



# Cooperation and Planning from the Regional Viewpoint

CHARLES W. DAVID AND  
RUDOLF HIRSCH

LIBRARY COOPERATION involves the voluntary joining of forces to achieve a common goal when this can be done more successfully by group action than by the uncoordinated efforts of individual institutions. It is a perennial subject about which there has long been very general agreement in thoughtful library circles. The arguments in its favor are legion. Yet the record of cooperation among American research libraries, in spite of some notable achievements, is hardly an inspiring one, particularly at the regional or local level. Since cooperation by its very nature implies voluntary action and not coercion, it not infrequently happens that enterprises which were carefully planned and launched turn out ineffectively or even, before many years have passed, sink into something little short of oblivion.

Regional plans of cooperation, with which this article is primarily concerned, seem to suffer from the want of a recognized place in a national plan. They lack effective endorsement by any of the various central agencies, and they are not related with each other in any effective scheme of regional coordination. These plans are mildly praised in occasional papers read at professional meetings and published in library literature, but if they are to thrive, much more than this is needed. Though they are essentially local, they deserve a large place in national planning. It would seem most desirable that the plans be developed right across the country in such a pattern as to give adequate coverage of every major region with the best publications issued on a world-wide scale.

This ought not to be an impossible ideal, though it is far from

---

Mr. David is Director of the University of Pennsylvania Libraries.

Mr. Hirsch is Assistant Librarian in charge of Preparation at the University of Pennsylvania.

### *Cooperation and Planning from the Regional Viewpoint*

realization. The area of the United States is vast, the population is large, wealth is widely distributed, and the standard of living is high. Whether the country is divided with L. R. Wilson into six regions or with the Bureau of Census into nine, even the least favored ought surely to be able to afford a library system which would provide the scholar with the essential research materials and the bibliographical tools which he requires. It may be argued that the physical possession of great library resources has been over-emphasized, since inter-library lending has been so greatly developed and since modern technology has introduced various kinds of rapid telecommunication for scholarly use. Yet, important as these devices are, the argument for the actual possession of important texts in at least a single copy in each region is a valid one.

This paper attempts to get at the facts of the existing situation with respect to cooperation on a regional or local basis, particularly with respect to acquisitions and collection building. Two separate approaches to the problem have been made. First, a letter was sent to sixty colleagues deemed most likely to be well informed about the considerable number of local or regional cooperative efforts which, during the past generation, have found a place in library literature. Second, a representative list of scholarly titles in the humanities and social sciences which might well be expected to be found in research libraries have been checked against the catalogs of several libraries in the various regions of the United States. All the titles were published and reviewed several years ago, therefore allowing ample time for them to find their way into library catalogs. The showings from this checking indicate what is actually happening, on a regional basis, with respect to the acquisition of these particular titles. Acknowledgment should be given to the many librarians and directors of regional union catalogs who have generously cooperated in gathering these data.

In the early 1940's the present writers were identified with a group which was interested in the development of library cooperation in the Philadelphia area. The report then published<sup>1</sup> contained a brief estimate of library cooperation to that time showing that less progress had been made in the United States than in Germany, Great Britain, or some of the smaller countries of Europe. Also, cooperation had for the most part been local in scope and somewhat haphazard in its development. Nevertheless, the writers believed that considerable headway was being made in America, mentioning among other promising features the cooperative allocation of responsibility for special fields

among libraries and cooperation in book selection and book buying. There seemed to be a fair prospect for the future. In the light of the replies from the inquiry it must be acknowledged that the prospect has been but partly realized. There have, indeed, been valuable achievements, as the following paragraphs will show, but there have also been failures and questionable successes. The picture is mixed.

The well-known 1896 agreement between Columbia University Library and New York Public Library, which laid out an extensive division of subject fields between the two institutions has become less rather than more effective as the years have passed. "It would be quite safe to say," reports the Columbia librarian, "that this statement of understanding is no longer effective as a guide to selection policy."

There has been a more effective agreement between the Columbia University Library and the New York Academy of Medicine. Columbia has actually turned over to the Academy a considerable body of foreign medical dissertations, which the latter has cataloged for the two institutions, and has recognized that the Academy has "the primary responsibility . . . for the literature of medicine" developing its buying policy accordingly. But the cooperation "has in general been a one-way proposition, there being no area in which the Academy defers to Columbia, with the possible exception of plastic surgery." Other important cooperative arrangements have been made between Columbia, the American Museum of Natural History and the New York Botanical Garden whereby each institution defers to the strongest in such fields as systematic botany, taxonomy and paleobotany, vertebrate paleontology, and systematic zoology.

