PRODUCTION NOTE

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library Large-scale Digitization Project, 2007.
Library Trends
A Publication of the University of Illinois Library School

Managing Editor
HAROLD LANCOUR

Editorial Assistant
JANET PHILLIPS

Publications Board
ROBERT B. DOWNS
LESLIE W. DUNLAP
THELMA EATON
FRANCES B. JENKINS
HAROLD LANCOUR
ARNOLD H. TROTIER
WAYNE S. YENAWINE

Library Trends, a quarterly journal in librarianship, provides a medium for evaluative recapitulation of current thought and practice, searching for those ideas and procedures which hold the greatest potentialities for the future.

Each issue is concerned with one aspect of librarianship. Each is planned with the assistance of an invited advisory editor. All articles are by invitation. Suggestions for future issues are welcomed and should be sent to the Managing Editor.

Published four times a year, in July, October, January, and April. Office of Publication: University of Illinois Library School, Urbana, Illinois. Entered as second-class matter June 25, 1952, at the Post Office at Urbana, Illinois, under the act of August 24, 1912. Copyright 1955 by the University of Illinois. All rights reserved.

Subscription price is $5.00 a year. Individual issues are priced at $2.00. Address orders to Subscription Department, University of Illinois Press, 207 Administration East, Urbana, Illinois. Editorial correspondence should be sent to LIBRARY TRENDS, University of Illinois Library School, Urbana, Illinois.
Introduction

ROBERT VOSPER

It is an interesting, even curious, situation that in teaching and writing about librarianship relatively little has been said about acquisitions matters. The traditional curriculum, even as it survives today, has given heaviest attention to cataloging and classification and considerable attention to reference work or public service, but very seldom has there been any devoted attention to acquisitions work. One could perhaps set up a trinity of library activities: acquiring books, organizing books, and using books. Certainly in the total library economy the procurement of books and thus the development of book collections is a major and responsible function; yet our attention has been centered on the other two functions.

There is an occasional course called “Acquisition of Library Materials” or “Problems of Acquisitions” in recent library school catalogs. Some courses labeled “Technical Processes” apparently give attention to routine office aspects of acquisitions work, but more frequently they appear to be concerned with classification and cataloging and binding. Possibly some of the newer courses on “Resources and Materials” consider procurement, but the course descriptions generally refer to a survey of the literature of the subject field in question or to methods of appraisal of that literature. One might hope that courses on the history of libraries would give at least some attention to the basic aspect of the history of any research library, the development of its book collection, but indications are that this is seldom the case.

Even the organization of the national professional association bears out this observation. The Division of Cataloging and Classification is an ancient and powerful group, but the Board on Acquisition of Library Materials was created as recently as 1951.

Here then was some justification, if any were needed, for planning this issue of Library Trends. Here also is some reason for failing to look adequately at all aspects of the matter, for most of the con-

Mr. Vosper is Director of Libraries at the University of Kansas.

[ 333 ]
tributors ran into this general failure to think about acquisitional matters. They found the literature on the subject thin or non-existent. This accounts for the unexpected necessity for writing letters and imposing questionnaires on librarians. No other issue of Library Trends thus far has been so dependent on this procedure for assaying practice and thinking in the field. Here then perhaps is the primary trend; libraries and librarians just do not trend sufficiently in the direction of acquisitions. All persons concerned with this issue consider this negative situation most unfortunate and deserving of a remedy.

In this issue the contributors have tried to probe from several vantage points rather than to depend on a clean vertical or horizontal slice through the subject. The two initial articles deal with a related pair of major philosophical trends in over-all acquisitional strategy. Librarians of research libraries have given much of their energy and attention in recent years to the total adequacy of American library collections, as a glance through the minutes of the Association of Research Libraries will reveal. Because collecting “in the national interest” requires a high measure of cooperation in the acquisition of library materials, the first article justifiably looks over also the literature on “cooperation,” which is the second major trend in strategy. The second article then takes a good hard look at the actuality of cooperative acquisitions, especially in terms of regional collecting. What is revealed by this look is a matter of great concern to most of the other contributors, who point individually to the need for better regional collecting policy. As a matter of fact, at this stage in library history apparently only the American children can have effective library service without the need for regional collecting programs.

Next are discussed two parts of the book market, an important subject not adequately understood by most librarians. After the market place follow three, out of many, special types of library materials: serials, government publications, and scientific and technical publications. Here the complicated task of acquiring them is considered. Two specialized procedures for procurement, via publications exchange and microreproduction, come next; and then the authors review two types of libraries in acquisitional terms, public libraries in general and school and children’s libraries in particular. The issue concludes with a careful study of the complex internal operations required by the acquisitions program.

By using this method many important aspects of the whole problem are necessarily overlooked, the place of gifts in developing a book collection, for example. In this age which seems to need its National
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Association of Societies Friendly to Libraries, this is no small subject in itself. What high drama there is in Wilmarth Lewis' quiet statement in his *Collector's Progress*, "I am giving my collection to the Yale Library." ¹

Throughout the issue the authors are aware of being parochial, but it was so difficult to gather information about American libraries that they did not have the temerity to look abroad. But perhaps from this tentative probing both author and reader may begin to understand the composition and nature of acquisitions work today. Some trends have already been noted; the several contributors will elucidate them. Needing a bit more emphasis in this introduction perhaps are some of the problems encountered.

Singularly lacking in the literature and certainly beyond the capacity of this issue is anything like a synoptic view of collection building in research libraries. Librarians know something about the selection and procurement of single books for children's libraries and something about assaying the literature of a particular science, but who can tell us much about that great adventure, the development over generations of a university library collection? What about, for example, the high strategy as well as the procedures involved in deciding whether to buy, and then buying, the Sadleir Collection that is mentioned later in this issue, or, for another example, the distinguished Stellfeld Music Library recently purchased at Michigan? A little has been hinted about the former; ² the fascinating details of acquiring the latter have appeared recently in a report ³ that should be required reading and become a model for many of us, because there are clearly too few such effective reports in library literature. When is it wiser to plunge in and buy *en bloc* and when to piece together, book by book, over the years? How does one marshal and use effectively the book gathering skills of a university faculty? This is a fascinating business on which too little is written or taught for the benefit of younger librarians. Good histories of individual libraries in these terms would help, but there aren't many. What about the skills involved in searching out the book riches that our research libraries need? The writings of Lawrence Powell and Gordon Ray, cited later, are stimulating reports, but many more are needed to encourage and train young acquisitions people.

And so there is a gap in education and in training. Where are the courses in the history, organization and use of the antiquarian book trade; courses in the fascinating history of books moving through time and their grouping and regrouping into collections; courses that would
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enrich the book knowledge of young librarians and avoid the mechanical and the callow; courses that would tend to answer the strong plea entered by R. A. Miller:

A final conclusion relates to personnel in American libraries who are empowered and entrusted with the acquisition of foreign materials. In America, order and acquisition departments are capably managed. The procedures are standardized and a great amount of work is accomplished with a minimum of error and waste. Our acquisition departments are efficient because the full time of a responsible person is taken with problems of management, personnel and production. But a small seed of doubt that I picked up somewhere in Europe is constantly growing. Acquisition is more than a mechanical process, even when selection is left entirely in the hands of specialists or faculty. There must be time for the responsible person or persons in our acquisition departments to assimilate the book knowledge which comes to them daily. Somehow or other, our research libraries must develop bookmen and bookwomen in our acquisition departments, persons who are personally interested in the books they handle and in the trade history of these books. It is evident to me now that I must provide in Indiana University library for the kind of acquisition knowledge that enables a library to grow in quality. Provision in this case must include these measures: less pressure in insisting on mechanical results, opportunities for growth in book knowledge, salaries equivalent to the best elsewhere so that personal security and reward are not sought elsewhere, and a constant identification of acquisition personnel with the highest objective of a research library, book quality. 4

An imaginative, book-wise and effective acquisitions librarian is a gem in any library setting, and as one who knows has said, “There is no excitement like the hunt . . . for books.” This issue of Library Trends should suggest why these observations are true.

References

Collecting in the National Interest

THOMAS R. BARCUS AND VERNER W. CLAPP

The concept that book resources are important in the national interest is not new. Over a century ago Charles Coffin Jewett in one of the first surveys of libraries in this country expressed the belief that “Books constitute a large element of the intellectual wealth of a nation.” Even earlier, in the 1840's, the Committee on Organization of the then nascent Smithsonian Institution recommended the establishment of a national union catalog and bibliographical center and the building up of collections which would supplement, without duplicating, library resources already available:

Your committee conceive that . . . the Smithsonian Institution may . . . become a centre of literary and bibliographical reference for our entire country. Your committee recommend that the librarian be instructed to procure catalogues . . . of all important public libraries in the United States; and . . . Europe, and the more important works on bibliography. With these beside him, he may be consulted by the scholar, the student, the author, the historian, from every section of the Union, and will be prepared to inform them whether any works they may desire to examine are to be found in the United States; and if so, in what library, or if in Europe only, in what country of Europe they must be sought.

Informed by these catalogues, it will be easy, and your committee think desirable . . . to make the Smithsonian library chiefly a supplemental one; to purchase, for the most part, valuable works which are not to be found elsewhere in the Union. . . .

In following out this mode of collecting a library for the institution, whenever a particular class of works of importance is found to be specially deficient in the libraries of our country, the vacancy may be filled.

In a contribution to the second great survey of the libraries of the United States, that of 1876, Justin Winsor, then superintendent of the
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Boston Public Library, carried these basic concepts a step farther by suggesting a system of regional depositories for publications of secondary importance, the institution of exchanges between these depositories, and centralized cataloging arrangements:

For a given bulk the labor which must be bestowed on pamphlets, broadsides, scraps, etc., to render them of any use in a library— assorting, cataloguing, binding, etc.—is vastly greater than for books; and, as labor is money, and as money should be made to go as far as possible in a library, there is no reason why ordinary libraries should give any of their resources to this end, except so far as the matters to be preserved are of local interest. . . . A few great libraries in the country, the chief one in each principal geographical section, should do this work, and they should open an exchange account with each other. . . . The lesser collections will do the best thing for the future historical investigator if they will make regular contributions into the larger repository of all such grist as may come to their mill, so that it can there be cared for and rendered available for use by indexing of one kind or another. The cost of this work is large, and the chief libraries should by all means provide for it.3

Toward the turn of the century, one of Winsor’s successors as librarian of the Boston Public Library, Herbert Putnam, was called upon to advise a Congressional committee engaged in studying the Library of Congress just prior to its removal from the Capitol to its own building. It was his opinion that:

“while a library ‘universal in scope’ is pleasing in idea, I am quite clear that a library universal in scope is not practicable, unless you are sure of unlimited funds. . . . I should say it was desirable that this Library should pursue the plan that other libraries throughout the United States are following of differentiating—in its case of laying particular stress on the material particularly appropriate to it under its title as a National Library. 

“This would include material on law and legislation, and necessarily (under the copyright) all publications issued in the United States. But when you come to general literature outside of that, certainly when you come to other specialized literature . . . it ought to take account of what other libraries have and are seeking to do.”4

On the same occasion W. I. Fletcher, librarian of Amherst College, called attention to the considerable number of government libraries in Washington, citing especially those of the Department of Agriculture, the Surgeon-General, the Geological Survey, the Census Bureau, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. He urged “thoroughgoing
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coordination and cooperation" between these libraries and the Library of Congress to prevent "wasteful duplication" and promote "their harmonious co-working," and suggested an "advisory council" which would work toward a unified system of federal libraries. Melvil Dewey, who was present at the same hearing, expressed similar ideas.

Historians as well as librarians have, from an early date, concerned themselves with the over-all national resources for research. Studies made by Jewett and others in the middle of the nineteenth century had demonstrated the gross insufficiency of these resources. A survey of collections relating to European history made as late as 1911 by the American Historical Association's Committee on Bibliography reported these resources as still insufficient and badly distributed. The Committee compiled a check list of 2,197 titles basic for the study of European history and sent it to 305 libraries. Only one library, Harvard, had as many as half the titles and only 12 libraries had more than ten per cent. Of the 2,197 titles only 1,884 were located somewhere in the United States. Some sections of the country, notably New England and the Middle Atlantic states, had from two to nine copies of works not be found elsewhere.

The committee concluded: "(1) that no American library contains all the sets which may be needed by any historical worker in his work, (2) that the cooperation between libraries in the matter of interlibrary loan is seriously limited by the lack of knowledge as to where copies are located, (3) that the desultory attempts of individual libraries to supply lacks by purchase results in waste from unnecessary duplication and competition for copies, (4) that the geographical distribution of present books is bad." It added that although it is "neither to be expected or desired" that every library should contain every title on the list, there should be at least one copy in each geographical section. This of course was written when communication and transportation were much slower than at present.

The committee's chairman, E. C. Richardson, in an article a year later wrote:

To attempt to build every university library up into a complete apparatus in itself is to attempt the impossible. Even the independent attempts of a dozen libraries to reach approximately this stage results in enormous expense of unnecessary duplication, while there are still tremendous lacks common to all.

The remedy for this is systematic cooperation between the thirty libraries which spend $1,000,000 a year for books. The definite assumption of certain classes of books by certain libraries, and the dis-
distribution of copies to be purchased, so that each geographical locality shall have a copy instead of massing the same, would increase the efficiency result by much more than the cost of organization.

The first World War and the peace conference which followed it found the libraries of this country seriously deficient in the resources required for the detailed study of foreign areas. As Andrew Keogh, then librarian of Yale, put it, "... in our national emergency our libraries were not equal to the demands made upon them, individually and collectively... territorial questions had to be studied in just such detail, and in many cases the answers were not to be found in this country, and owing to war conditions could not be obtained." He urged that the research libraries "organize their material and their effort so that unnecessary duplication may be avoided, that what is lacking may be known and provided, and that the literary resources of the nation may be made available easily and quickly." It took a second World War to drive these lessons home.

In 1916 the American Library Institute had adopted a "plan of cooperation by specialization" under which research libraries would accept certain specialties and would engage to build up their collections in these fields. The basic aim was to insure the presence in each of seven regions into which the United States could be divided of "at least one reference copy and one lending copy" (either in the original or in photostat) of books in each subject. During the 1920's the main features of this plan, with some additions, were promoted by the American Library Association, the Bibliographical Society of America, and the American Historical Association but little progress was made in putting it into operation.

Prerequisite to any national scheme of acquisition was a national record of materials acquired, and this did not exist. Towards the end of the period in 1927, a gift by J. D. Rockefeller Jr. made possible the active development of the National Union Catalog at the Library of Congress under the supervision of Richardson. The enormous and rapid progress of the catalog in inventorying the important books of major American libraries (in five years, 1927-1932, the catalog increased its two million entries to a record of nearly nine million copies of more than seven million works) once more stimulated thinking and planning toward a national scheme of collecting. Richardson, who not only directed the union catalog project but was at the same time chairman of the American Library Association's Committee on Bibliography, developed in 1930 for the A.L.A. Executive Board a series of twelve projects, all revolving about the union catalog idea.
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These included plans for a subject union catalog and for the cooperative selection, purchase, cataloging, and warehousing of books. At just this time, 1929, the Social Science Research Council joined forces with the American Council of Learned Societies in an effort toward "the improvement and preservation of research data" and established the Joint Committee on Materials of Research. During the ensuing decade this committee, under the successive chairmanship of S. J. Buck and R. C. Binkley, was to make signal contributions to the development of thinking and apparatus with respect to the materials for research, especially in the social sciences and humanities. At an early stage the committee discovered that "One of the most difficult problems... is that of bringing about cooperation among libraries so that copies of all important materials may be preserved and conveniently distributed and unnecessary duplication may be avoided." Although, before its demise, the committee made certain concrete proposals for solving this problem, especially in connection with the reorganization of the Library of Congress under Archibald MacLeish, the onset of World War II and Binkley's death in 1940 led to its discontinuance. A similar organization, if gifted with similar leadership, could be very useful today.

