical projects and services. Several of the subsequent papers—those of Mrs. Brownson, Miss Fine, Mr. Gull, and Mr. Rogers, specifically—touch these relationships in greater detail.

The knowledgeable reader will observe, in this introduction and in the papers which follow, one signal omission. There is nowhere here any real discussion of the work of the Library Service Division in the U.S. Office of Education. This has been deliberate. While the establishment and services of the Division hold the greatest interest and have actually and potentially the utmost importance for librarians and libraries, the editors have for two reasons refrained from mention of them. The first and less weighty of these is that the Division does not, as a library, come technically within the scope of the present issue of Library Trends, which has been restricted thus far to the libraries and library-like facilities of the federal government. The preponderant reason, however, is that the Division is part of an even larger canvas than is being painted here—the picture of library planning in the United States and of the relations of the American library world to the federal government. It may be hoped that in good time an issue of the journal may be devoted to this topic. In such a number the Division of Library Service will naturally and necessarily be a central subject of attention.

The editors have attempted to find in the federal library complex not a static pattern, but dynamic evolving situations. Since the library activities are inextricably related to the larger programs of government agencies, their missions inevitably alter with governmental reorganization. Hence a change in national administration, such as has occurred since the initiation of this issue, will inevitably condition to some extent the character of federal library development, and the directions taken by it.

Regardless of political shifts, however, there are certain demon-
strable trends, rooted safely in history, which appear to be more im-
portant than others and to deserve remark:

Recognition of the essential role of libraries in government. If the
statistics show anything, they prove that libraries have been found
serviceable in government operations of all kinds, whether purely
administrative, legal, and judicial, or concerned with scientific research
and development, intelligence, morale, instruction, or the carrying out
of foreign policy. It does not seem likely that this trend will reverse
itself.

Tendency to form national systems. The multiplication of libraries
of particular types, the decentralization of government activities, the
economies possible through central control and central services—these
are factors which have tended to the creation of systems of federal
libraries, especially since the beginning of World War II. The trend
seems likely to continue.

Experimentation. Congress understandably dislikes to add addi-
tional permanent members to the already immense civil service. This
fact alone, when reflected in the inability of federal librarians to secure
the enlarged staffs which they believe are fully justified by their work-
loads, would compel experimentation in order to produce more bricks
with less straw. Whether in the use of microfilm, the application of
photo-offset to bibliography, the construction of a rapid selector, or
the development of a facsimile network to obviate interlibrary lend-
ing, the federal librarians have not recoiled from new ideas. This trend
is likely to persist, as is its cause.

A national outlook. There may have been a time—and it is reputed
that there was—when a job in a federal agency in the sleepy town
of Washington on the banks of the Potomac was a sinecure where the
world could be forgotten. Those days have certainly gone. The agencies
which the federal libraries serve are nowadays strenuously engaged in
service to forty-eight states, and their libraries are not likely to forget
this, no matter how intradepartmental their activities may appear to
be at times. They live in an atmosphere of national responsibility. The
extent to which this situation may affect their operation may be hard
to determine, but it certainly affects their outlook. Indeed, this trend
possibly is more unmistakeable than any other, and perhaps a recogni-
tion of it is responsible for the present collection of essays.
Introduction

References

3. Information received from Helen Newman, Librarian of the U.S. Supreme Court.
35. U.S. Congress, op. cit., ref. 11, p. 49.