Philadelphia, with its successful regional Union Library Catalogue and its group of active cooperators, was surely one of the most promising areas in 1940, but cooperation in acquisitions has met with only moderate success. Among the large number and great variety of Philadelphia libraries duplication of acquisitions, sometimes amounting to as much as one-third of the total, is more prevalent than it ought to be; and while large sums are consumed in duplication, many monographs and serials which should be in the area are acquired by no one. There are exceptions to these generalizations. For example, "In the field of rare books Philadelphia libraries are extremely cooperative. A careful check with the Union Library Catalogue is the order of the day. Three libraries will not purchase any rarity which is already in the area."

In Baltimore a good many years ago a cooperative arrangement was entered into—somewhat like the 1896 agreement between Columbia and the New York Public Library—with respect to "areas of emphasis"

### *Cooperation and Planning from the Regional Viewpoint*

in collecting. A pale reflection of it is still to be seen in the current statement of book selection policy at the Enoch Pratt Free Library, but it is reported that "though [the original arrangement] is not dead [it] is certainly dormant." Still other cooperative agreements have more recently been attempted among Baltimore libraries—with respect to the collecting of "Maryland materials," for example, between the Pratt Library, the Historical Society and the Peabody Institute; and with respect to Maryland music and music literature between the Pratt Library and the Historical Society—but their success has not been remarkable. "All this, I'm afraid, adds up to very little," says our informant. "The chief difficulties . . . seem to be (1) variations in hours of opening, privilege of using, etc.; (2) difficulty of doing reference work at second hand or by telephone; (3) physical distance or inaccessibility, e.g. Goucher [College] is harder to reach . . . than the Library of Congress unless one has a car. The nearness of the Library of Congress is a factor that affects all Baltimore libraries."

The well-known cooperative arrangement which has existed since 1933 between Duke University and the University of North Carolina under which there have been a mutual exchange of catalog cards and firm agreements with respect to the division of subject fields of responsibility, is remarkable; yet even here success has not been unqualified. "Unfortunately, needless duplication has not been eliminated completely," writes our informant. "Pride of ownership and reluctance on the part of a few faculty members to recognize the advantages of cooperation are conditions which remain with us, and they continue to be costly. But the combined holdings of the two libraries are vastly stronger than would have been true without cooperation and enough is being achieved to make the program eminently successful."

In the Atlanta-Athens area of Georgia an ambitious plan of inter-university collaboration goes back many years to the establishment of the University Center of Georgia. This involved, among other things, the compilation of a union library catalog, the mutual recognition of fields of interest and the elimination of needless overlapping and duplication. While realization has fallen far short of the original concept, a fresh effort is now being made upon the initiative of six university presidents in Georgia and Florida. The Georgia-Florida Committee for Planning Research Library Cooperation has been set up with a salaried executive secretary, the Atlanta-Athens Union Catalog is to be reactivated, and while cooperation in acquisitions is so far confined to the voluntary exchange of information, it may well be expected to be more effective than it has been in the past.

Cooperation has had a remarkably successful history in Nashville. A Union List of Serials held in Nashville libraries was made the basis for the assignment of responsibility for the acquisition and maintenance of complete files of certain periodicals. There was some transfer of broken files from one library to another with a view to filling gaps and making holdings stronger. Then came the formation of the Joint University Libraries, in 1936 or soon thereafter, which involved joint ownership, control, and management of the library resources and services of Peabody College, Scarritt College, and Vanderbilt University under a single director. The compilation of the Nashville Union Catalog gave a further impetus to cooperation and specialization. "With a unified library administration," writes the director, "duplication in periodical subscriptions has been steadily reduced . . . In the matter of separate books recommended for purchase, such recommendations in the Central Division are checked against the Union Catalog, and before orders are placed available copies are reported to the instructor proposing a given purchase to determine whether duplication is necessary."

There is moderate optimism with respect to cooperation in the Cleveland area, where the existence of the Cleveland Union Catalog has been a contributing factor. There has long been a kind of cooperative, though wholly informal and voluntary, understanding with respect to acquisitions between the libraries of Western Reserve University, the Cleveland Public Library, the Western Reserve Historical Society, the Case Institute of Technology, and the Cleveland Museum of Art with an agreed division of responsibility in certain fields of specialization. The publication by the university in 1951 of a bibliography of serials being acquired by the principal libraries of Cleveland, except the Cleveland Public Library, has been an influence in reducing duplication of subscriptions. Yet optimism is tempered, and it is recognized that much remains to be done.