Meanwhile, the thirties continued the coacervation of data proving the need for a national plan of acquisition. Douglas Waples searched a list of about 100 journals and 500 monographs in economics, law, government, and sociology published between 1927 and 1933 in England, France, and Germany against the catalogs of five major American libraries—the New York Public Library, Library of Congress, Harvard, Chicago, California, and Michigan. The New York Public Library made the best showing but none of these institutions had all the works on this carefully selected list of important titles. Studies by R. B. Downs, W. J. Wilson, and C. B. Joeckel revealed anew the unequal distribution of the national book resources, the great differences between the major geographic regions, and the tendency of these inequalities to perpetuate themselves. Joeckel, writing during a period of federal aid programs, revived for the second time the turn-of-the-century recommendation of a "Federal Library Council... to coordinate the policies and procedures of the libraries of the Federal Government." More fundamentally he proposed that, "The Federal Government, through grants-in-aid and the services of its own libraries, should aid in the development of regional centers for library service and in a general program of cooperation and coordination of library resources on a regional and national scale." And finally
that "A system of permanent annual Federal grants-in-aid to libraries is essential to the maintenance of an adequate Nation-wide minimum of library service." 16

In 1941 a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York made possible the establishment in the Library of Congress for one year of an Experimental Division of Library Cooperation, under the direction of H. A. Kellar. The Division issued a publication on library cooperation which devoted a chapter to the "acquisition, control, and mobility of materials for research in American libraries." It envisaged a plan under which there would be "at least one copy somewhere in the country of all books infrequently consulted; at least two copies (one for lending and one for reference) in a number of strategic centers of all books frequently referred to; and an adequate distribution in every research library of all books constantly used." The chapter called attention to the incompleteness of the national resources for research and recommended, among other measures, coordinated purchases and exchanges, storage libraries, regional depositories, and "an intense specialization in designated fields by all of the major research institutions of the country." 17 Kellar conferred with librarians in all parts of the country and plans were made for working out a general statement and a detailed program for submission to librarians and university administrators, under which there would be initiated cooperative measures for dealing with common problems. The entry of the United States into World War II prevented for the time being the execution of these plans.

It was the war, however, and the efforts made to meet wartime needs which finally led to the implementation of concrete and far-reaching programs for collecting in the national interest. The Library of Congress was requested to establish, for the Office of the Coordinator of Information (later the Office of Strategic Services) and with funds transferred for the purpose, a Division of Special Information, to provide reference and research material to the Coordinator's staff. More than one hundred experts on foreign countries were drawn for the purpose from the faculties of the country's principal universities. Much was accomplished but the efforts of these specialists to provide essential information demonstrated for the second time in a generation that the resources of the United States were inadequate to meet the demands made upon them by a nation at war.

Some of these inadequacies were remedied through the efforts of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Acquisition of Foreign Pub-
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lications which was set up by the government as an emergency measure and through the efforts of the Joint Committee on Importations, an emergency-created body representing seven national library associations. The Interdepartmental Committee did particularly effective work in acquiring through special channels, and reproducing on microfilm current foreign publications, chiefly newspapers, periodicals, government publications, and scientific and technological journals. The Joint Committee on Importations was successful in obtaining through commercial channels, as long as these remained open, many foreign publications which could not have been acquired by individual libraries, and it secured the release of some large shipments which had been impounded by Allied military authorities. The American Council of Learned Societies sponsored a War Emergency Program for Microcopying Research Materials in Britain, and other bodies also made substantial contributions toward meeting the nation's wartime needs.

The most important effort toward meeting these needs, however, was undoubtedly the Cooperative Acquisitions Project which was established to distribute the publications collected in the national interest by the Library of Congress Mission. As early as 1943 the Library of Congress had sent a representative to Portugal and Spain. Between that date and 1945 he extended his activities to North Africa, Italy, and France, working in close cooperation with our armed forces. These activities, while highly beneficial to the Library of Congress, could not meet the needs of non-governmental libraries nor did they extend to German publications, the lack of which was particularly felt. Consequently, the Association of Research Libraries, the American Library Association, and the Library of Congress made joint representation to the Secretary of State and to the War Department which culminated in 1945 in the dispatch to Europe of the Library of Congress Mission, representing the research libraries of the country. Its duties were to secure multiple copies of publications for the war period in order to assure their availability in the scholarly and research institutions of the United States. In all, over two million pieces were acquired through purchase, through the transfer to the Mission of materials confiscated by the Army from military and Nazi organizations, and through other sources, while negotiations with the Soviet authorities resulted in the release of nearly $200,000 worth of publications, chiefly serials, which had been stored in Leipzig during the war by German publishers and dealers for American institutions.

At home a Committee to Advise on the Distribution of Foreign
Acquisitions was formed to devise the criteria for the distribution of the materials acquired by the Mission, with representatives from the several research councils and library associations. The actual work of distribution continued for several years. When it was terminated in the fall of 1948 a total of 820,000 books and periodical volumes, representing approximately 2,000,000 pieces, had been sent to the cooperating libraries, at a net average cost to them, including the purchased material, of seventy-five cents a volume. R. B. Downs wrote, in summarizing the achievements of the Cooperative Acquisitions Project, that through its instrumentality "there is available in the United States an unsurpassed collection of European wartime publications, far richer than would have been possible if we had been forced to depend upon the efforts of individual libraries." \(^{21}\) Dan Lacy, in a somewhat later summary, declared that the project "made the World War II period one of the strongest, rather than one of the weakest, periods in the holdings of American research libraries." \(^{22}\)

Perhaps the most important result of the Cooperative Acquisitions Project—more important even than the materials which it acquired—was that it demonstrated for the first time on a really large scale what American libraries can accomplish when they work together toward a common goal and, as E. E. Williams has pointed out in the *Farmington Plan Handbook*,\(^{23}\) a successful accomplishment in cooperation on this scale encouraged efforts toward a longer-term acquisitions program in the national interest. But another important result was in the expression of government policy toward such projects. In a letter dated August 4, 1945, Archibald MacLeish, Assistant Secretary of State, wrote to the Librarian of Congress on behalf of the Acting Secretary of State as follows:

"The Department of State agrees with the Library's [i.e. the Library of Congress'] view that the national interest is directly affected by the holdings of the private research libraries. It would, therefore, interpose no objection in principle to the employment of federal government facilities to assist in maintaining their specialized collections where normal channels of acquisition are inoperative."

However, the letter went on to state,—

"The Department would wish to be assured that the private libraries had agreed upon and carefully planned a program of cooperative buying, and that they would continue to support such a plan as long as Federal assistance was granted them." \(^{24}\)

The policy thus formulated has been since employed in connection
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with several acquisitions problems of American libraries in areas in which obstacles of one kind or another to ordinary commercial procurement have existed, e.g. in the Soviet Union, Communist China,\textsuperscript{25} and Afghanistan.

The Farmington Plan has been described with such thoroughness in the 1953 publication by Williams just mentioned and in the approximately 90 references cited in his bibliography that extended discussion of it here is unnecessary. The Plan originated in the fall of 1942 at Farmington, Connecticut, in the deliberations of the Executive Committee of the Librarian’s Council, an informal body of distinguished librarians and men of letters who had been invited by the Librarian of Congress the year previous to advise him on national programs. The ultimate aim was agreed to be to possess, at some point in the United States, one copy at least, in original or reproduction, of every title, wherever published, of which American scholars might have need. This aim could best be achieved, it was thought, if American research libraries would divide responsibility for the coverage of the various fields and subfields among them. The result, so far as each particular library was concerned, would be an affirmative responsibility to secure everything of importance in specified areas, accompanied by complete freedom to purchase or not in all other fields as the needs of the library dictated. As a beginning, the Farmington meeting proposed that agreement between libraries should be limited for the time being to newly published works.

K. D. Metcalf, director of the Harvard University Libraries, then president of the American Library Association, and Julian Boyd, librarian of Princeton University, took the lead in drafting a formal proposal along these lines and in securing the support of librarians, associations of scholars, and the presidents of a number of the more important universities. An application for a grant to cover the work of organization was submitted to a foundation but the necessary funds were not available under wartime conditions.

In 1944, therefore, Metcalf brought the Farmington Proposal before the Association of Research Libraries, which appointed a Farmington Plan Committee with Metcalf as chairman. Several members of the Association undertook the checking of a typical year’s book production in one foreign country, computed the number of books in each subject, and estimated their cost. Sample lists were sent to sixty libraries for a report of their holdings. Other preparatory steps followed but it was not until 1947 that the partial reopening of the foreign book markets made it possible to bring the proposal before American li-
braries in terms of a concrete operation. In two conferences attended by representatives of 40 libraries agreement was reached on a division of fields of responsibility in acquisition and on methods of purchasing and distribution. It was further agreed that the Farmington Plan should go into operation in 1948, beginning with the publications of France, Sweden, and Switzerland as a preliminary test.

Early in 1948 the Carnegie Corporation of New York made a grant of $15,000 to cover the expenses of a Farmington Plan Office for three years. By the summer nearly one thousand volumes had been received and in the fall a representative of the Plan visited twelve European countries in its interest. In 1949 the Plan was extended to Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, and Norway, in 1950 to Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru, in 1951 to Australia, Austria, Germany, Ireland, Portugal, and Spain, in 1952 to 13 countries and colonies in the Caribbean area, and in 1953 to Cyprus, Finland, Greece, Yugoslavia and 22 nations and territories in Africa and Asia. As of 1953 the Farmington Plan was in operation in 99 countries and possessions. Its further extension to the Latin American countries not already included, to Japan, New Zealand, Oceania, and the Union of South Africa had been approved, the number of participating libraries had grown to 62, and the possibility of broadening the Plan's coverage to include serials and publications outside the book trade was being studied. Surely, the Farmington Plan marks one of the high points to date in the history of library cooperation in this country.23

But, by the same token, the effectiveness of the Plan as a method of acquisition in the national interest needs to be closely regarded. In 1949 C. W. David and Rudolf Hirsch made a "rash investigation" into the first few months of the Plan's operation, showing that it had achieved a far from perfect score,26 but a review of Swiss publications for 1949, made in 1951-52, showed that 90 per cent of the eligible material had been supplied.27 Further studies, and careful weighing of their results, are obviously needed.

The American Library Association's Board on Resources of American Libraries, has, for more than thirty years, worked steadily and effectively for the development of interlibrary cooperation on the national level. Created in 1923 "to study the present resources of American libraries; to suggest plans for coordination in the acquisition of research publications by American libraries" it has made notable contributions in its chosen field. The Board's 1935 report, Resources of American Libraries; a Preliminary Study of Available Records and of Efforts Toward the Coordination of the Resources of American Libraries
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Libraries summarized developments up to that time and laid the ground-work for future progress in many important directions. The surveys conducted for the Board by R. B. Downs of the resources for research of Southern libraries (1938), of New York City libraries (1942) and of American library resources in general (1951) are landmarks of lasting usefulness as is also his Union Catalogs in the United States. The 1941 conference on library specialization and the annual reports on important materials added to libraries in the United States were likewise sponsored by the Board. It has done much to promote regional union catalogs and cooperative microfilming projects and has worked closely with other library groups and with the research associations in the furtherance of common interests.

The 1946 Conference on International, Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Exchanges, sponsored jointly by the Board on Resources and the International Relations Board of the A.L.A., made a contribution of permanent importance toward the solution of problems in the whole field of international exchanges. The Carnegie Corporation of New York underwrote the expense of preparing and publishing memoranda on the major topics to be discussed and the proceedings themselves. For this purpose E. E. Williams and Ruth V. Noble brought together a comprehensive study covering, among many other topics, cooperative acquisitions and specialization, exchange of documents between governments, and exchanges between libraries. It was the first thorough and scholarly survey of the entire field and it provided historical perspective as well as a review of current activities. The conference was attended by 33 representatives of libraries, foundations, learned societies, and federal departments. All phases of the subject were explored and the recommendations for action adopted there have been followed up with concrete results in a number of directions.28

Four years later L. J. Kipp conducted for the Library of Congress under a grant from the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation a survey of the government's programs for the exchange of publications with Latin America and of the programs of private institutions insofar as they complemented the government's programs or made use of their facilities. Kipp's report was published in the spring of 1950 and was widely distributed to government agencies and libraries in this country and abroad. It described the historical development of exchanges in general, their legislative bases and objectives, the operational machinery of the programs with Latin America, problems which must be faced, and important current de-
developments such as the use of microphotography, the Farmington Plan, and the activities of Unesco. The roles of the United States Book Exchange, the Department of State, the Smithsonian Institution, the Library of Congress, the Armed Forces Medical Library, and the Department of Agriculture were helpfully analyzed and eighteen specific recommendations for action were presented. Many individual libraries in their acquisitions programs have kept the national interest in mind. This has been true, for example, of the federal libraries. Earlier in this article mention was made of the pioneering efforts of the Smithsonian Institution, of the stress laid on specialization by Herbert Putnam, and of the suggestion that a “council” of government libraries be established. Reference was also made to the Experimental Division of Library Cooperation at the Library of Congress, the wartime Interdepartmental Committee for the Acquisition of Foreign Publications, the Library of Congress Mission, and the Kipp survey of the government’s exchange programs.

The Canons of Selection adopted by the Library of Congress in 1940 recognized the primary roles of the Department of Agriculture Library and the Armed Forces Medical Library in their respective fields and pledged the best efforts of the Library of Congress toward the strengthening of these complementary collections. They acknowledged the primacy of the National Archives as regards the official manuscript records of the federal government and emphasized that the Library’s chief concern “as regards local manuscript records is to stimulate their location in appropriate localities.” Finally the Canons stipulated that “where, aside from such official documents, other American libraries, whose collections are made broadly available, have already accumulated, or are in process of accumulating, outstanding collections in well-defined areas, in which areas the Library of Congress is not strong, the Library of Congress will satisfy itself with general reference materials and will not attempt to establish intensive collections.” The Library’s Acquisitions Committee, in existence since 1943, in charting the development of the collections and determining subject fields for special emphasis, has been constantly guided by these general principles.

In 1946 a number of eminent persons, each representative of a class of users of the Library’s services, were invited to form a Library of Congress Planning Committee. Their report, submitted the following year, presented a program for the future development of the Library in matters of service to Congress, to the other federal agencies, to local libraries, educational, scientific and learned institutions and
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organizations, to industrial and commercial enterprises, and to individual investigators. In describing the kinds of collections which the Library should maintain the committee stressed the necessity for coordination of effort and elimination of duplicative collecting both in the federal library system and in that of the nation as a whole.31

A 1944 survey, The National Medical Library, noted the founding of the Army Medical Library (now the Armed Forces Medical Library) in 1836 and its emergence since 1865 as a great research institution with the most impressive collection of medical publications in the United States. The surveyors found that the Armed Forces Medical Library serves to a large extent as the central medical research library for the country, that it lends books by interlibrary loan to a tremendous extent to libraries all over the United States, and that this service has been greatly extended through the use of microfilm and photostat, with hundreds of thousands of pages of microfilm and several thousand photostats and photoprints produced each year. They recommended that the Library of Congress transfer to the Armed Forces Medical Library one of the two copyright copies which it receives and this has been effected. They also called attention to the need for a more definitive division of fields of collecting between this library and the Department of Agriculture Library.32

In the same year, Scott Adams wrote, “the library drew up a directive for its acquisition policy, defining fields of interest, and setting as an ideal the acquisition of one copy of any work of importance to medical research, regardless of language and date of publication. In carrying out this directive, the library has assumed the responsibility of supplying to agencies of the federal government all library materials in the field of medicine necessary to the national interest. As a corollary the library has accepted responsibility under the Farmington Plan of acquiring these materials in the interests of the private research libraries of the nation.” He goes on to add that the library’s services are “supplementary, not competitive. . . . The library’s collections augment the resources of private libraries; the bibliographical activities . . . interpret these collections, providing services which could not be performed by libraries with smaller resources.”33 The directive referred to was amplified in 1951 in a statement on scope and coverage which carefully defined the library’s acquisitions policy in each subject field with due regard to the collecting policies of the other major federal libraries.34

The Department of Agriculture Library serves as the national library for agriculture and has the largest agricultural collection in the
world, containing over 1,000,000 volumes in the field of agriculture and the related sciences. Ralph Shaw, in a 1948 summary, stressed the service given by this library to the country as a whole through interlibrary loans, field branches, photographic reproductions, and current bibliographies. He also described the limitations imposed by the library's administration to avoid duplicating the collections and services of other great research libraries. Purchases in fields beyond the collecting scope of the Department of Agriculture Library are limited to working collections needed for current use and recourse is had to the Armed Forces Medical Library and the Library of Congress for literature in their fields.35

A number of other federal libraries, for example, those of the Bureau of the Census, the Patent Office, and the Weather Bureau have collections of national scope and render a country-wide service. The collections of these specialized libraries are often the largest to be found in the United States and other libraries in the Washington area refrain from efforts to duplicate them. The resources and services of these libraries are briefly described in Library and Reference Facilities in the Area of the District of Columbia, a joint publication of the Washington, D.C. Chapter of the Special Libraries Association and the Library of Congress, now in its fourth edition (1952).