Perhaps the most successful example of formal cooperation in an acquisitions program is to be met with in Chicago. Though it is well known, the recent statement of the Newberry librarian with respect to it deserves quotation:

The cooperative acquisitions agreement which was drawn up in 1896 by the librarians of the John Crerar, the Newberry, and the Chicago Public, and subsequently formally approved by their Boards of Trustees, is perhaps the most famous example of cooperation in American Library history. The Newberry promptly sold to the Crerar, at a modest figure, its collections in science and technology, and some time

### *Cooperation and Planning from the Regional Viewpoint*

later arranged for the transfer of its excellent medical library, which had been the gift of Dr. Nicholas Senn. The Crerar recently disposed of its collections in philosophy and the social sciences, two fields which, by the agreement of 1896, both libraries were to cultivate, and gave to its sister library the first opportunity to select what it wanted. There has never been, to my knowledge, any friction or competition between the three libraries, and each, with limited purchasing budgets, has been enabled to meet the needs of its readers in a manner which would have been impossible without this statesmanlike understanding.

The University of Chicago Libraries were not included in the agreement of 1896, for they did not then exist under a unified management, and such cooperation as has been achieved has come through informal discussions between successive librarians. Much remains to be done. A few years ago the Newberry and the Chicago Historical Society formally agreed, through their Boards of Trustees, that the former should collect books relating to the literary history of Chicago, and that the latter should concentrate in the history of the city.

A project for a union catalog in Detroit was abandoned before it was completed. There is frequent consultation between the Detroit Public Library and Wayne University Library before major outlays are made for materials which are not expected to have very active use, but it is acknowledged that a far more active program of cooperation must be developed.

The existence of the Rocky Mountain Bibliographical Center in Denver, which dates from 1936 and which began with the compilation of a union catalog of the region, constitutes a standing invitation to cooperation. In the beginning high hopes were entertained for the development of a correlated acquisitions policy among the member institutions, but it appears that so far the accomplishment has been a very modest one. Without formal agreement, a number of major libraries in the region check with the Bibliographical Center before purchasing expensive items. There is also a modest acquisitions program for certain materials to be located at the Bibliographical Center itself.

In the Pacific Northwest the cooperative movement has been led by the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center which initiated a comprehensive survey of the library resources of the region and sponsored a conference in 1943 which resulted in a formal "Agreement for Regional Specialization in the Pacific Northwest." The avowed purpose of the agreement was "to coordinate and integrate the development of library resources in the Pacific Northwest, to eliminate needless duplication, and to build up within our region strong subject collec-

tions in fields of particular interest to this area." Yet, notwithstanding the agreement, cooperation remained on a completely voluntary and informal basis. The Bibliographic Center is from time to time consulted by the various contributing libraries before an expensive purchase is undertaken, but apparently such consultation is sporadic rather than routine and much avoidable duplication of acquisitions still continues.

One of the definite results of the Agreement for Regional Specialization has been a settled procedure for discards. Before even a trivial book is permanently removed from a collection it is checked at the Bibliographic Center to determine if it is the last copy existing in the region, in which case it is detoured for preservation to the library in whose field of specialization it logically falls. In the year 1951 sixty-six lists of proposed discards were checked against the center's union catalog, and 576 last copies were preserved.

The Oregon State System of Higher Education was cited long ago as offering an example of library cooperation in its most advanced form, but it would appear that the current facts do not support the impression which is widely held. When the state system was established in 1932 instructional fields were allocated between the various institutions of the state, notably Oregon State College, the University of Oregon, and the Schools of Medicine and Dentistry located in Portland. The allocations were definite, designed to avoid competition and unnecessary duplication of effort. The acquisitions program for the libraries followed naturally upon the instructional subject division. "The distribution of instructional fields is basic to our acquisition program for the libraries," writes the university librarian. "However, no central control is exercised over acquisitions. The university Library simply does not acquire materials in agriculture or engineering, for example, and Oregon State College would not purchase a major set in the humanities. The Medical Library and the Dental Library, of course, take care of their respective areas." This situation does not differ greatly from that in other states with a less centrally controlled system of higher education.

One of the most promising recent ventures is the Hampshire Inter-Library Center, embracing four institutions in the Connecticut Valley. Confining its efforts for the present primarily to serials, it has taken over a considerable number of files, together with subscriptions, which the cooperating libraries are willing to transfer, and then has developed a specific, though limited, acquisitions program of its own. This program is designed judiciously and with proper advice to fill in gaps

### *Cooperation and Planning from the Regional Viewpoint*

in series and to add additional serials (and some monographs) which none of the cooperating libraries would be likely to acquire individually. To finance the acquisitions program, duplicates which have resulted from the consolidation of serials from the several libraries are being disposed of systematically. The Hampshire Inter-Library Center has been in operation for little more than three years. Its promoters feel that it is still too early for a sound appraisal. But they "are very well satisfied with what has been accomplished," and though deliberately "proceeding slowly," they are gratified that "desirable resources [in their area] have already been visibly augmented."

Another recent cooperative effort has involved three well-known colleges near Philadelphia, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore. In 1945 a committee of outside librarians was called in to study their libraries and make recommendations. The report of the committee very cautiously proposed a mutual exchange of author entries in the three catalogs, to be followed by the exercise of self-denial and cooperation in collecting, with, ultimately, an informal and spontaneous division of collecting fields, particularly with reference to the acquisition of expensive foreign periodicals. Since there has long been considerable "informal and spontaneous" cooperation, as is here envisaged, between the three institutions, it may well be doubted whether the committee's report, now all but forgotten, has exercised any notable influence. On the other hand a 1949 foundation grant made to the three colleges for a cooperative program of Russian studies in which library cooperation was to play a large part has brought positive results. Author cards for Russian holdings in the three libraries were assembled, reproduced, with locations, and mutually exchanged, thereby creating a limited union catalog. Then a systematic effort was made to avoid duplication in new orders, and the holdings of each library were made freely available to all. Though the subsidized program has now been terminated, it is agreed that its success has been such as to warrant continuation, "so that the Russian books in these colleges will continue to grow as a unit rather than as three separate collections."

The most ambitious as well as the best reported recent example of regional library cooperation is to be met with in the Midwest Inter-Library Center, an enterprise of sixteen research libraries of the Middle West, now housed in a fine new building near the University of Chicago campus. Although designed primarily to provide a central library for little used materials and so relieve the respective contributors of burdensome holdings while keeping them conveniently avail-



able in the region, it has developed a positive acquisitions policy of its own which is supported jointly by the contributing institutions. Subject to constant review and criticism, MILC will acquire by purchase an item or a collection, provided it does not exist or is not readily available in one of its participating libraries, and provided it has value in terms of the research purposes of the region and is likely to be little used. One of the latest decisions of the center is directed to the taking over of subscriptions from participating libraries to little used periodicals.

The center is still young, established in 1950, and in some sense still feeling its way. But of its success the director entertains no doubt. He writes: "I consider that [its] acquisitions program . . . is the most important development in library cooperation after the Farmington Plan. Except for [the Hampshire Inter-Library Center], I do not know of any other group where dollars are being pooled in a common fund for buying library materials . . . In Chicago we have an independent library, created, supported, and managed by sixteen individual libraries, and this central library is acquiring books from its own funds for the use of its constituent member libraries. Furthermore this is not merely a Plan, . . . it is a going operation."

Yet it should be recorded that there are honest misgivings about the merits of the Midwest project, whether as a whole it is worth the original capital outlay and the very substantial annual budget necessary to sustain it. More particularly, apprehension has been expressed lest the cost of the independent acquisitions program become burdensome and lest the mere existence of the Midwest Center may be used by university administrators as an excuse for not providing adequate support for their own libraries. In the words of a recent outside observer "the present opinion of the presidents, librarians, and scholars of the member institutions is mixed."

Finally, attention may be directed to the Library Council of the University of California which was created in 1945 to deal with the complex situation arising from the fact that the University operates on eight campuses, which include two general universities, two liberal arts colleges, a separate medical campus, an oceanographic institute, a major astronomical observatory, and an agricultural school which is also developing a liberal arts program. The council has from the beginning been an effective body, drawing the administrators of the several libraries into a closer relationship and providing a channel for the presentation of common library problems to the university administration. The list of its achievements is impressive. With respect to

### *Cooperation and Planning from the Regional Viewpoint*

acquisitions it has left decisions to the several libraries and has been content simply to define the philosophy that "the Common Pool seeks, within the University, a full use of all its library collections and a reduction in the cost of acquisitions and other services." For the convenient exchange of information it has developed an "Intercampus Union List of Serials," but it has eschewed the compilation of a union catalog. Rather it is experimenting with the installation of teletype instruments in the Berkeley and Los Angeles main library buildings.

The foregoing review of local or regional cooperative ventures, if it is realized, suffers from serious limitations and is incomplete. There may well be other projects of an importance comparable with those which we have examined. The spirit of cooperation is widespread in American librarianship, and much informal yet effective cooperation is carried on which never gets widely publicized. Also, as this issue is confined to the problems of acquisitions and collection building other creditable features of cooperation have been passed over. The authors have tried to present a fair yet candid view of regional or local cooperation as presently developed and in operation and now turn to the second part of this paper which describes a test of current acquisitions results.

In view of the wide theoretical acceptance of cooperation in book selection and collection building, it is not only a matter of interest but of real importance to determine just what is being achieved, by cooperation or otherwise, in the holdings of American research libraries on a regional basis. If cooperative acquisition of research materials on a planned regional basis should ever come to fruition in this country, all major regions should contain all the most important titles on our list in at least one copy, so recorded and reported as to be readily obtainable for all scholars in the area. How closely is this ideal approached? A partial answer to this question may be found by determining the actual holdings in libraries in designated regions of a selected sample of titles.