University libraries, individually and as a group, have from the beginning taken the lead in movements designed to strengthen the national resources for research. This is equally true of the great reference libraries in such cities as Boston, New York, and Chicago. These great libraries, whether attached to universities or to municipalities, are in a sense national assets. Their vast collections are major components of the total national resource and each renders a service which extends far beyond the campus or city in which it is located. A number of them, for example the New York Public Library and the Harvard University Library, have conducted surveys of their collections and prepared blueprints for their planned development which take into account national as well as local needs. Such men as Richardson, Keogh, W. W. Bishop, Metcalf, and Downs, to name but a few, have been in the forefront of every program for interlibrary cooperation in this country. The university and reference libraries have sponsored and executed such cooperative projects as the Farmington Plan, the New England Depository Library, and the Midwest Inter-Library Center. The next article in this issue reviews in detail the cooperative acquisitions programs that have been discussed and tried in recent years, and tests this trend with an actual sampling, on a regional basis, of recent acquisitions practice.
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In 1942 Julian Boyd wrote, in the working paper for the crucial meeting at Farmington, Connecticut, "American research libraries cannot place in the hands of American scholars the records of knowledge that they need, for the simple reason that a least two-thirds of the estimated thirty million research titles of printed books in the world do not exist in even a single copy in any library in America... No single library is great enough or can become great enough to meet the responsibility alone. It is a responsibility which can be met only by the united strength of all libraries and the unwavering faith of all librarians." 36

Since that date the picture has considerably improved. The Farmington Plan, with its allocation of responsibilities by subject and area to achieve comprehensive coverage, to avoid unnecessary duplication, and to reduce costs, has established a basically sound pattern for developing our library resources in the interest of the nation as a whole.

On the other hand, much remains to be done. The Farmington Plan now covers important categories of monographs of research value currently published in nearly a hundred countries, but its omissions are significant. Quite apart from the geographic exclusions (among which are China, the Cominform Countries and the United States), the list of categories of excluded material fills a whole page in the Farmington Plan Handbook, and comprises dissertations, government documents, maps, music, newspapers, periodicals, and numbered series issued by societies or academic institutions.

There have not been wanting, it is true, various attempts to fill some of these gaps. The Committee on National Needs of the Association of Research Libraries was successful in extending the coverage of the Plan to certain areas using non-Roman alphabets, especially in the Middle East, to which the Plan had not previously extended and has explored the conditions prerequisite for making generally useful the stocks of books in non-Roman alphabets now present in the United States.37 When it appeared that among these prerequisites were standards of transliteration of non-Roman alphabets into the Roman alphabet, and rules for cataloging Oriental books, the Association of Research Libraries took steps toward the filling of these wants. Its own Committee on Transliteration is presently active,38 and the A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification has appointed a Special Committee on Cataloging Oriental Materials.39 Similarly a committee of the Association of Research Libraries has proposed a plan for assuring the availability, with least duplication, of microfilms of important foreign newspapers 40 and the A.L.A. Board on Resources
of American Libraries has performed a major task toward assuring preservation and availability of American newspapers. There is also pending a recent proposal by the Board for bringing into the United States copies of older books discovered to be wanting here, but the major problem of retrospective publications, mentioned by Boyd, still remains to be solved and is rarely discussed. Various informal agreements, delimiting spheres of interest, are in effect but have not been welded into a national plan.

Deserving of mention, as representing a curious twist of the concept of “collecting in the national interest,” is the present status of discussions regarding the dispersal of collections to provide for continuance of national life and culture in the event of the destruction of the great metropolitan libraries by aerial warfare. One national library association has been impressed with the suggestion for building up, by cooperative effort and through the judicious use of duplicates, of “shadow collections” in newer and more remote institutions, mirroring the great collections of the older libraries. A joint committee of the Council of National Library Associations has countered this proposal with one for dividing the country into areas, each of which would attempt to make itself self-sufficient in the basic materials of research, using for the purpose a series of standard lists to be compiled for each of the sciences and arts. Thus assured of sufficiency in the staples of research, preparations against bombing could be limited to the removal of rariora. It may well be that techniques of microfacsimile reproduction could put such a scheme within the limits of feasibility.

But even this proposal emphasizes the importance of bibliography to planned collecting, and there is present need for greatly improved bibliographical controls over the materials being acquired from abroad by American libraries. Cards representing their Farmington Plan receipts are forwarded by the cooperating libraries for filing in the National Union Catalog but the publication of this catalog is yet to be achieved, and it is not yet a subject catalog. Publications cataloged by other libraries through cooperative arrangements appear in the currently issued Library of Congress book catalogs but these catalogs do not include all the receipts of Farmington Plan libraries. The Monthly List of Russian Accessions does provide a national coverage for one important area of the world and the possibility of publishing the Cyrillic National Union Catalog in book form is being explored with some prospect of success. The East European Accessions List and New Serial Titles are being expanded to include the acquisitions
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of all major American libraries in the fields covered by these publications but these efforts represent only a first step toward meeting the overall need.

Thus it is clear that it is impossible to discuss "collecting in the national interest" without touching on almost the whole range of principal activities which make up library work. There was little use in elaborating a national plan of collecting prior to the construction of the National Union Catalog and the Union List of Serials, and neither of these would be possible without standards of cataloging and transliteration. Although much progress has been made since 1920 in this whole area, the problems toward further progress are just as formidable, while the urgency is greater. In 1927 it was estimated that the world's annual production of monographic works was 161,489 titles. A recent estimate places the figure at 329,276. This, then, is the number of books which should be regarded as having a potential "national interest," and the number of periodicals, newspapers, maps, music, and other forms of material are comparable in immensity. But without the tools of selection, recording and service, it is merely frightening to regard these masses of material. Consequently, the present interest in the utilization of the National Union Catalog, the push toward a current Union List of Serials, and the experiments with telefacsimile may all be considered as trends basic to and encouraging for collecting in the national interest.
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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.
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 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"
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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
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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-
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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
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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
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, 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

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

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No. of Titles</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No. of Titles</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. and Misc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>Lang. and Lit.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>Gen. and Misc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>Celtic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.47</td>
<td>Eng. Lit.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slavic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oriental Studies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistory and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classical Archaeology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Economics and Sociology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 which in turn is based on the earlier work, Southern Regions of the United States by H. W. Odum; 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported Library Holdings of Sample Titles, arranged by regions according to Wilson-Odum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part A. Region I (Southeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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

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

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

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

Different titles held in entire region = 204 = 97.89%
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Table II, Part D. Region IV (Northwest)  
Population: 7,987,326

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Locations searched and reported by</th>
<th>Titles located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tex.</td>
<td>7,711,194</td>
<td>DLC-UC, TxU</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark.</td>
<td>749,587</td>
<td>DLC-UC, CoDBC</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.</td>
<td>681,187</td>
<td>DLC-UC, CoDBC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Locations searched and reported by</th>
<th>Titles located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td>10,586,223</td>
<td>DLC-UC, CL, CLU, CU</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash.</td>
<td>2,378,963</td>
<td>DLC-UC, WaSPBC</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ore.</td>
<td>1,521,341</td>
<td>DLC-UC, WaSPBC</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.C.</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Locations searched and reported by</th>
<th>Titles located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>802,178</td>
<td>DLC-UC, DSG, DA</td>
<td>179 = 80.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

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

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Total Titles in Sample</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>REG</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>REG</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>REG</th>
<th>REGION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>States Included</th>
<th>Population Rank</th>
<th>Located</th>
<th>Located</th>
<th>% Located Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>N.J., N.Y., Pa.</td>
<td>30,163,533</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>96.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. East North Central</td>
<td>Ind., III., Mich., Wisc.</td>
<td>30,399,968</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>91.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. South Atlantic</td>
<td>Del., Md., D.C., Va., W.Va., N.C., S.C., Ga., Fla.</td>
<td>21,182,335</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>91.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. East South Central</td>
<td>Ky., Ala., Tenn., Miss.</td>
<td>11,477,181</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. West South Central</td>
<td>Ark., La., Okla., Tex.</td>
<td>14,537,572</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>40.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pacific Coast</td>
<td>Calif., Oregon, Wash.</td>
<td>14,486,527</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>78.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-field</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and Misc.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic (excl. English)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-field</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and Misc.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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d. Oriental Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

e. Philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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
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The Current Bookmarket

FLEMING BENNETT

The publishing of books is a six-hundred-million-dollar-a-year industry in the United States. On the American business scene, it is one of the lesser giants, a giant whose vagaries have often baffled librarians, and whose recurrent cries of anguish have given them much concern. New books, and new editions of older books, flow from the presses in a never-ending and again-rising stream: 12,050 titles in 1953, surpassing the industry's previous peak in 1940 when 11,328 new books appeared, and nearly doubling the figure reported in the trough-year 1945 when only 6,548 new titles or new editions were published.¹ It is from this stream, augmented by the publishing output of foreign countries, that libraries of all kinds and sizes must select whatever new books are needed in their service programs, and then to acquire them by whatever means experience has proved most expedient and economical.

For some libraries, the new-book stream is almost the sole focus of selection, while for others a major portion of available book funds is earmarked for out-of-print materials. All libraries, however, are concerned in one degree or another with the acquisition of books currently in print. This article describes the industry upon which libraries depend for books-in-print, and reports a survey of methods used by libraries in acquiring them.

In book-publishing, as in many other industries, a relatively small number of firms dominates the field. In 1953 the Big Four—Doubleday, Macmillan, McGraw-Hill, and Harper—added 1,297 titles to their already large lists, nearly 11% of the entire number brought out by the 332 firms publishing at least five books during the year. Clustering around these four are twenty-five other companies which published more than a hundred books each and, together, accounted for slightly more than one-fourth of the year's total. Broadening the circle to include thirty-two firms which brought out between fifty and one hundred books during the year, one finds that 18% of the publishers issued 56% of the books appearing in 1953.¹

¹ The author is Librarian at the University of Arizona.
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The postwar years, during which the annual production of new books or editions has risen more than 80%, have witnessed the phenomenal rise of a group of publishers whose sights are frankly trained upon mass markets. By 1953 nine of these firms had so successfully expanded their publishing and marketing of inexpensive paper-bound books that they were securely within the circle of large publishers. A total of 984 books was published by these nine firms and seven others whose lists have not yet reached the fifty-or-more-a-year mark. An estimated 270 million copies of their paper-covered books were sold in 1952, 35% of the 766-million copies-total for the year, but only 8% of the dollar-value total.

Like earlier threats to the economic health of book-publishing, paper-bound book-production has not toppled the industry. While sales of paper-bound books increased nearly threefold from 1947 to 1952, sales in all other broad categories increased also (e.g., trade books, 46%; textbooks, 2%; technical and professional books, 35%). As a kind of hedge, some of the old-line companies have actually strengthened their positions by establishing subsidiary firms to produce inexpensive lines of paper-books, or by tailoring their current lists to appeal more strongly to the reprint segment of the industry.

This trimming of sails is reminiscent of what happened during the years when the meteoric development of book clubs filled the book-trade with dark forebodings. To meet the threat embodied in skyrocketing subscriber-lists and club-distribution, publishers increasingly selected for publication manuscripts which would appeal to the editorial boards of the larger book clubs and which, if selected, would bring in additional revenue in the form of book-club royalties.

While publishers were and apparently still are able to accommodate themselves to the proliferation of book clubs, local booksellers have been so seriously affected that they probably take small comfort in the fact that book distribution by clubs has declined from 54 million copies in 1947 to 48 million in 1952. Book-club distribution and the rise of the paper-bound book form negligible factors in library acquisitions programs, but librarians are nonetheless concerned with them as trends affecting the book industry’s moral as well as economic health.

It is quite obvious that publishers must not only make ends meet, but must make a profit from their endeavors. However, despite rising production costs, publishers have been understandably reluctant to increase too rapidly the prices of their books. Experience has taught
them how precarious their market is. Hence average book prices in 1953, as compared with those in 1941, show increases of only 28% for novels, 41% for biographies, and 55% for historical works, whereas prices for other products have risen 80–100% over the same period.

Only by embracing expedients that would ensure additional revenues have publishers been able to keep book prices from rising too steeply. Royalties from reprinters, book clubs and, perhaps more significantly, from movie producers, have helped keep publishers solvent. The influence exerted by these groups upon the selection of manuscripts for publication, however, is of questionable virtue. It seems almost certain that, with the editorial environment more surcharged than formerly with the economics of publishing, a relatively greater number of manuscripts worthy of publication have been rejected. The rising birth-rate of university presses and of one-man scholarly presses with their expanding lists afford some small solace to librarians and others who deplore the diminishing incidence of the more scholarly type of book on trade publishers’ lists, but it is recognized that the activities of these presses also are circumscribed by economic considerations.

In general, the channels through which current books are acquired by individuals or by libraries are relatively uncomplicated, but almost any acquisitions librarian can cite a myriad instances in which books currently in print were acquired only with extreme difficulty. It is often the case that a book can be purchased only from its author, or that a severely limited number of outlets are being utilized in the book’s distribution. In such cases, librarians are often thwarted in their efforts to identify sources of availability, but for the majority of books-in-print sources are easily ascertainable, and accumulated experience enables librarians to select the right one for each title.

The publishers themselves are of course at the top of the distribution pyramid. Some of them operate their own printing establishments, while others have their printing done by separate firms. Some of them have their own binderies, but most of them have specialized binding houses do their work. The finished product is delivered either directly to the publisher’s establishment or, in the case of some of the larger firms, to one or more strategically located warehouses or distribution points. The bulk of sales for any newly-published book is made to wholesale jobbers and to local bookstores. Not all of the latter group deal with publishers directly; many prefer to acquire their stocks from jobbers, who can give them discounts comparable to those the publisher allows, and whose service is often swifter and more satisfactory.
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An individual book-buyer more often than not makes his purchases at a local bookstore, or in one of the many book outlets which are operated in conjunction with the sale of other, often seemingly unrelated, products. Many individuals secure their books by the mail-order route, particularly if the towns they live in or near do not have bookstores. It is unfortunate that this kind of situation exists in so many places, and wholly understandable that some of the more enterprising publishers have resorted to mail-order advertising or direct circularizing, even though this distribution tactic has involved them in bitter controversy with booksellers.

Libraries can utilize at least three alternative sources in acquiring books-in-print. They may place their orders with local bookstores if adequate stocks are maintained and satisfactory discounts offered. Some public librarians, or their boards of trustees, consider it good public relations to buy locally, even though they might more judiciously spend their limited book funds with jobbers. Occasionally a college or university bookstore's operations are large enough to include the campus library's orders for current books. One of few such campus bookstores known to the writer is the Columbia University Bookstore, from which a majority of Columbia University Libraries' purchases of current titles is acquired on quite advantageous terms.

Orders may also be placed directly with publishers, but unless the library regularly buys multiple copies of single titles, or single copies of many titles from individual publishers, the latter often prefer not to handle the orders. The large public library with many branches may find it advantageous to place the bulk of its orders directly with publishers, but a small college library, on the other hand, may find it uneconomical and unsatisfactory to do so. Many such libraries, however, probably find it expedient, as do larger libraries, to place blanket orders for all books published by certain of the university presses or "specialty" publishers.