For this study a list of titles was drawn up from the books which were reviewed in *Erasmus*, volume IV, for the year 1951, a journal which regularly offers a broad representation of scholarly titles. Its editorial committee includes such scholars as S. Madariaga (Oxford), T. Munro (Cleveland), and G. Toffanin (Naples), and the reviewers are well known in the world of learning. A drawback is that *Erasmus* excludes the pure and applied sciences. Omitted from the list were those titles clearly marked as continuations, translations, popularizations, or re-editions. The completed check list of 223 titles

(from which one title was later dropped) was mimeographed and sent to the Union Catalog at the Library of Congress, hereinafter referred to by the symbol DLC-UC, which in due course returned a copy with locations entered on it from their file. The list of locations reported by the Union Catalog was reproduced and attached and then mailed for further checking to all members of the Association of Research Libraries, the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center (WaSPBC), the Rocky Mountain Bibliographical Center (CoDBC), the Cleveland Regional Union Catalog (OCIUC), the Philadelphia Bibliographical Center (PPBC), and to the Los Angeles and Detroit Public Libraries. All institutions generously responded though, unfortunately, the report from Stanford University arrived too late for inclusion.

TABLE I

*a. National origin of 222 books reviewed in Erasmus, v. 4, 1951*

Country	No. of Titles	%	Country	No. of Titles	%
Germany	62	27.93	Austria	14	6.31
Switzerland	45	20.27	Italy	14	6.31
France	25	11.26	Sweden	5	2.25
United States	20	9.01	Netherlands	4	1.80
Great Britain	17	7.70	Denmark	3	1.35
			Others*	13	5.85

\* Two each from Egypt, Poland, Spain and the U.S.S.R., and one each from China, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, and Norway.

*b. Subject Analysis of 222 books reviewed in Erasmus, v. 4, 1951*

Subject	No. of Titles	%	Subject	No. of Titles	%
Gen. and Misc.	6	2.70	Lang. and Lit.	48	21.62
Philosophy	19	8.56	Gen. and Misc.	5	
Psychology	8	3.60	Celtic . . . . .	2	
Religion	29	13.06	Classical . . . . .	4	
History	41	18.47	Eng. Lit. . . . .	2	
General . . . . .	13		German . . . . .	22	
Ancient . . . . .	10		Romance . . . . .	10	
Medieval . . . . .	7		Slavic . . . . .	3	
Modern . . . . .	11		Oriental Studies	20	9.01
Geography	4	1.8	Art	6	2.70
Prehistory and			Classical Archaeol-		
Ethnology 6 }			ogy	5	2.25
American Indian 2 }	8	3.6	Music	8	3.60
			Economics and		
			Sociology	8	3.60
			Law	9	4.05
			Education	3	1.35

## *Cooperation and Planning from the Regional Viewpoint*

Other institutions and particularly specialized libraries may possess a not inconsiderable percentage of the 222 titles on the final list. This study, however, is concerned with regional bibliographical recording as well as simple location. If the record of such holdings is not to be found in any of the regional, or national, union catalogs the book cannot be considered as readily obtainable generally.

Distribution of the books are seen in the reported locations according to two separate regional schemes. The first follows the regionalization used by Wilson in his *Geography of Reading*<sup>2</sup> which in turn is based on the earlier work, *Southern Regions of the United States* by H. W. Odum;<sup>3</sup> the second is arranged in accordance with the regions distinguished by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The total and the percentage figures under each region indicate respectively the number of titles credited to the region and the percentage of the total sample which they represent. The population figures in Wilson were adjusted to the 1950 census, and the District of Columbia was added to Wilson and Odum's six regions.

Sections of Region I are close to the District of Columbia (Region VII) and therefore enjoy the riches of the Library of Congress and of the other great libraries of the Capitol. Greater distance from Washington, however, does not reflect stronger representation in the sample and thus, increased independence, otherwise Louisiana and Tennes-

TABLE II

### *Reported Library Holdings of Sample Titles, arranged by regions according to Wilson-Odum*

Part A. Region I (Southeast) Population: 31,783,727

State	Population	Locations searched and reported by*	Titles located
N.C.	4,061,929	DLC-UC, NcD, NcU	127
Ky.	2,944,806	DLC-UC, KyU	85
Tenn.	3,291,718	DLC-UC, TNJ	59
La.	2,683,516	DLC-UC, LU	56
Va.	3,318,680	DLC-UC, ViU	40
S.C.	2,117,020	DLC-UC, only	1

Different titles held in entire region 146 = 65.77%

No locations reported by DLC-UC for Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, and Mississippi.

\* The symbols used in this and succeeding tables are from:

U.S. Library of Congress. Union Catalog Division. *Symbols Used in the National Union Catalog of the Library of Congress*. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1954.

CHARLES W. DAVID AND RUDOLF HIRSCH

see would contain a larger percentage of the titles. Virginia's small showing of 40 titles probably indicates reliance upon the Library of Congress. The showings of individual states are also, of course, reflections of the abundance or paucity of research libraries with broad humanistic and social science programs of acquisition within them.

The comment following the table for Region I is applicable in part to Region II. Attention may be drawn to the large number of institutions in the state of New York or to Connecticut where all the 134 titles were reported by a single institution, viz. Yale University Library. The state of Pennsylvania benefited from the many locations recorded in, and reported by the Philadelphia Bibliographical Center.

Table II, Part B. Region II (Northeast) Population: 44,144,624

State	Population	Locations searched and reported by	Titles located
N.Y.	14,830,192	DLC-UC, NIC, NN, NNC, NNU, NNUT, NRU	210
Mass.	4,690,514	DLC-UC, MCM, MH	190
Pa.	10,498,012	DLC-UC, PPBC, PU	140
Conn.	2,007,280	DLC-UC, CtY	134
N.J.	4,835,329	DLC-UC, NjP	133
R.I.	791,896	DLC-UC, RPB	98
Md.	2,343,001	DLC-UC, MdBj	88
N.H.	533,242	DLC-UC	1

Different titles held in entire region 218 = 98.20%

No locations reported by DLC-UC for Delaware, Maine, Vermont, and West Virginia.

A copy sent to Dartmouth would undoubtedly have increased the number of locations for the state considerably but would probably not have altered the total for the region.

Table II, Part C. Region III (Midwest) Population: 34,959,577

State	Population	Locations searched and reported by	Titles located
Ill.	8,712,176	DLC-UC, ICJ, ICN, ICU, IEN, IU	188
Minn.	2,982,483	DLC-UC, MnU	152
Mich.	6,731,766	DLC-UC, MiD, MiU	144
Ohio	7,946,627	DLC-UC, OCIUC, OCU OU	126
Wisc.	3,434,575	DLC-UC, WU	108
Ind.	3,934,224	DLC-UC, InU	96
Ia.	2,621,073	DLC-UC, IaAS, IaU	85
Mo.	3,954,653	DLC-UC, CoDBC, MoU	84

Different titles held in entire region 204 = 97.89%

*Cooperation and Planning from the Regional Viewpoint*

Table II, Part D. Region IV (Northwest)      Population: 7,987,326

State	Population	Locations searched and reported by	Titles located
Kan.	1,905,299	DLC-UC, CoDBC, KU	82
Nebr.	1,325,510	DLC-UC, NbU	53
Colo.	1,325,089	DLC-UC, CoDBC, CoU	51
Utah	688,862	DLC-UC, CoDBC	16
Idaho	588,637	DLC-UC, WaSPBC	15
Mont.	591,024	DLC-UC, WaSPBC	13
Wyo.	290,529	DLC-UC, CoDBC	8

Different titles held in entire region 98 = 44.14%  
 No locations reported by DLC-UC for North Dakota and South Dakota.  
 Four of the states appearing in this table are covered by the Rocky Mountain Bibliographical Center.

Table II, Part E. Region V (Southwest)      Population: 11,375,319

State	Population	Locations searched and reported by	Titles located
Tex.	7,711,194	DLC-UC, TxU	72
Ark.	749,587	DLC-UC, CoDBC	12
N.M.	681,187	DLC-UC, CoDBC	1

Different titles held in entire region 78 = 35.14%  
 No locations reported by DLC-UC for Oklahoma.

Table II, Part F. Region VI (West)      Population: 14,646,610

State	Population	Locations searched and reported by	Titles located
Cal.	10,586,223	DLC-UC, CL, CLU, CU	166
Wash.	2,378,963	DLC-UC, WaSPBC	72
Ore.	1,521,341	DLC-UC, WaSPBC	63

Different titles in entire region 173 = 77.93%  
 No locations reported by DLC-UC for Nevada.

Table II, Part G. Region VII (District of Columbia)

D.C.	802,178	DLC-UC, DSG, DA	179 = 80.63%
------	---------	-----------------	--------------

Since the sample stems from a period antedating the operation of the Midwest Inter-Library Center, this interesting cooperative venture has had no effect on the distribution of locations. Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Indiana are each represented by a single institution. In contrast Ohio benefited from the reporting by the Cleveland Regional Union Catalog much as Pennsylvania did in Part B.

The number of research libraries in Part E is particularly small.

This explains the low total of 78. It should, however, be noted that the population figures for this region are larger than for Region IV and not much smaller than for Region VI.

Two of the states in the West benefited from the comprehensive reporting of the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center.

The density of population, the number of institutions in a position to be covered by the inquiry, and various other factors explain why considerably fewer titles were located in Regions IV and V than, for example, in Regions II and III. The same factors may explain why Region I, comparatively large in size and populous ranks only fifth.