The third major alternative is to place the majority of orders for current books with wholesale book jobbers. The larger jobbers build up tremendous inventories, carrying in stock not only books recently published but also backlist items for which there remains some demand; the same can be said of some of the smaller regional jobbers. Some jobbers develop specialties, e.g., medical and technical books, or university press books. Libraries served by these jobbers can be reasonably certain of receiving prompt delivery on most books they order, and of receiving prompt reports on books not immediately available. The assertion about reporting probably applies more accurately
to the medium-sized jobber than to the larger companies. It would appear that the service aspects of book-jobbing do not always keep pace with an acceleration in sales volume.

In shaping their buying policies, librarians may choose to direct orders for books-in-print to one type of source exclusively, or they may elect to employ all three types, with equal or varying emphases. In general, decisions are based upon such considerations as (1) where can we buy most cheaply? (2) what sources make possible a greater simplification of our internal purchasing procedure? and (3) from what sources can we get promptest service? The last-named factor often outweighs the other two, but in most libraries the price and efficiency factors outrank the third most of the time.

In an attempt to discover existing patterns of buying, the writer mailed a short questionnaire last summer to thirty-one public libraries and sixty-four college or university libraries. Both small and large libraries were included on the mailing list, and care was exercised to include all regions of the United States in the sample. Librarians were asked to estimate, or to discover by close analysis, what proportion of their orders for books-in-print were placed directly with publishers, with jobbers, or with local bookstores. They were asked also to specify the reasons underlying the particular policies adopted in their libraries.

The responses of twenty-five public and forty-two college or university librarians make possible certain generalizations, the first of which is that the buying practices of no two respondent libraries are identical. Differences in collecting policy, correlative differences in requirements of clientele, and differing experiences in dealing with jobbers, publishers and bookstores account in large measure for this unsurprising observation. However, similarities in buying practice are strong enough to permit grouping the respondent libraries into four categories: (1) Those which purchase 65% or more (in some cases, as much as 95%) of their current books from jobbers, and divide the remainder of their buying between publishers and bookstores, in that order; (2) Those which purchase 65% or more directly from publishers, and split the rest between jobbers and bookstores; (3) Those which divide their purchases nearly half-and-half between jobbers and publishers; and (4) Those few which place the majority of their orders with local bookstores. The distribution of these groups, for the sixty-seven libraries participating in the survey, is shown in the following table:
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TABLE I

Book Buying Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buying-Pattern Category</th>
<th>Academic Libraries (%)</th>
<th>Public Libraries (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From jobbers, 65% or more; 35% or less from publishers and/or bookstores</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From publishers, 65% or more; 35% or less from jobbers and/or bookstores</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From jobbers and publishers, 35%-65% each</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From bookstores, 65% or more; 35% or less from jobbers and/or publishers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N = 100%)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the respondent libraries comprise a representative sample of libraries in the U.S. (and no such claim is made for them), it can be asserted (1) that both public and academic libraries tend to place the majority of their current book orders with jobbers, (2) that academic libraries place more orders directly with publishers than do public libraries, and (3) that neither public nor academic libraries purchase many books from local bookstores.

In earlier years, many public libraries utilized the services of bookstores, but it would appear that as acquisitions programs have grown, local booksellers have been unable adequately to meet libraries’ requirements. Similarly, except on very large campuses, university bookstores are totally unable to fulfill the specialized needs of university libraries. With further reference to local bookstores, it is worth noting here that in later articles in this issue both Henderson and Mrs. Spain point to the problem faced by small libraries in areas lacking adequate bookstores. Since, as Henderson adds, book reviews are often unsatisfactory, these isolated libraries have considerable difficulty in selecting and acquiring current books. Furthermore the death rate among retail book outlets is apparently high. It is understood, of course, that this whole question of inadequate local bookstores presents a large economic and social problem throughout the country, a problem that disturbs publishers, booksellers and librarians.

A few of the respondent public libraries place as many as 50% of their orders directly with publishers, but among the academic libraries there are some (14%) which purchase two-thirds or more directly from publishers and a larger proportion (29%) that buy about half their books-in-print directly. This difference in buying practice can prob-
ably be explained chiefly in terms of the greater premium often placed on speedy procurement by academic libraries. When a professor discovers the library’s lack of a book urgently needed for research currently underway, or when, two weeks or less before the semester begins, an instructor requests multiple copies of a book he wants placed on reserve, the library usually makes all-out efforts to procure the materials speedily, and in most cases a “rush” order to the publisher is the most effective method.

In a majority of both public and academic libraries it has apparently been found advantageous to buy chiefly from wholesale book-jobbers, but this conviction appears to be more prevalent among public libraries. Only slightly over half the academic libraries in the survey reported placing 65% or more of their current orders with jobbers, but over four-fifths of the public libraries do so.

The most probable explanation of this difference lies in the more specialized nature of the collecting programs of larger libraries, particularly those serving universities in which research activities are well developed. These programs involve procurement of many publications (e.g., those published by societies) which are not readily procurable through book-jobbers, either because the publishing agency cannot afford to allow the jobber the discount he expects and receives from trade publishers, or because the jobber himself is unwilling to handle items which are difficult to secure. If the volume of orders placed with him is large, it is often the case that, solely as a matter of courtesy and accommodation, a jobber will handle the hard-to-get items, but the small and medium-sized library is usually forced back upon the expedient of ordering directly from the publishing agency. Although smaller libraries may receive assurances from their jobbers that they will attempt to supply any currently available item, placing orders for the hard-to-get items is often followed by dismaying delays and fruitless correspondence which increase the ultimate cost of these items to the library.

The reasons given by librarians for placing most of their orders for current books with jobbers are varied and illuminating. Discounts allowed by jobbers, they claim, are as good as, and in many instances better than, those allowed by publishers. Some librarians cite contractual agreements with jobbers, under the terms of which favorable discount schedules apply throughout the year and rebates are granted if the total purchases exceed a specified amount. Many jobbers pay all transportation charges, and for some libraries this item alone represents considerable savings.
Another side of the coin which puts jobbers in a favored position is that libraries can effect internal economies by dealing with one or two jobbers instead of ordering directly from a large number of publishers. One of the public librarians participating in the survey asserts, "We have found that purchasing direct from publishers creates a tremendous amount of paper work, check writing, etc., which more than eats up the differential in discounts offered by jobber and publisher. It is a question of total economy in the long run." It should be fairly obvious that by consolidating orders, savings are effected not only in the initial process of writing orders, but also in the checking of shipments and the processing of invoices for payment. Furthermore, to quote an acquisitions librarian in a large university, "We find [ordering through jobbers] more satisfactory than from publisher direct as it gives us a greater uniformity in type of invoice." As will be immediately obvious, this factor can operate to save the time of acquisitions librarians for more productive endeavor.

Librarians testify also that better service is usually given them by jobbers than by publishers. Books are supplied more promptly; invoices are rendered speedily and more accurately, with billing procedures modified to fit requirements that must often be imposed by libraries; reports on books whose delivery must be deferred or cancelled are submitted more promptly and consistently; claims are expeditiously handled, and adjustments readily made for returned duplicate, damaged or defective copies.

The relative proximity of their jobbers was cited by some librarians as another favorable service factor. It is known, however, that distance often adversely affects the volume of orders placed with jobbers. Most of the libraries which reported splitting their current orders about half-and-half between jobbers and publishers are located at considerable distances from the larger book-distribution centers. It appears entirely likely that if libraries in Arizona, New Mexico, and Oregon, for example, were closer to such centers, they would divert a larger proportion of their orders to jobbers than they now do.

It should be noted that the foregoing observations apply primarily, and perhaps exclusively, to domestic book-buying. Several respondents pointed out that their estimates did not include the acquisition of books published in other countries, and it is not known whether other respondents likewise excluded them. It seems moderately safe, however, to assert that most libraries which place domestic orders chiefly with jobbers also order the bulk of their foreign books from jobbers, and also that libraries which order directly from publishers in this
country tend to use the services of a jobber (located either abroad or in the U.S.) in acquiring foreign publications. Participation in the Farmington Plan operation has undoubtedly helped many libraries in their selection of foreign agents and in their methods of foreign business. The writer's experience, coupled with responses made by some librarians in the survey, would seem to indicate the wisdom of a library's selecting a single dealer in each country from which books-in-print are desired, or acquiring such books through American firms which specialize in foreign publications. Service elements outweigh economic considerations in this buying area, because as a general rule there are no discounts, other than on pre-publication offers, on books published in foreign countries. The recency and excellence of John Fall's discussion of procuring foreign publications makes any further observation unnecessary here.4

Never more true than now is the old saying, "Of making many books there is no end." New books appear in this country at the rate of about 230 each week; in Great Britain at a weekly rate of 351;6 and in countries embraced by the Farmington Plan a combined total of 17,504 in 1952,6 or an average of 337 each week. Not all these books are candidates for acquisition in any one library, but their numbers provide a measure of the flood of print which libraries collectively attempt to assimilate. They yield also some notion of the problems that confront acquisitions librarians in procuring the books-in-print wanted in individual libraries. Solutions found to be satisfactory in one library may not prove so in another, but the survey findings reported in these pages reveal prevalent buying patterns which may be instructive as well as interesting to librarians who have found only partial cures for their current book-buying ills.
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The Antiquarian Bookmarket and the Acquisition of Rare Books

DONALD G. WING and ROBERT VOSPER

In only a few cases is the acquisition of general out-of-print and of rare books identical. Usually two different approaches and two different types of dealers or private owners are involved. One of the most frequent headaches is the little old lady who comes in off the street and expects that because her book is old (to her) it must be rare. It seems entirely reasonable to throw away most of what is so carefully preserved in safe deposit boxes and replace this with pamphlets and broadsides all too frequently carelessly forgotten in attics. Few family Bibles are of value beyond the immediate family, and eighteenth century German prayer books seldom budge the purse strings of order librarians. Occasionally there will be a local historical society that will accept Bibles with genealogical entries, if they are of local interest. Otherwise, that Bible, with the immigrant ancestor's other forms of piety, had better be handed on to another member of the family, less cramped for space than a library. The late Rumball-Petrel had something to say on this particular matter.

Effectiveness in both kinds of antiquarian buying, general out-of-print and rare books, is crucial to the health of any library. And neither is too well understood by librarians. It is a rare library school teacher who mentions the matter, and too little is written on the subject. The only way to find out, given imagination and an enthusiastic flair for the work, is to learn on the job in a good library or a bookstore, or both, to read dealers' catalogs and the other literature of the trade assiduously, to talk with dealers and collectors, or better yet listen to them, and, most of all, to be in love with the excitement of books, bibliography, and the book trade. The best practitioners are artists and their learning came easily.

If current books pose problems because of the numbers of books,
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the shortcomings of the bibliography and the complications of the
market, the world of out-of-print books can be awesome to the unin-
initiated. The successful hunter in this jungle must be filled with the
excitement of the chase. Should he try a specialty dealer, one in French
books or one in sporting books, for example? Or should he try a general
out-of-print dealer, use a search service, or advertise on his own in the
Antiquarian Bookman? Or dare he venture into the auction room,
and if so is the bid to go to the auctioneer or through an agent? Or is
it better just to read catalogs and hope the right books turn up at the
right price and that someone else does not buy them first? And what
is the right price, and should he cable or just write air mail? And what
about book scouts, or should he do his own shop browsing, and where?
And what about desiderata lists? Questions like these baffle many li-
brarians, and the answers can not be found in a textbook. Moreover
the experts often suggest conflicting advice. Experience helps.

The general out-of-print market is important to many kinds of li-
braries, of course, both public and academic. All librarians are con-
tinually looking for some kind of book that the publishers no longer
stock. That is what the antiquarian trade is for, and no practical
amount of reprinting will solve the whole problem. The New York
Public Library's book sleuth G. W. Bergquist looked into this question
for the American Library Association a few years ago, and his report
gives some picture of the problem. Reichmann's article in this issue
says something more about the operating procedures and records in-
volved, and, to judge from an earlier article of his, this is a field in
which he is interested and an expert. Judging from the questions that
librarians ask and from the complaints that they and dealers make,
the whole matter needs more consideration, probably joint considera-
tion by dealers and librarians. There is an apparent tendency for the
two groups to talk together more freely and to count less on mutual
suspicion. Possibly each group is becoming more sophisticated. Per-
haps it means that more libraries are buying heavily in the antiquarian
market. At any rate the tendency is there, as witness the University of
Chicago's Graduate Library School Conference in the summer of
1953 and a recent small meeting at the University of Kansas.

Librarians are even beginning to write on the subject. This is re-
freshing and hopeful, for some of their statements are acute. Fall's report is concerned primarily with the current book market abroad,
but it also considers some aspects of antiquarian buying. Miller's opinions and findings deserve to be more easily available for reading
than they are in their present form, and so do several of the European
book-buying reports that Jens Nyholm, librarian of Northwestern University, has occasionally sent home for his staff newsletter.

The authors are more interested here, however, in the discovery and acquisition of really rare books and out-of-print materials that seldom come on the market, even though when they do they are not necessarily expensive. Some libraries have arbitrarily set date limits before which everything becomes a rare book. At Yale, for example, this is true of any book printed before 1551; any English book before 1641; any American book before 1801 whether of North or South America. One result of this is heavy buying in American imprints at one or two dollars apiece and any complete Short Title Catalog book offered for not more than ten dollars. They still exist although they become, for Yale, fewer each year as holdings grow stronger. Eventually the end date will be extended in all categories, but by that time it may be easier to move the resulting few circulating volumes to a smaller stack space. Scholars have often marvelled at the difference in price between an edition printed in 1500 and another a year older. It may seem strange, but now is the time to pick up the cheaper 1501 variety before someone makes a census and proves their scarcity. Because there are so few bibliographical tools for the first half of the sixteenth century it is still possible to buy these early works cheaply, particularly if they are anonymous. Reformation tracts from Germany have recently been available in bulk for about fifteen dollars a title. Yet to buy a specific tract, more than that may probably be spent in time and postage before a copy can even be located. There are those who will settle for a photostat or a microfilm and sometimes this is the only way to produce a text quickly and inexpensively, but they can never be as satisfactory for some important purposes as the original and they sometimes cost more. Gordon Ray's opinions on this and other matters of concern to this article are always pertinent and refreshing.

This is not the place to go further into the vexing question of what is a rare book and why, but it needs saying that, on this whole matter of the scholarly importance of rare books and their place in libraries, librarians appear to be coming into a period of maturity and sanity. To be sure, not every librarian and scholar agrees in the matter, and the term “rare book” still retains enough pejorative sense to some people that many libraries now hide behind the phrase “special collections.” Nonetheless, the mere titles of recent publications from Minnesota and the University of California at Los Angeles suggest the saner trend, as does the development in recent years of effective rare book programs and rare book rooms in many university libraries. Thus
the period when most librarians and scholars expressed an immature disdain for rare books and many rare book curators, in self-defense, were only lily-white and captious, is left behind.

It is only natural that the majority of rare and antiquarian books continue to come from England. There are periodic howls of anguish that America is despoiling one country or another, but there still seems to be almost enough to satisfy the demand. Two skillful and eloquent American operators bear this out. Lawrence Powell felt that, "all the gems have not been mined, nor all 'sleepers' awakened." Ray suggests that "we hardly give much heed to the gloomy protestations of English booksellers that their sources of supply are rapidly dwindling." The howls of anguish may have little real substance anyway since many English dealers in rare books report little buying activity among English libraries and indicate that two-thirds or more of their business comes from this country, particularly from American libraries. In fact the American library in general begins to be a larger customer for many antiquarian dealers than does the private collector. Only a few years ago the opposite was clearly true. To be sure, one now hears much of vigorous buying by wealthy collectors in such unexpected places as Switzerland and Latin America.