TABLE II (continued)

*Recapitulation*

Region	Total No. of Locations	Different Titles Located	Percentage Located	Rank
I Southeast	365	146	65.77%	5
II Northeast	994	218	98.20%	1
III Midwest	983	204	91.89%	2
IV Northwest	238	98	44.14%	6
V Southwest	85	78	35.14%	7
VI West	301	173	77.93%	4
District of Columbia		179	80.63%	3

The distribution of holdings, dividing titles by country of origin shows a considerable divergence in the degree of coverage as shown in Table III.

Only one item was not located of all, a German imprint of a Latvian text: *Bukss, Martins, Sencu pasaule . . .* Traunstein, Locis Verlag, 1950 (no. 23 of the sample). Italian imprints were rather poorly represented in at least half of the regions while the United States and Great Britain were, of course, very well covered throughout.

TABLE III

*Regional Holdings of Selected Titles Arranged by Country of Origin*

Country of Origin	Total Titles in Sample	REGION											
		I		II		III		IV		V		VI	
		Items	%	Items	%	Items	%	Items	%	Items	%	Items	%
Germany	62	39	62.9	61	98.4	58	93.6	24	38.7	9	14.8	42	67.8
Switzerland	45	26	57.7	45	100.0	37	82.2	12	26.6	15	33.3	35	77.7
France	25	19	76.0	25	100.0	25	100.0	13	52.0	10	40.0	23	92.0
U. S.	20	20	100.0	20	100.0	20	100.0	19	95.0	20	100.0	20	100.0
Great Britain	17	17	100.0	17	100.0	17	100.0	14	82.3	11	64.7	17	100.0
Austria	14	11	78.6	14	100.0	14	100.0	8	57.2	2	14.3	11	78.6
Italy	14	3	21.4	13	92.9	14	100.0	3	21.4	3	21.4	9	64.2
All Others	25	12	48.0	24	96.0	20	80.0	6	24.0	8	32.0	18	72.0

## *Cooperation and Planning from the Regional Viewpoint*

In general the study revealed that duplication quite naturally appears highest in those regions where there is the greatest concentration of research libraries (e.g. New York) and where extraneous locations were reported through regional union catalogs (e.g. Pennsylvania). The existence of union catalogs or the density of research libraries apparently did not have any effect in decreasing duplication; nor has the existence of various cooperative schemes assured more complete coverage in a region. More effective attention to non-duplication would surely make it possible in some regions to acquire a greater variety of titles without increasing the total cost. It is recognized that strong inter-institutional competition in the Northeast and in the Midwest is responsible in part for the preeminence of individual libraries in those areas.

For the remainder of this paper it may be advantageous to use the division of the country into nine regions after the Bureau of the Census rather than the Wilson regionalization which divides it into six and treats the District of Columbia separately.

The preeminence of the Atlantic Seaboard and the Midwest is very apparent. The West North Central area and the Pacific Coast States (4 and 9) rank close to Regions 1, 2, 3, and 5, particularly if we consider that they contain a population less than half as large as that of

TABLE IV  
*Reported Library Holdings of Sample Titles Arranged by Regions  
of the Bureau of Census*

Region	States Included	Population	Rank	Titles Located	%	% Located	Rank
1. New England	Me., N.H., Vt., Mass., R.I., Conn.	9,314,453	8	202	90.99	4	
2. Middle Atlantic	N.J., N.Y., Pa.	30,163,533	2	214	96.40	1	
3. East North Central	Ind., Ill., Mich., Wisc.	30,399,368	1	203	91.44	2.5	
4. West North Central	Kan., Minn., Mo., Neb., N.D., S.D., Ia.	14,061,394	6	172	77.48	6	
5. South Atlantic	Del., Md., D.C., Va., W.Va., N.C., S.C., Ga., Fla.	21,182,335	3	203	91.44	2.5	
6. East South Central	Ky., Ala., Tenn., Miss.	11,477,181	7	100	45.05	7	
7. West South Central	Ark., La., Okla., Tex.	14,537,572	4	89	40.09	8	
8. Mountain States	Ariz., Col., Idaho, Mont., Nev., N.M., Utah	5,074,998	9	59	26.58	9	
9. Pacific Coast	Calif., Oregon, Wash.	14,486,527	5	174	78.39	5	



Regions 2 and 3. The greatest weakness appears in the West South Central Region (7) which has a slightly larger population than Region 9, yet reported 48.85% fewer titles than the Pacific Coast States.

A sample of 222 titles is perhaps too small to use for a convincing analysis of holdings by subject. However, for the major fields it may yield data for some interesting speculations.

TABLE V  
*Analysis of Library Holdings of Selected Title by Subject*  
a. Language and Literature

Sub-field	Total	Region								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
General and Misc.	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	5	6
Classical	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	1	4
Germanic (excl. English)	22	22	22	22	22	21	19	12	8	22
English	2	2	2	2	2	2	-	2	-	2
Romance	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	6	4	10
Slavic	3	2	2	2	1	2	1	-	-	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>45</b>

The low of 18 in region 8 represents 37.5% of the total number of titles in this group. The mean of all 9 regions is 84.5%.

b. History

Sub-field	Total	Region								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
General and Misc.	13	12	13	12	11	13	5	7	5	12
Ancient	10	9	10	9	10	10	3	5	-	10
Medieval	7	7	7	5	5	7	3	2	3	5
Modern	11	11	11	9	7	10	5	5	5	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>31</b>

The low in this field is 13, again in region 8; it represents 31.7% of the total. The mean is 71.8%.

c. Religion

Total	Region								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>29</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>

The low is one location out of 29 in region 8. The mean in the field of religion is 55.9%. If independent theological libraries could have been included, representation would undoubtedly have been better.

*Cooperation and Planning from the Regional Viewpoint*

d. Oriental Studies

Total	Region								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
20	19	20	19	14	18	4	7	5	18

The low is 4 (20%) in region 6. The mean of all 9 regions is 68.9%.

e. Philosophy

Total	Region								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19	17	16	17	12	16	9	7	5	12

The low is 5 locations in region 8, holding 26.3% of the total. The mean of all 9 regions is 64.9%.

f. Economics, Sociology and Law

Total	Region								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17	13	15	16	11	14	4	4	4	12

Three regions share the low of 4. The mean is 60.8%.

As a test of the completeness of the Library of Congress Union Catalog the holdings of items for which the Union Catalog supplied five or less locations, i.e. the "rarer" titles in the sample, have been compared in Table VI with the holdings revealed by the more comprehensive checking of this study.

TABLE VI  
*111 Items for Which DLC-UC Reported Five or Less Locations*

Region	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
a. Locations according to DLC-UC	48	76	50	6	78	2	4	0	7
b. According to DLC-UC and direct library and regional union catalog reports	91	101	90	68	93	25	22	11	68

The result is rather disturbing. In the critical regions 6, 7, and 8 the national Union Catalog located only 6 out of 111 titles, yet individual checking by libraries and selected regional union catalogs increased the number of titles located to 58, or almost 1,000%. Even in region 9, the western states, the coverage by the national Union Catalog is apparently quite inadequate. Out of these 111 titles 68 were

located by the comprehensive method, but only 7 were recorded for this area in the national Union Catalog.

The only conclusion is that if this study had been based solely upon locations provided by the national Union Catalog the findings would have been very different. Thus it appears that reporting to that all-important location tool is woefully incomplete. Even so, the staff of the Union Catalog seems unable to absorb all the locations that are supplied.

In general the study indicates that holdings of a selected sample of research titles by American libraries as a whole are extremely good and that even on the basis of regional distribution the showing is quite remarkable. There is reason to believe that not all of the 222 items, or even a very large percentage of them, need to be in all the major regions of the United States. On the other hand, at least 3 of the census regions have not provided locations for some of the books which may be considered of great importance. The fact remains that research facilities of American libraries are nearly as uneven today as they were a generation ago; where there has been an almost dramatic rise, as for example in the far west, this fact is not reflected in locations reported in the national Union Catalog.

Fifteen years ago L. C. Merritt<sup>4</sup> in his part of a survey of union catalogs reached the conclusion that the best solution for the national problem of location service should be found in a nationally organized system of regional union catalogs. Years later, when the discussion of library depositories became again active, some of the exponents felt that the ideal solution would be a national network of regional depositories, all cooperating with each other and treating the problem as national. The checking of the *Erasmus* sample seems to add further emphasis to the view that greatest success would be achieved, in the national and regional interest, through a nationally coordinated program of regional library cooperation. Therefore, in conclusion, two recommendations are made: (1) the coverage of the national Union Catalog must be systematized and expanded in card or published form, (2) after this has been achieved the national Union Catalog should become the center for planned cooperative acquisition programs. As such it should act as coordinator and adviser to all research libraries in the United States.

## *Cooperation and Planning from the Regional Viewpoint*

### *References*

1. Philadelphia Libraries. *A Survey of Facilities, Needs, and Opportunities*. A Report of the Carnegie Corporation of New York by the Bibliographical Planning Committee of Philadelphia. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1942, pp. 28-29.
2. Wilson, L. R.: *The Geography of Reading*. Chicago, American Library Association and the University of Chicago Press, 1938, p. 21.
3. Odum, H. W.: *Southern Regions of the United States*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina, University of North Carolina Press, 1936.
4. Merritt, L. C.: Administrative, Fiscal and Quantitative Aspects of the Regional Union Catalog. In: Downs, R. B., ed.: *Union Catalogs in the United States*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1942.