Most purchases are made in England through catalogs or by private treaty. Everyone has an uneasy feeling that others may see catalogs before he does. Attempts are made to receive advance copies by air mail, but there is no sure way of arranging mailings so that copies are delivered everywhere at the same time. A cable may perhaps raise suspicion. All librarians have had the answer, by surface mail, "copy offered previously sold. Have another identical at higher price." Were there then two copies? Anyway, some prefer an air mail letter sent the day the catalog is received. Quick decision and rapid action are requisite if the acquisitions department is to operate in this market. To be sure, one can avoid some of the frustration of catalog buying by gaining such a good reputation among dealers that they will offer desirable books directly, before issuing a catalog. Auction catalogs are something else. Why does no auction house produce even a decent job of description? There are various answers, none of them completely satisfactory. There was a time when as underbidder Yale fairly regularly had its wants offered after the sale at a lower price than the Yale underbid, and from Switzerland! Fall has something to say about auction buying, and a fine way to gain some feeling for the color and excitement of the auction room is to read the "Notes on Sales" section in each issue of the new English quarterly, The Book Collector.
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A good many antiquarian English books are offered by American dealers after a book hunting expedition abroad. More recently they too have complained that English stocks are low, that one cannot bribe his way behind the scenes or into the cellar, or that now prices are ridiculously high. Still, the material keeps coming, every year more and better buys, as is indicated by the Powell and Ray reports cited earlier.

The honesty and integrity of book sellers all over the world is profoundly impressing. The fly-by-night operators who want a quick turnover are few and seldom last more than a season. The good book dealer's knowledge of books and bibliography, a knowledge often rising to scholarly heights, offers great service and advantage to librarians if they will only come to know their brethren in the trade. John Carter, one of the giants himself, discussed this matter wisely, including a tribute to the greatest of them all, the late E. P. Goldschmidt. The two fine annual volumes issued in England by the Antiquarian Booksellers' Association in 1952 and 1953 offer further proof, as do the articles in The Book Collector and the collected volume of Talks on Book-Collecting that was issued in 1952 under the auspices of the Antiquarian Booksellers' Association. These men and women in the trade are not only scholarly but also helpful to librarians. They, along with book collectors, are among the most interesting and warmest friends that a bookish librarian can find, as many will testify. The world of books is full of richly rewarding human relationships. The recent formation of the Antiquarian Booksellers' Association of America, as a member of the International League of Antiquarian Booksellers and with several regional chapters throughout the country, has been widely praised and the choice of officers, thus far, has been extraordinarily fine. Here is a court of appeals ready at hand, but its existence almost precludes the necessity for arbitration, and the very fact that the trade is now organized offers far better possibilities for librarians and dealers to discuss their mutual relationships and to work toward the solution of common problems. It will indeed be a pleasure to have the next international meeting of the book trade in this country.

Continental dealers in antiquarian and rare books are of all kinds and types, sending out catalogs with everything from colored illustrations to illegible mimeographed sheets. It is quite impossible to make a list of which dealers to try for which kind of books. Experience once more is the only guide, and even there a new man with his first catalog may usurp a field previously jealously guarded by someone else. One must read catalogs all the time in order to stay abreast. At the
moment, Oxford is the place for Portuguese Judaica and the Japanese book you want may be in Rutland, Vermont. A few years ago the best outlet for current Russian publications, rare in their own way, was a department store in Finland. American librarians have all learned a lot from the refugee book sellers now in this country. The earliest comers had a missionary zeal and impolitely instructed librarians that books printed in 1500 were also incunables. Now they have learned better manners, and frequent trips to Europe have replenished their stocks to the extent that there is a pretty good chance that the book you need may already be in this country and for sale.

American librarians are more conscious today than they were twenty years ago that foreign books need mention neither America nor tobacco to be worth buying. The slight trickle that is grandly referred to as the Farmington Plan helps to keep librarians aware that all the world is interested in everything. A few years ago ten bad books a year on Victor Hugo might be bought by twenty American libraries, while one good book on him, published in Belgium, would not even be heard of. Perhaps with better bibliographical tools and with better universal coverage librarians will be able to improve their collections tremendously. The necessary human element is still the cordial relationship between libraries and dealers. Where that relationship exists, superb work has been accomplished; the lack of it has often done such damage that our libraries are still far behind in our delirious, exhilarating race toward adequacy.

Fashion has always played a large role in the minds of collectors. In the great days of American buying, the man who owned a telephone company frequently beat the man who relied on cables. Most large libraries now have the basic early works printed abroad about the new continent. The day is with us now for Western Americana, with pamphlets of local imprint plainly charted by the McMurtrie type of state bibliography. More recently color-plate books of birds and flowers and topographical views have more than come into their own. What really starts a deluge is a printed bibliography with the happy dealer shouting “not in . . .” or more rarely “not found in . . .” This can become ridiculous. A short while ago a copy of Balzac’s most minor work on the tying of a cravat was offered with the added inducement that it was “not in Pforzheimer.” Someday Gone with the Wind may be described as “not in Huth, Clawson, or Dibdin.”

This digression on collecting fashions reminds us that the acquisitions librarian should know and enjoy the world of the private book collector and the literature of private book collecting. The private
The Antiquarian Bookmarket and the Acquisition of Rare Books

collector has not only formed many of the great collections that give scholarly distinction to libraries; he can also teach us much about the acquisition of books, for though institutional book collecting may differ in some ways, in many ways it is part of the same exciting search. What librarian could not learn from the imagination and sheer genius for collection building revealed by Michael Sadleir in his "Passages from the Autobiography of a Bibliomaniac," introductory to the bibliography of his unsurpassed collection of nineteenth century novels, a collection that now enriches the research strength of an American library?

When a library takes on a new interest it is often the result of a new collection, more or less complete, which has come by purchase or gift. It should be the solemn duty of every library to do everything in its power to add something annually to each of its major collections. When a university undertakes to teach a new subject, the problem is very different. The only likely solution then seems to be to buy a collection as complete as the purse can afford, if the collection can be found. Back files of periodicals rank now with Elizabethan quartos in expense. The older libraries are very lucky indeed when they are well stocked with the scientist's first desideratum, a rare item of quite a different stripe. It is difficult today to find runs of German periodicals. The professor's widow used to call in the dealer and hope for the best, but today all too often the local university makes her feel a traitor not to replace its bombed set at a fraction of what a dealer would pay. Holland and Switzerland may have the set you need, but no one in either country is unaware of current values.

The purchase of Latin American books is extremely troublesome, as Fall and others have indicated. Some libraries like to have a local dealer in each country, but none would admit to complete satisfaction. It is so terribly hard to find dealers who will reply to letters, and some countries have no national bibliographies. In Venezuela, it is said, one does not put one's novels on sale. They have to be presentation copies and so unprocurable until, as has happened, the author is divorced and the mother-in-law can be persuaded to clear her shelves. Perhaps of all countries, Egypt presents most difficulties. Exchanges are agreed to but nothing comes. Books are ordered by purchase, but Egypt does not want dollars. The only solution, in one case, has been to find a dealer with a second ménage in France where, at a certain time every year, at his convenience not the library's, accounts can be settled. In the more remote parts of the Near and Far East, where the chances of duplication are least, some libraries have benefited most by
giving travelling scholars a few hundred dollars to buy what they will find useful on their return. In fact, if one knows his faculty and the faculty knows books, the acquisitions librarian should miss no chance to work them hard when they go abroad for a leisurely sabbatical. Illinois’ Gordon Ray, much cited here, offers a fine case in point. Many European scholarly collections have been ferreted out for American libraries by book-wise men of this kind.

There are as many ways of locating and acquiring antiquarian and rare books as there are imaginations to grapple with their multifarious problems. Everyone cannot get a set of the Kanjur out of Tibet by yak train with one air mail letter, but it has happened once.
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A Few Aspects of Acquiring Serials

ROBERT W. ORR

In the family of graphic media, serial publications are brash upstarts of a relatively recent age. Although their 300th anniversary will not occur for another decade, the impact of serials as a medium for the mass dissemination of information to laymen and specialists alike has been incalculable.

The effect of serials on libraries has been no less profound. At the time of their first appearance, a new phase of the acquisitions program of unprecedented scope and complexity came into being. Ever since then, libraries have been trying, with varying degrees of success, to cope with the many problems associated with the development of collections of these indispensable publications.

The birth of serials occurred in the latter part of the seventeenth century, in an era characterized by some as the Golden Century and more aptly by others as the Century of Genius. Journal des Sçavans, which was started in Paris on January 5, 1665, is generally considered to be the first independent periodical. The developments in learning and scholarship of the age were of tremendous significance to libraries and to those who used them. It may be worthwhile, therefore, to dwell briefly on the circumstances and the temper of the times which witnessed so many revolutionary changes.

In her book The Role of Scientific Societies in the Seventeenth Century, Martha Ornstein points out that this was the age in which scientific inquiry was developed as the charlatanry and curiosity of the alchemist and the magician were supplanted by methodical investigation. It was during this period, when such men as Boyle, Galileo, and Newton were busily engaged in uprooting superstition and discarding time-honored traditions, that the modern experimental scientist was born.

Hand in hand with other developments came a far-reaching change in the means of communication employed by scholars. Formerly they had relied solely on private correspondence, some of which was writ-
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ten in cipher to keep the meaning from unauthorized readers. According to Miss Ornstein, this arrangement was unsatisfactory because it depended too much on friendly or hostile feelings, and at times on geographical contiguity, as to whether or not information about important discoveries was disclosed to the world at large.2

Just how well serials filled a real need of the times can be gathered from the promptness with which Journal des Scavans was copied and from the enthusiastic acceptance of it and similar publications. Two months afterward, the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London was started. According to Barnes, 330 periodicals were founded in seven European countries by 1730. Of the 113 specialized journals which appeared during this time, 30 were devoted to the natural sciences, 18 were general in scope, 11 were essentially medical, and one was devoted to mathematics and physics.3 Since the early part of the eighteenth century, tens of thousands of serials have appeared, to the confusion of anyone attempting to keep track of them. To make the situation even more chaotic, each year many discontinuations, mergers, separations, and other changes occur. As noted in the second edition of the World List of Scientific Periodicals, “No single library receives more than a portion of these; and even all the libraries in a centre so great as London do not together contain them all.” 4

The 1953 edition of Ulrich's Periodicals Directory lists approximately 14,000 titles, an increase of 4,000 entries over those included in the 1951 edition.5 This expansion is due in part to a more complete coverage of foreign publications. According to the third edition of the World List of Scientific Periodicals, the number of listings “proved to be of the order of 50,000.”6 The Union List of Serials is reported to contain between 115,000 and 120,000 entries.7

Advances in subscription prices of serials, especially during the recent inflationary years, have made it more and more difficult for libraries to meet the mounting costs involved. Actually, however, the situation has not been without its advantages. Price increases have had the beneficial effect of encouraging libraries to forego the expensive luxury of subscriptions to publications of questionable value, and to examine carefully their policies with respect to the purchase of multiple copies.

The Association of Research Libraries Serials Committee has estimated, on the basis of a random sampling of journals, that subscription costs rose 27 per cent from 1939 to 1950.8 Since 1949–50 the Iowa State College Library has needed a total increase of 22 per cent in funds for books and serials, including back sets, to maintain its normal
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acquisitions program. According to figures given in the 1954 edition of the American Library Directory, the appropriations of 1,374 college and university libraries for books and periodicals were increased an average of 35 per cent from 1950 to 1953.9

Special mention should be made of German scientific serials and the long years of discussion which have centered upon the pricing of these important works. As early as 1921 the American Library Association Committee on Book Buying was taking a lively interest in what was referred to as "the German system of discrimination against foreign book buyers." 10, 11 According to Downs,12 the first formal action protesting the high prices of German publications may have been taken at a meeting of the Medical Library Association on June 10, 1924. Ten years later the depreciation of the dollar resulted in further talk about cancellation of subscriptions to German serials. Timely relief of a substantial character was obtained in 1935 when C. H. Brown, chairman of the A.L.A. Sub-committee on German Periodicals, went to Berlin to talk with German publishers and officials. Soon afterward, the German government granted a 25 per cent reduction in prices of all German books and periodicals sold to libraries in the United States. Other concessions were also secured, as set forth in the final report of the sub-committee.13

Following World War II, criticism with respect to the pricing of German scientific serials was renewed, much of it this time being directed at one well-known publisher. Protests were based on the claim that price increases per page of the firm’s medical periodicals were exorbitant. The A.R.L. Serials Committee responded by saying that while price increases on a per page basis were substantial they were less than the rise in the cost of living for the corresponding period.14 Moreover, the committee cited its study of annual total costs rather than per page costs. The results of this study, using the prices charged one library for thirty of the firm’s scientific and medical publications, showed a decrease in prices from 1939 to 1950 of 16 per cent.15

The continued upward spiraling of prices makes it more imperative than ever before that libraries appraise their need of any serial carefully before deciding to acquire it. Evaluation of the most painstaking sort must not only be done at the time of first consideration of each title, new or old, but it must be repeated on a recurring basis as a means of eliminating all serials no longer needed. Evaluation techniques as practiced by libraries generally have been summarized by various writers, including Wilson and Tauber,16 Lancaster-Jones,17 and Bixler.18
Libraries are aided in their selection of serials by noting the presence or absence of titles under study in pertinent indexing and abstracting journals. If a title does not appear, its importance, except possibly on a current basis, is probably doubtful. This criterion, of course, does not apply to new titles. A knowledge of the holdings of a given journal by other libraries in the region, as revealed by union lists, is also helpful as it may enable the library to rely on interlibrary loans, at least temporarily, to meet the needs of its readers.

Quite commonly, useful information is collected by the librarian in charge of interlibrary loans. Judgment must be employed, of course, in using such records to decide whether the need of the publications is only temporary, arising from a special investigation of short duration, or whether it will be a sustained one of sufficient magnitude to justify purchase, if available. Value judgments by readers or librarians or both are also helpful in evaluating serials. Such opinions may be utilized on an individual basis, especially when obtained from subject specialists, or they may be grouped for purposes of statistical comparison and study. Well-known examples of such lists by Waples, Hyde, Lyle and Trumper, and others are present in the literature.

Another technique that is gaining in usage is one known as reference counting, in which the references in selected volumes of key journals are tabulated. The assumption is that the journals cited most frequently are of greater importance than the others. Sometimes these tabulations are also broken down into time spans in order to determine in which periods the references are concentrated. This is a device to ascertain which portions of the journals cited are the most important on the basis of use as reflected by a count of the citations to them.

Gross and Gross pioneered in developing the reference counting technique in their study in the field of chemical journals. By checking the Journal of the American Chemical Society for 1926, they found that of 3,633 references made to 247 journals, the majority of the citations were to only 28 of the titles. The references were also tabulated by time periods. More recently, Fussler selected the Physical Review and the Journal of the American Chemical Society as the key journals in his study of the research literature used by chemists and physicists in this country. His emphasis was placed on the use of generalized data on date distribution rather than its association with individual titles.

A widely consulted study based on reference counting is the one made by Brown. Lists of the approximately one hundred most-cited journals in a number of subject fields were developed. In chemistry,
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for example, the seven key journals used in the study included three published in the United States, and one each from Great Britain, France, Germany, and Switzerland. Foreign journals were included in an effort to obtain information which would be more representative of actual research needs than that which is based solely on the use of key journals published in this country. Although this study does not include analysis by time spans, a new edition now in preparation will.

Once serials are selected, the exacting task of securing them as expeditiously and economically as possible must be faced. Basically, the matter is quite simple, as they can be obtained by purchase, on exchange, or as gifts. In general, the highest percentage of them are secured by purchase. The Iowa State College Library, for example, obtains an estimated 50 per cent of its total serials, including periodicals, by purchase; 22 per cent on exchange; and the remaining 28 per cent as gifts, including government documents.

Sometimes a given serial is obtainable only as a direct purchase from the publisher. In other instances the services of dealers are employed on the basis of the quality of service rendered and on the discounts offered. The choice of dealers is also influenced by such additional factors as geographical location, specialization in publications of certain categories, or of countries. Some of the large research libraries are showing a tendency to place their orders for foreign serials with dealers located in the countries where the publications originate. In many such cases the dealers selected are the ones serving as agents for the Farmington Plan. The articles by Bennett and Reichmann in this issue contain more about purchasing in general.

A purchasing matter which has caused some particular concern in the serials field is the practice by certain dealers of computing the prices for foreign publications on the basis of rates of exchange which are higher than the official rates. In the case of German currency, for example, dealers have used rates of exchange for the mark varying from the official 23.8 cents to as high as 30 cents. The practice has been excused on the grounds that it is a convenient device to obtain the extra revenue needed to enable dealers to stay in business. If an amount in excess of the list price is necessary to assure a fair profit, it should be listed separately and suitably identified. In this way, prices charged by various dealers can be compared more easily. Sometimes auditors insist that invoices be fully itemized and that foreign currencies be converted at the official rates of exchange.

In a special report the A.R.L. Serials Committee has taken note of the practice by certain publishers in this country of charging libraries
more for subscriptions to scientific journals than they do members of scientific societies and other individuals. In a later report the committee stated that the differential rates in prospect for new research serials probably would not exceed 20 per cent as compared with the additional charge to libraries of 200 per cent being made by two publications, including a well-known abstracting journal. The conclusion was that the situation in general is not yet serious enough to justify a formal protest, but that future broadening of the base and further increases in such differentials would severely impair the functioning of research libraries.

The practice of some foreign publishers in asking payment in dollars from buyers in this country at rates which are considerably in excess of domestic prices is another relatively recent development which is causing serious concern. The matter was discussed in the report of the A.R.L. Serials Committee dated January 26, 1952. The committee stated that there can be no objection to the practice of foreign publishers requiring payment in American dollars if such charges do not exceed their own domestic rates plus the postage to the United States, but the increase in rates so far announced has been much greater than this. Unfortunately, this situation seems to be growing worse. With one notable exception, French publishers included in a random sample are increasing the difference.

A comprehensive program of exchanges, a matter discussed at length in this issue by Miss Welch, is an important activity for research libraries. Some publications are available in no other way, and others can be obtained more easily by this means. For example, libraries have experienced great difficulty in obtaining certain scientific serials by subscription from Iron Curtain countries. On the other hand, some of the publications which could not thus be obtained have been acquired with astonishing ease through exchange channels. For example, research workers at one library began calling for volumes of the Czechoslovakian chemical journal *Chemické Listy*. A check of the *Union List of Serials* and inquiries sent to likely sources of information failed to locate a single complete set anywhere in this country. Efforts to purchase the set were fruitless; yet the journal was readily obtained on exchange from the *Československá Akademie Věd Ústav Organické Chemie*.

Often the weakest part of a library's program of acquisitions is its program of exchanges. The fault may be due to the institution's failure to centralize exchange activities in the hands of the library. In other cases, the librarian may have developed this program only half-heart-
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dedly because of a lack of conviction as to its potential value. Some libraries content themselves with participation in domestic exchanges, including participation in such programs as the Duplicate Exchange Union and cooperation with the United States Book Exchange. Although these steps are not to be minimized, they nevertheless constitute only a minor part of the over-all program of exchanges for research libraries.

Gifts comprise a third category of serial publications for libraries. For the most part, publications secured in this manner are comprised of government documents received on a current basis, back files of periodicals, and occasional gift subscriptions from professional and commercial sources. Back files of periodicals are sometimes presented to libraries as memorials or other gifts. Obviously, gifts of serials should be made in accordance with applicable policy provisions of the acquisitions program. Unneeded first sets or duplicates, especially those offered on impracticable conditions, may well prove to be too costly to process and house in terms of the benefits to be derived from their ownership.

The question of policy with respect to the acquisition of back files of periodicals and other serials is one of the most important matters in the serials field facing libraries today. Librarians have clung too long to the costly fetish that serials sets should be completed without regard to need, and with scant consideration for the sacrifices in funds and shelf room involved. Librarians are not solely to blame. College faculties, for instance, always seem to have at least an interested few who lend their enthusiastic and uncritical endorsement to such practices.

The day will come, if indeed it is not already here, when libraries will be rated less by the completeness of their holdings of serials than by means of a yardstick which takes into account a definitive evaluation of serial holdings both in titles and time spans. Under such a system, a library whose holdings include many unneeded serials will be criticized fully as much as the one found to be lacking in essential publications.

Microreproductions, covered elsewhere in this issue, possess attractive possibilities as a medium of compromise between those librarians who want their serial sets to be complete at all costs and those who rightly feel that there are limits to money and space to be used for this purpose. Libraries have already made a small but significant beginning in substituting microfilms, microcards, and other forms of microtext for the bulky paper editions of little-used serials. The prac-
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tice is certain to spread as rapidly as it wins acceptance from library users, many of whom are still openly voicing their dislike of using reading machines.

There will always be whole or partial sets of important serials which some libraries, according to their respective needs, will not want on their shelves either in paper editions or as microtext. Nevertheless, copies of such publications must definitely be a part of the total library resources available within designated geographical contiguities. It is here that cooperative patterns, such as subject specialization and joint holdings, must be made to play an increasingly important role in library development.

The success of such cooperative ventures on a national scale as the Farmington Plan \(^2\) and the Library of Congress Cooperative Acquisitions Project, \(^2\) both chiefly for books rather than serials, have shown that cooperation will work if meticulously conceived and capably managed. When the eventual potentialities of regional projects, such as the Midwest Inter-Library Center \(^3\) and the local arrangements in effect in many parts of the country are also taken into account, there emerges the rudiments of a multi-phased program of cooperation which has promising possibilities of easing the intolerable burdens of individual libraries. The accomplishments to date as well as the possibilities of cooperation are set forth in another paper in this issue.

In conclusion, let it be said quite frankly that the time has come when libraries must face up to the mounting problems stemming from their dependence on serials. The extreme urgency in the situation is due to the rapidly approaching end of relatively unlimited funds for publications and places in which to shelve them. Subscription lists need to be pared to more realistic totals. Cooperative measures must be utilized in providing access to marginal materials. On a back-set basis, libraries should intensify their efforts to weed out serials which are no longer needed, and to substitute space-saving microreproductions of bulky volumes of older but still essential publications. No longer can any library hope to be all things to all persons who enter its doors.
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The Acquisition of Government Publications

JEROME K. WILCOX

Although a few librarians still complain about the disappearance of the "free" document the myth that government publications are inexpensive has finally been recognized. While it is true that great quantities of government publications are available without charge to federal depository libraries or can be acquired for the asking by other libraries on request to issuing agencies, librarians have long since learned that the original purchase price is but one part of the necessary expenditure to procure and process acquisitions. Just keeping government serial publications up-to-date is an expensive annual undertaking. Adequate acquisition of government publications at all levels, federal, state, local, foreign, and international is a major budget item for all university and research libraries and should be so treated.

Many of the larger university and public libraries have recognized the need for trained personnel with special knowledge of acquisitions and servicing of government publications and have set up separate Document Divisions or Departments. Wherever this has been done, excellent collections have resulted. Unfortunately, there are still too many instances in libraries where the acquisition of government publications is large and the staff to handle them is too small. Even free document acquisitions cannot function adequately with an inadequate professional staff to keep them recorded and up-to-date. Whether a library maintains its own professional staff for acquisitions or takes part in a cooperative venture like the Documents Expediting Project the acquisition of government publications will not be free.

More and more development of government documents collections must be considered cooperatively on a national or regional basis. When funds and space could be had for the asking, two or more libraries in a metropolitan area could boast of having the sessional papers of all the British Dominions and Colonies plus comprehensive sets of all the publications of the forty-eight states. The immediate needs of the
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community and the current and immediate future needs of the university's research program did not need to be thoroughly considered. Instead the factors of selection could be self-sufficiency, prospective future, and the possibility of occasional use. Now that funds for materials and buildings are tight and probably will continue to be so, the acquisition of government publications needs serious consideration on a coordinated national level.

Three trends affecting document procurement are discernible. First is the development of a system of regional depository libraries to store and make available to all libraries and scholars in the region little used sets of government publications. The best example of this type of regional library is the Midwest Inter-Library Center in Chicago. Libraries in the region need to duplicate this material only in cases of actual constant or steady demands for it, using the regional library (1) to borrow items on inter-library loan, (2) to send scholars directly to it, and (3) to secure photographed or microphotographed copies from it.

Second, the collecting of government publications by university, research, and college libraries is tending to be done only in terms of immediate needs and current research programs. While many of the collections might become substantial in size, this plan eliminates the idea of acquiring for prospective use material which would become only a storage problem.

The third type of acquisition and that which effects the largest number of libraries, particularly the public libraries, is the trend toward selective collection for reference and local interest needs limited, for example, to the type of government publication listed in W. P. Leidy's Popular Guide to Government Publications. Additionally, it might be noted here that microreproduction is increasingly a factor in acquisitions planning in the area of government publications.

Despite the several decades of excellent work by the Committee on Public Documents of the American Library Association, one centralized source for the acquisition of all United States government publications has not been attained. Decentralization seems permanently entrenched due to the multiplicity of agencies and their wide use of such printing devices as the mimeograph, the multigraph, and offset. Substantial progress has been made however in providing better bibliographical tools for acquisitions and other purposes. The Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications continuously becomes more comprehensive for so-called processed publications. In February and August it contains in a special cumulated section, "Semi-
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annual List of Periodicals, Releases and Statistical Statements," peri-
odical and other serial publications of the federal government. Many
more departments and agencies are making available better and more
comprehensive checklists and indexes of their own publications, for
example, the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce and State and
the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

United States government publications still are acquired chiefly
by purchase through the Superintendent of Documents Office or by
gift from the issuing agencies. As of September 1, 1953, 557 designated
depository libraries enjoyed the free distribution of the printed publi-
cations selected by them from 1,346 items available from the "Classi-
fied List." Libraries attain this permanent depository privilege
through designation by a representative or senator. Each representa-
tive may designate one library in his congressional district and each
senator may designate one in any part of his state. Depository library
privileges may be terminated only by the written request of the library
to the Superintendent of Documents or by the Superintendent of
Document's decision that a depository library has failed "to meet the
standards required by law" or has shown "consistent disregard of
notices and instructions so as to cause unnecessary expense to the
government in administering the program for that particular library."

In 1954 the Superintendent of Documents was forced for the first
time to make a pro rata charge to all depository libraries for postage
for mailing depository shipments. By law this could have been done
as early as 1895. Only about 30 depository libraries to date have pro-
tested these charges and as of October 25, 1954, only three have failed
to pay the charges or stated that they do not plan to do so. In passing,
it is interesting to note that strictly speaking there no longer is an "all"
depository, one which receives automatically everything printed and
made available. Probably no more than ten now receive all 1,346
items available in the Classified List and only 57 select at least 1,300
of the total.

U.S. government publications may be purchased from the Super-
intendent of Documents (1) by coupon, (2) by money order or its
equivalent, and (3) by establishment of a deposit account. Coupons
of five cent face value in blocks of twenty may be purchased in quan-
tity from the Superintendent of Documents and forwarded in sufficient
amount to cover each order. This procedure is particularly useful for
orders amounting to less than a dollar. Deposit accounts may be es-
tablished by forwarding certain cash sums to the Superintendent of
Documents in advance of any purchase and thereafter maintaining a
credit balance in excess of purchases. After the deposit account has been established, all items can be ordered with the request to charge the cost to the deposit account. The Superintendent of Documents through this medium sold $56,240 worth of publications to 506 libraries during the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1954.

When the Superintendent of Documents announced by circular letter of April 28, 1952, the discontinuance of standing orders for periodicals and other serial publications, a valuable service to libraries was abandoned because of expense. Periodical subscriptions through the Superintendent of Documents Office again must be renewed annually by all libraries. An immediate result was the springing up of agencies offering this service such as Dennis & Co., Inc., Buffalo, New York, Bernan Associates, Washington, D.C., and now Documents Index, Arlington, Virginia.

Libraries interested in acquiring the so-called processed federal government publications can now acquire them: (1) By requesting them directly from issuing agencies; (2) By subscribing to the Documents Expediting Project; or (3) By subscribing for the microprint edition of all non-depository items in the Monthly Catalog from the Readex Microprint Corporation, New York City.

The Documents Expediting Project was initiated in 1946 by the Joint Committee on Government Publications of the American Library Association, the Association of Research Libraries, the Special Library Association, and the American Association of Law Libraries as a medium through which federal government publications might be secured collectively by a group of libraries, especially the processed publications not available through the Superintendent of Documents Office. The project has been given office space in the Library of Congress and now has 70 participating members. Each member contributes annually from $100 to $500 and receives service and publications to the extent of its annual contribution. The project has prepared a Classified Checklist of United States Government Processed Publications, chiefly periodical and serial publications, and will make arrangements for any member library to receive regularly any title on the list.

Beginning with the January 1953 issue of the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications, the Readex Microprint Corporation has made available in microprint form all items contained therein not distributed to depository libraries by the Superintendent of Documents. Distribution of the microprint edition is made monthly covering at one time the contents of an entire issue of the Monthly Catalog. No separate items can be attained in microprint, only the
The Acquisition of Government Publications

entire contents of a monthly issue. In January 1956 Readex Microprint plans to issue, in addition, those items distributed to depository libraries indicated by a black dot in the Monthly Catalog and in 1955 the so-called Serial Set of U.S. government publications.

It is well to point out that an increasing number of federal government publications are now becoming available in microphotographed form in addition to the microprint items. For example, microcards can now be secured of the Annals of Congress; the Federal Register, v. 15-17; and the Official Gazette of the U.S. Patent Office, v. 630-665. Also microfilms can be obtained from University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan, of the Congressional Record beginning with the 82nd Congress as well as the hearings, committee reports and committee prints of the 82nd Congress and Microphoto, Inc., Cleveland, has made available the Official Gazette of the U.S. Patent Office, 1930–1952. An excellent medium for determining what federal and other government publications are available on microfilm, is the Union List of Microfilms prepared at regular intervals by the Philadelphia Bibliographical Center and Union Library Catalog.

The Superintendent of Documents now allows federal depository libraries to substitute for permanent Keeping any microfilmed edition it may purchase of regular depository items. The originals in the depository library may then be disposed of after application to the Superintendent of Documents for instructions as to whether they should be returned to him, sent to another library, or disposed of in another manner.

Libraries which still have the pioneer spirit may write to federal agencies requesting all publications issued or certain specified items. Two directories necessary for securing names and addresses of existing agencies are the U.S. Government Organization Manual and the Official Congressional Directory, while a useful guide to publications for sale has been compiled by N. M. Bowman.

In another article in this issue Mrs. Jenkins offers helpful advice on the acquisition of patent literature and governmental research reports.

As with federal government publications, none of the states have a complete central distributing agency for their publications. Many state libraries make extensive distribution of state publications chiefly by exchange but the supply of copies is generally restricted or limited. Some state universities as well as state libraries now share the privilege of using state publications for exchange. A few states have a central agency for purchase of publications offered for sale. In at least two
states, California and Louisiana, a state depository library system has been set up similar to the federal depository system.

The issuing agency still appears to be to a large extent the chief source of acquisitions. Therefore an adequate collection of the tools of acquisition for state publications becomes an absolute necessity. General tools covering all forty-eight states are the biennial Book of the States, issued by the Council of State Governments and the Monthly Checklist of State Publications issued by the Library of Congress. The former is particularly valuable for its directory of state officers and officials with similar functions or purposes. The Monthly Checklist of State Publications has undergone a number of changes in recent years resulting in more prompt appearance of monthly issues, expansion of subject coverage in the annual indexes, and improved listing in the checklist. Although still only an accession record of items actually received by the Library of Congress, greater pressure has been exerted upon the states to send all their publications to the Library of Congress. Periodicals and series publications are included.

Two types of reference tools, state manuals or yearbooks and the periodic checklists of publications are useful in securing state documents. It is through the individual state manual or yearbook, official or unofficial, that a thorough knowledge of government organization, its function and operation is attained, while the checklists provide the necessary specific information about current releases.

The growth of the periodic checklists of individual state publications is most encouraging. This undertaking has been chiefly the work of the state library or the state university library. Periodic checklists are now issued for thirty-one states as follows: by the state libraries in California, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington; by the state university libraries in Arkansas, Florida, North Carolina, and Hawaii; by the Public Archives Commission in Delaware; by the secretary of state in Louisiana; by the archivist, Hall of Records in Maryland; by the Bureau of Publications, Department of Property and Supplies in Pennsylvania; by the Historical Commission in South Carolina; by the Department of Archives and History in West Virginia; and by the State Historical Society in Wisconsin. It is hoped that this trend will spread until all forty-eight states have checklists and that eventually these efforts can be pooled more effectively in some way with the Monthly Checklist of State Publications of the Library of Congress.

In general, three procedures may be followed in the acquisition of
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state publications: (1) by using the directory information in the Book of the States or individual state manuals, to write to the agencies from which publications are desired requesting everything issued or specific types of publications; (2) by using the Monthly Checklist of State Publications or individual list of publications of the state to request specific titles as recorded therein; (3) to a more limited extent by setting up exchange arrangements through a state library or state university library. Except for the Jenkin's Project at the University of North Carolina in association with the Library of Congress, there appears to be no extensive effort to microphotograph state publications.14 It should be noted that a number of state publications, even some of those acquired from the issuing agencies, are no longer free.

The acquisition of municipal and county government publications might well be restricted to municipal reference libraries and a limited number of the larger research libraries. This is particularly true of publications from cities under 100,000 population and from most counties. Publications from the various departments of cities of over 500,000 population could, on the other hand, supplement a state document collection wherever held. In most cases, one extensive collection within the state of the municipal publications of any one state should certainly suffice.

General sources for locating current publications of municipalities are the periodical publications of state leagues of municipalities, periodicals in the field of municipal government, such as American City and Western City, and periodic bibliographical lists from municipal reference libraries. Local daily newspapers are another source which should not be overlooked. While municipal reference libraries will assist and aid in acquiring the publications of the city in which they are located, none can be considered the source of acquisition. The municipal reference libraries of Chicago and New York City have, however, for some time issued periodic checklists of their municipal publications and the Milwaukee and Los Angeles Municipal Reference Libraries also issue checklists from time to time. Municipal and county government publications are usually acquired direct from the issuing agency particularly for the larger cities; in smaller cities, the city clerk's office or its equivalent may be of assistance. Many state libraries, particularly the larger ones such as California and New York, maintain collections of the publications of the cities and counties within the state. University and college libraries would do well to acquire only sufficient municipal publications to satisfy curriculum and immediate research needs.

The documents and publications of foreign governments present
a fertile field for microphotography ventures. Strangely enough, only one major project has been undertaken and is now nearly completed—the *Sessional Papers of Great Britain, 1800-1900* by the Readex Microprint Corporation. The same firm also plans to undertake the *Sessional Papers* before 1800 and the *House of Commons Journals* from their beginning to date. University Microfilms, Incorporated, is now issuing a microfilm edition of the *Journal Officiel De La Republique Francaise*, beginning with the year 1952. Because of the ever increasing difficulty in securing originals, Sessional Papers, Parliamentary Proceedings and Debates, and Official Gazettes should be undertaken as microphotography projects whether by private interests or collectively by a group of research libraries.

Like domestic documents, there appears to be no short cut to the acquisition of foreign government publications. Language difficulties have always presented difficulties in solicitation. When possible, it is best to write requests for publications to the issuing agency in the language of the country concerned. Acquisition of current or recent material is easier than securing older files or sets from volume one. Often, the service of a reputable dealer is necessary. Any acquisitions program for foreign government publications requires a good collection of national checklists, government organization manuals, yearbooks, and statistical yearbooks.

Much foreign government material can be obtained by gift or exchange although many foreign countries are becoming increasingly rigid with monetary demands for their publications. American libraries of international reputation such as the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library enjoy an enviable position in this respect. Many government agencies send their publications unsolicited to the Library of Congress for deposit therein or with the hope of receiving Library of Congress cards for them. By State Department executive agreements, some forty foreign countries exchange certain of their publications with the Library of Congress for certain United States government publications. While this program at present is only about 25% automatic with the forty countries, it does provide the national library with a method of obtaining unsolicited individual items and sets. For other libraries, exchange arrangements with the national library may work best.

Experience has taught many of the larger research libraries not to depend entirely on gift and exchange. Many of them now have standing orders with reputable dealers or a central government distributing agency for major items such as Sessional Papers, Parliamentary De-
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bates, and Official Gazettes. An example of a central source is the acquisition of British Colonial documents and publications from the Crown Agent for the Colonies in London. Current publications and assistance in obtaining older publications is often acquired from consular offices and information services of foreign governments located in the United States. An example of this type of service is that offered by the British Information Service in New York City for British documents and publications.

In the field of foreign government publications acquisition, there is a great need for collections on a regional basis as well as an over-all national plan of acquisition. With the rapid development of communications, there is no need for wholesale duplication of foreign government publications.

The documents and publications of the United Nations and its specialized agencies are of increasing value and quantity. Methods of acquisition of these documents and publications are regular features of the United Nations Documents Index published monthly by the Documents Index Unit of the United Nations Library in New York City. Each January issue contains general information for the United Nations and each specialized agency as to the acquisition of documents and publications by purchase as well as the free distribution policy of each. The February 1954 issue contained a list of periodicals and press releases of the United Nations and each specialized agency with a statement of subscription rates. Part 2 of each April issue is a Consolidated List of Depository Libraries and Sales Agents and Offices for the documents and publications of the United Nations and its specialized agencies throughout the world. The United Nations Documents Index itself is a monthly checklist of the unrestricted documents and publications, mimeographed and printed, of the United Nations and its specialized agencies by symbol numbers with a subject index. Only unrestricted and limited issue items are obtainable so this Index generally omits all restricted items. The United Nations has been slow to declassify any restricted items even in early issues, 1946–1949, and there is still a considerable body of literature not available to libraries and others. While the Documents Index Unit has nearly completed the publications of the so-called back-log checklist, Check Lists of United Nations Documents, by body or agency, the documents and publications contained therein have long since ceased to be available in original form. The World Peace Foundation in Boston has been issuing on microfilm the unrestricted documents of the United Nations only. Beginning early in 1955, the Readex
Microprint Corporation issued in microprint form all unrestricted United Nations documents beginning with the period 1946-1953. Eventually this project will undertake the current documents as well. This latter project will give libraries the first opportunity to acquire in permanent form all the unrestricted documents of the United Nations. Nothing similar is available for any of the specialized agencies where the earlier issues of their documents and publications are no longer available, especially Unesco.

The United Nations Library has the privilege of using United Nations documents and publications for exchange, either for other publications of approximate value or for reference services received. Therefore some libraries, especially university and college libraries, might make arrangements to exchange publications of their institutions for United Nations documents and publications.
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The Acquisition of Scientific and Technological Material

FRANCES B. JENKINS

It is an accepted fact that the potential value of a library to its users is the result almost entirely of the acquisition policies, past and present, which have determined the nature and extent of its holdings. The development of a library acquisitions program which will insure a collection of materials in the field of science and technology adequate to meet the demands placed upon a library depends basically on the answer to such questions as: Who will use the collection? What materials are necessary to provide good service to these users? How can the materials be made available?

Who will use the collection? No two library communities are so similar that a collection adjusted to the needs of one group will necessarily meet the demands of any other community. Each library bases its acquisitions program for scientific and technological literature on a rather thorough background knowledge about the particular people which it serves.

An analysis of library clientele discloses the fact that users of scientific material may be grouped into at least five types: 1) intelligent laymen, individuals who attempt to keep abreast of current developments which affect society; 2) amateurs, the untrained individuals who have made a hobby of certain phases of the field of science; 3) students, learners at various levels from elementary school to post-doctorate level; 4) applied scientists, the specialists who are interested in using their knowledge of science and technology for a practical purpose; 5) research workers, the individuals interested in scholarly research in pure or applied science. The relative proportion of each of these types of users in the community of a specific library will depend on such factors as type of library, location, size, and adequacy of collection.

What scientific and technological material is necessary to provide

Mrs. Jenkins is Associate Professor of Library Science at the University of Illinois.
good service to the users? The answer to this question should be based
on a dynamic view of science such as expressed by J. B. Conant when
he defines science as "an interconnected series of concepts and
conceptual schemes that have developed as a result of experimenta-
tion and observation and are fruitful of further experimentation and
observations." Implied in this definition are certain factors that have
a marked influence on the literature of science and technology. Sci-
tific progress is cumulative; hence it is the report of the latest develop-
ment in the field that is in demand. The problem of the dissemination
of scientific information is enhanced by the fact that science is inter-
national in scope, and that modern specialization has resulted in a
great interdependence of the various fields of science. To these fac-
tors add the influence on the literature of the extraordinary increase
in the volume of research and the increased interest on the part of
the layman in scientific development, and there is some explanation
of why scientific literature poses before the world a problem huge
in bulk and intricate in complexity.

There is a steadily increasing demand for understandable books on
science by the novice, the intelligent layman, the hobbist and the
beginning student. Nearly all young people today have an interest
in science and a fairly clear understanding of even the more obscure
aspects of the field. This is a scientific age, an age in which the results
of science affect everyday living to an extent undreamed of a few
years ago, an age in which science plays a controlling role in matters
that affect the whole policy of industry, commerce, and government.
In our modern culture there is a need, as never before, for an intelli-
gent citizenry with sympathetic understanding of science and the way
scientific work is done, an intelligent citizenry who as voters should
be interested in congressional action on scientific and technological
matters.

Fortunately for the general reading public there is an increasing
flow of books in which science is made intelligible to the novice. As
Helen Haines indicates,

There are manuals or textbooks for elementary or advanced use; mono-
graphs and treatises for the scientific investigator or scholar; simple,
popularized introductions and "outlines" for the inexperienced general
reader; essays and studies of literary charm; "classics" that have won
permanence both as science and as literature (from Lucretius' poem,"On
the Nature of Things," to Augustus De Morgan's Budget of Para-
doxes); and works of sound scientific authority that with ability and
literary skill are "humanized" knowledge. Each form has its own
special requirements and characteristics, but for all there is one prime qualification. Truth and art together establish permanence as literature; but in the field of science truth is the first necessity... in contemporary scientific literature the more recent a publication is, the more valuable it is likely to be. So rapid are the modern developments in research, experimentation, discovery, and invention that new material constantly changes and enlarges the body of knowledge. This, of course, is particularly true in applied science; but in all fields of science the latest harvests are the richest.

Numerous investigations of the literature used by the serious students of science have been reported within recent years. These studies are based primarily on either “reference counting” methods or on surveys of the use of a particular collection. Of the former type, Fussler’s analysis of the literature used by chemists and physicists and Hintz’s comparison of the literature used by botanists in four different countries are noteworthy. Elsewhere in this issue Orr goes further into this subject.

Of the latter type, Urquhart’s report on users of the Library of the Science Museum in London, Bernal’s study of scientists in English universities, research foundations, and laboratories, and Herner’s report on the information gathering habits of the scientific personnel of Johns Hopkins University are particularly significant.

Data collected by Herner on the relative use of fifteen different sources of information by the pure and applied scientist indicate that monographs, research journals, handbooks, tables, and unclassified research reports were the most extensively used. Elementary textbooks, review publications, classified research reports, dictionaries, and supply catalogs were close behind the first five categories. The least used were patents, encyclopedias, standards and specifications, theses, and trade publications. According to this study, the extent of formal education and the age of users apparently had small effect on the use of the literature. The factors which appeared to influence the scientists use of materials were their field of specialization, the type of institution in which they were working, and whether they were working in pure or applied science. The difference in literature use between the pure and applied scientist was that the pure scientist made relatively great use of periodicals, monographs, and review publications and little use of classified research reports. The applied scientist, on the other hand, made heavy use of classified research reports, slightly less use of periodicals and monographs than the pure scientist, and very little use of review publications. The scant use of review publications
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by the applied scientist is undoubtedly explained by the fact that the review literature of applied science is not so well developed as in the pure sciences. It is interesting that one of the recommendations of the Royal Science Information Conference dealt with the need for making available more reviews, particularly in the fields of the applied sciences. In addition to providing a critical summary of current and past developments in a field, reviews usually include an extensive bibliography of works on the subject.

Fussler 8 found a heavy, almost overwhelming proportion of serial use in his study of the research literature of the chemist and physicist. The scientific journal has been recognized as the most important media for the dissemination of scientific information since its origin in the mid-seventeenth century. In the intervening three centuries the number of scientific periodicals has increased to such an extent that today the World List of Scientific Periodicals, 1900–1950 lists some 50,000 titles and undoubtedly does not completely cover the field. New Serial Titles indicates that for the past three years there have been more than 500 new periodicals in the basic sciences annually with three to four times that many in the fields of agriculture, medicine and technology. Estimates of the quantity of individual papers run as high as two million articles per year. Scientific journals furnish the major source of original material in science and technology and also provide important bibliographic tools. For example, during 1953 Chemical Abstracts published over 73,000 abstracts (approximately 61,000 of papers and 12,000 of patents), Biological Abstracts covered 33,498 articles, and the Current List of Medical Literature indexed over 105,000 papers.

The acquisition of scientific periodicals presents two kinds of problems: subscription to a new serial is a far more serious decision than the purchase of a book of equal cost for periodicals must be checked in, claimed, bound, and stored for years to come; and the literature on a given topic may be widely distributed through a number of subject periodicals as demonstrated by Bradford's so-called "law of scattering." 8 Complete sets of all the serials which are of potential value to the users constitute the ideal resources of a library; incomplete files of periodicals are almost valueless for the particular issue needed is usually not available.

In reporting on the comparative ages of the periodicals consulted by scientists, Herner 7 indicates, "the overwhelming majority of the group surveyed stated that they referred mainly to journals less than 5 years old. Thirty-five per cent consulted mainly journals less than
1 year old. Thirty-seven per cent referred mainly to journals from 1 to 5 years old. The pure scientists made greater use of the older periodical sources than the applied scientist. Thirty-two per cent of the pure scientists used mainly periodicals 5 years old. Twenty-two per cent of the applied scientists referred to periodicals 5 years and older.

These data are indicative of the reason research libraries find it necessary to maintain as complete a file as possible of as many serials as the needs of their users indicate. It should be noted, however, that in his section of this issue on serials Orr presents arguments against acquiring complete files when the need is not clear.

Scientific research has experienced great changes in the past decade, not alone in the volume of activity but also in the methods of support. During the war period the federal government initiated a program of research by contract with university and industrial laboratories in order to expand research activities. According to the third annual report of the National Science Foundation there has been a general tendency for federal research expenditures to rise during the period 1940 to 1954. In 1954 these expenditures amounted to $2,225,000,000 as compared with an expenditure of $97,000,000 in 1940. Estimates for 1955 indicate a slight decline to about $2,020,000,000.

Since much of this research program has dealt with security classified information, it has not always been possible to describe the results of research in the regular scientific journals. Consequently, a system of research reports was initiated for the exchange of information between appropriate groups. When the seed of a new development falls on fertile soil the result can be both amazing and disturbing. It is evident that an increasingly significant body of information is appearing in the large number of research reports. Estimates as to the number of such reports prepared annually range as high as 150,000 but the more conservative figure of 50,000–75,000 appears more realistic at present time. Many of the reports are available, for security reasons, only to people associated with the research projects. However, there are many unclassified reports which are prepared in accordance with control requirements and that receive only limited distribution. The National Science Foundation in a small scale study of the eventual publication of information security in unclassified reports found that the most important findings eventually reach scientists through established publications channels but sometimes after a marked delay.

Individual governmental agencies have used four principle methods of distributing research reports: automatic mailing to a standing list on a field of interest basis; distribution upon specific request; loan dis-
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tribution, particularly when only a limited number of copies are available; and photographically reduced copies of reports. The Office of Technical Services, an agency of the Department of Commerce, was established on presidential order for the public dissemination of unclassified and declassified reports.

Librarians are finding of material assistance in their acquisition of research reports summary information supplied by such specialists in the field as Eugene Jackson,10 Eugene Miller,11 and Bernard Fry.12 Listing of research reports in normal acquisition tools is not always complete. The Monthly Catalog of U. S. Government Publications lists only a fraction of the annual output. Specialized indexing and abstracting services such as Current List of Medical Literature and Engineering Index are including selected research reports among the forms of literature covered by their publication. Various secondary source material now available, essentially for retrospective searching, include the U. S. Government Research Reports, formerly the Bibliography of Technical Reports with its special indexes, the key to 250,000 unclassified reports available through the Office of Technical Services, Nuclear Science Abstracts, the outstanding guide to the Atomic Energy Commission's unclassified reports, National Advisory Committee of Aeronautics' Research Abstracts which covers the N.A.C.A. publications, translations and reports of a number of British agencies, and the Title Announcement Bulletin which provides current notification of the research reports issued by the Armed Services Technical Information Agency. Acquisition procedures for the publications listed are indicated in these secondary sources.

The patent literature, considered as a part of the scientific literature, furnishes one of the important sources of original results for it records the progress made in almost all fields of industrial technology. It provides a valuable, and in some cases the sole, bibliographical source for the survey of the development and technical details of an operation. The patent literature of this country consists primarily of the publications of the U. S. Patent Office. Of prime importance are the patents themselves, some 45,000-50,000 issued annually and made available at the Patent Office library and at some thirteen public libraries, three university libraries and four special libraries over the country. Copies of individual patents can also be purchased at the Patent Office at a cost of 25 cents each. Important secondary literature published by the U. S. Patent Office includes the Official Gazette, which summarizes some 1000 patents and trademarks issued during the week, the Annual Index, issued in two volumes, and General In-
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formation Concerning Patents, a pamphlet, designed for laymen, that contains in non-technical language a large amount of general information about patents and about the workings of the Patent Office.

Most libraries find the cost of the physical maintenance and servicing of patents prohibitive in relation to the amount of use made of the collection. The general trend is toward the use of the rapid duplication service provided by many of those libraries which do maintain files of patents, both domestic and foreign.

It has been estimated that a considerable number of the approximate 100 countries which grant patent protection issue official publications from a national patent office similar to our own. With about 200,000 foreign patents issued annually, the patent literature of the world is of such stature that it cannot go unrecognized. Severance’s Manual of Foreign Patents,13 supplemented by the bibliographical sources indicated by Fleischer14 in his more recent paper, provide the best concise, but comprehensive, account of the subject.

Theses, original manuscripts for the major part, form a small but important part of the scholarly scientific literature. For the year 1952, 4,506 doctoral theses in science and technology are listed in Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities and 5,588 master theses in the field are listed in Masters Theses in Science, 1952. Many of these theses are eventually published in whole or in part but during the interim period the results are not available—and frequently the complete data are never published. It is to be hoped that those institutions which grant degrees in science will participate in the plan adopted by the Association of Research Libraries which provides for photographic reproductions of doctoral theses and the publication of an abstract of these dissertations in Dissertation Abstracts.

How can scientific literature be made available? As Lazerow15 indicates in his recent consideration of the acquisition program of the Armed Forces Medical Library, “Building a collection requires money, a large measure of skill and ingenuity, and a certain acquisitive instinct which can survive prolonged immersion in the cold sea of fanfold forms, balance sheets, overlapping bibliographies, and painfully fragmentary source information.”

The techniques for the acquisition of scientific materials are not unlike those discussed elsewhere in this issue for library materials in general. Perhaps a significant development in the acquisition of scientific literature by many libraries, research libraries in particular, has been the systematic use of exchanges as a means of acquiring both current and out-of-print material, a matter discussed in this issue by
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Miss Welch. The University of California, for instance, receives annually by exchange some 950 to 1,000 serials in the field of science and technology. An exchange program such as this can also fill in the lacunae of the library's collection by exchanging duplicates with other libraries.

No one library can hope to provide all of the material published in a single division, to say nothing of the entire field of science and technology. An alert librarian can, through the use of cooperative acquisition programs such as the Farmington Plan, bibliographical aids, Union lists, micro-duplication and the system of interlibrary loans open the doors of the vast resources of libraries the country over, and in time the world over, to those who have need for these resources.

The eminent scientist, Michael Faraday, is frequently quoted as having said that there are three important stages in the development of a research project: to start it, to end it, and to publish it. Had he been a twentieth century librarian instead of a nineteenth century scientist he would probably have included a fourth stage: to acquire the report of it.
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The importance of the governmental and institutional publications, which form the bulk of current exchange materials, has been recognized by governments as well as by research institutions. The fact that the system of barter known as exchange can secure important foreign publications for use in this country, circumvent the soft currency problem, make our publications available to technically-backward countries, and place our publications in countries whose citizens know too little about us, is recognized and appreciated.

There have been a number of significant developments and trends in exchanges since the beginning of World War II. They are as follows: the increased concern of governments for the extension and improvement of international exchanges; Unesco leadership in the same field; the establishment of national book centers, such as the United States Book Exchange; the use of procurement officers; and finally, the small beginnings of multilateral exchanges.

One of the most striking trends in the exchange of current publications during the past decade has been the increased interest which governments have shown in it. World War II made painfully apparent to our government the shortage in this country of vital information about other countries. Efforts to avoid World War III have pointed up the importance of the wide distribution of publications from this country which might make for better understanding with other nations. Both of these needs are met by the single operation of exchanges.

The United States government has supported exchanges for more than a century. The service of the Smithsonian Institution in shipping and in receiving publications for libraries in this country, now known as the International Exchange Service, has been in operation since 1849. In addition, the Institution executes the federal government's exchange agreements with other nations. The feeling that this long-
time program was inadequate was evidenced by the federal government's Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation when it authorized in 1948 "a comprehensive report on the legislation, policies, procedure, and program of the United States Government for carrying on exchanges of publications...". The resulting excellent and comprehensive report by Kipp confirmed the importance of exchange as an instrument in a cultural relations program.

Additional evidence of governmental concern is given by the two-year contract announced last June by the United States Book Exchange and the Foreign Operations Administration under which fifty-three foreign countries will acquire scientific, technical, and educational literature from the Exchange. The Exchange will send publications to libraries and institutions in F.O.A. countries without handling charges in exchange for their publications. The program is intended to build up back-issue stocks of books and periodicals in F.O.A. countries, and its two-year, $100,000 budget is apportioned to various parts of the world on the basis of need. The enlargement in the foreign holdings of the Exchange will be an incidental advantage to libraries in this country.

Another development, this time in the international field, is the decision of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation to sponsor an exchange of scientific and technical documents among its members. This decision extends to the whole of Western Europe the system of pooling and distributing scientific and technical information which proved valuable during World War II. The plan went into operation on January 1, 1950, with each of the member nations agreeing to supply free of charge six copies of its pertinent official documents to each of the other fourteen members.

Much credit for the increased activity in exchanges among nations must go to the leadership of Unesco. The Unesco Clearing House for Publications is the only international publications exchange service. It promotes inter-governmental exchange agreements, encourages the establishment of national book centers, and seeks to reduce or eliminate import duties and transportation costs on publications exchanged. Unesco has published a manual on the international exchange of publications, of which a second edition is in progress, and publishes monthly the UNESCO Bulletin for Libraries, which gives current information on exchange possibilities.

National book centers have been discussed frequently in library literature during the past twenty years. Some centers have been active
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since the Brussels' Convention of 1886; others have sprung up since World War II through the encouragement of UNESCO. The range of their activities varies greatly, as do their sponsoring agencies and means of support. Some, such as the Japanese and British centers, function primarily as information agencies. Others, such as the Hungarian and East German centers, serve as transmission agencies. A third group, represented by the French and Australian centers, perform both of the above functions and in addition negotiate exchange agreements.

The exchange of duplicate materials presents quite a different problem from the exchange of current publications. In this country the significant development in the exchange of duplicates has been the formation of the United States Book Exchange. The formation of such a center was suggested as early as 1876 by Melvil Dewey. It was his idea that such a center would be the least expensive way of exchanging duplicates, and that an activity that could not be profitably carried on in the least expensive way should not be carried on at all. Since 1876 there has been all through library literature a thread of articles suggesting the formation of such a center. Now there is a center, and its progress and usefulness must be of concern to all who are interested in the exchange of duplicates.

Historically the United States Book Exchange was preceded by the Duplicate Exchange Union and by the short-lived Wilson cooperative clearinghouse. In 1937 the H. W. Wilson Company offered to serve as a clearinghouse to facilitate the completion of fragmentary serial sets among libraries. The service operated at a loss and was withdrawn after a few months trial. The Duplicate Exchange Union met with more success, perhaps because it was initiated by librarians, who felt an obligation to support it. Largely through the efforts of Neil Van Deusen, the Union was formed in 1940 as a periodicals duplicate exchange. In 1944 its scope was broadened to include non-serial duplicates, and changes were made in its method of operation. The Union is still active, but it is interesting to note that the Detroit Public Library withdrew in 1949 because it felt that the United States Book Exchange would be more efficient. The reasons given were that the Exchange had a larger membership, consequently a larger stock to draw from, and that participation did not require listing of materials offered.

The United States Book Exchange succeeded the American Book Center for War-Devastated Libraries. The fact that it grew out of a benevolent organization may have colored some librarians' thinking
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about it during the first years of its existence. The Exchange was formed in 1948 as a service organization to handle duplicates in one central place. Its sponsors included the leading national library associations as well as many national scholarly, educational, and research organizations. Its financial support came from a $90,000 grant made by the Rockefeller Foundation, supplemented by fees paid by participating libraries for materials obtained and by contracts with the State Department for services performed for foreign libraries. By the end of 1953 the Exchange could report 3,000,000 duplicates on hand. It offers such special services as the supplying of L.C. catalog cards with books selected from the Exchange lists, the acceptance of orders for periodicals as well as the listing of duplicates on hand, the willingness to accept all periodicals which member libraries may wish to send, the holding of a semi-annual open house at which librarians may select from stock, and the investigation of the non-receipt of items due member libraries on regular exchanges in cases where claims have not been answered by the exchange partner.

The question of the cost of using the services of the United States Book Exchange is a basic one. The Exchange reported in 1951 that during its first year and a half it had placed 100,000 foreign and domestic serial items in participating American libraries at a cost to the participating institutions of about $20,000. This is an average cost of 20 cents per item. In the October, 1951, issue of Serial Slants a librarian reported that for her library U.S.B.E. items had cost 34 cents each and that items received on regular exchange cost only 4 cents each. Cost-per-item is not, of course, the whole story. As the U.S.B.E. collection becomes larger, it becomes potentially more useful. The elimination of the need for listing duplicates certainly saves time for libraries. However this advantage can be cancelled by the cost of transportation involved in sending duplicates to the Exchange, particularly if the library is some distance from Washington.

Inevitably the Exchange must compare its services with those of the periodical dealer. A library having a list of periodical wants may well decide to send it to a dealer, who will accept it at no charge, rather than to the Exchange, which charges 10 cents per title for considering wants. This disadvantage, of course, can be avoided by those libraries which are close to the Washington area and can economically send librarians to the Exchange's open house with their want lists in hand. A series of regional exchange centers would extend this advantage to all member libraries.

It seems unlikely that the United States Book Exchange will ever
Publications Exchange

replace the exchanges carried on by associations of special libraries limited to one field of interest. The oldest of these is the Medical Library Association Exchange, started in 1898. Other exchanges are operated by the American Association of Law Libraries and the American Theological Library Association. These specialized exchanges serve the same purpose in relation to periodical dealers that cooperatives do in the commercial field. In the general field the greater number of periodical dealers helps keep practices and prices reasonable.

A post-war development of potential importance to acquisitions is the use of trained procurement officers to secure hard-to-get materials. The Division of Acquisition and Distribution of the State Department has developed a successful procurement program for obtaining European publications for the Library of Congress. John Fall, writing in the April 1954 issue of the Library Quarterly, says, "If libraries could in some way make a working arrangement with the State Department procurement officers or with other federal agencies abroad, the acquisition of books and documents would be materially increased." 3

A more specialized project is that of nine federal agencies working together through the Inter-Agency Foreign Map Procurement Coordination Committee on a map procurement program. This project, which attempts systematic coverage of the world, has been served by six full-time geographical attachés and four temporary attachés. According to the 1953-1954 report of the Library of Congress Map Division, the Division has received under the project an average of 15,500 maps per year from approximately 125 official mapping agencies located in 58 countries or dependencies. Since maps are more often official publications than not, such a program is particularly important and productive. The program also has implications for the procurement of other types of material. It is a systematic, cooperative program and shows the value of the personal contact which the procurement officer is able to set up and maintain. Certainly research libraries in this country know the value of procurement agents through the work of the Documents Expediter. Further exploration of the use of this procurement method would seem to be indicated.

The multilateral exchange of current publications as a means of converting publications in one subject field into those of another has been suggested but not thoroughly explored. The Unesco Clearing House for Publications gives multilateral exchange promotion as one of its aims. Under this program it attempts to set up an arrangement whereby one institution gives to a second institution which gives in
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turn to a third which in turn gives to the first institution. The possibility of such three-way exchanges was considered by the Midwest Inter-Library Center about two years ago. A number of member libraries agreed to supply publications which could be used to obtain other publications for the center. According to Ralph Esterquest, director of MILC, the method has been used in only one instance so far because no other need for it has arisen. However the center still considers the method a possible one and will use it if need arises.

Serious problems remain to be solved if exchanges are to approach their full potential effectiveness. Lacks in bibliography, the economics of exchange, and inadequate coverage must be studied. The increased writing of recent years on the subject of exchanges, the points of dissatisfaction with current exchange practices, and the increased concern of government about exchange all suggest that action should be taken to systematize and rationalize exchange practices. The time is ripe for a modern-day Alexandre Vattemare to vitalize the world's exchange resources, but today it will take more than a single ventriloquist to accomplish all that should be done.

A serious handicap in the setting up of foreign exchanges is the lack of adequate bibliographies. One of the proposals which came out of the Conference on International Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Exchanges held at Princeton University in 1946 was that Unesco prepare a world list of periodicals which would indicate which titles were available on an exchange basis. Since this problem of bibliography is not peculiar to those engaged in exchange work, a more realistic approach to it would be the encouragement of the publication of national bibliographies which would include periodicals and exchange materials as well as the more obvious publications.

Studies of exchange costs and coverage are overdue. Figures on the cost of exchanges are so varied for different libraries that one must suspect that hidden costs are not always recognized. One library, such as Columbia University, may assess its exchange costs and conclude that it is getting nearly six times as much in returns as the expenses which it puts into its exchange program while another library may find that it is sending out more value in publications than it is receiving. Acquisition librarians need to know as a guide to everyday operations whether it costs more to request a title through exchange than it does to place an order for it. One obvious way to reduce the cost of exchanges would be to give some study to the techniques involved. Uniformity of listing, the use of the least expensive shipping methods, greater selectivity of material for listing, and the use of
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restricted subject lists are all obvious, but often ignored, economies. The existence of the Farmington Plan as a means of placing at least one copy of each priced non-serial, foreign publication of research value in this country points up the lack of systematic coverage in the exchange field. From a research point of view items received through exchange are just as important as trade items. The need for over-all planning for acquisition through exchange is recognized, but so far no action has been taken. Out of the writing that has been done on this problem during the past decade a two-point program emerges on which there is some agreement and which might be the basis for a practical plan.

Part One of the program would extend the federal government's treaty exchanges to permit the acquisition of one or more additional sets of foreign government publications to be deposited in research libraries in this country. This would require legislative action, as the 1936 act which regulates the treaty exchanges does not allow for additional copies. Librarians would not question the value of such an addition to the government's program. It would not seem too difficult to convince government officials also of the value of such action since such receipts add to the research resources of this country and serve its welfare.

Part Two of the program would arrange the systematic receipt of copies of all non-governmental, non-priced foreign publications of research value. The suggestion has been made that U.S.B.E. serve as an agency for the procurement of such publications, distribution to be based on the Farmington Plan. Efforts to secure a grant to set up the plan have not been successful so far.

If the federal government and U.S.B.E. would consent to carry out the two parts of this plan, the materials thus secured could very well be distributed on the basis of the Farmington Plan assignments. This would assure at least a second copy of foreign documents available in this country and at least one copy of non-governmental publications.

A more ambitious program, and one which should at least be considered, is that dependent upon the existence of a system of regional libraries in this country. This plan would involve getting all of the publications in multiple copies for deposit in the regional libraries. In general the securing of a first copy of the materials which we are discussing requires cost and effort while the securing of additional copies requires little more cost and effort.

The idea that a country of this size would have more adequate li-
library service with a system of regional libraries is not a new one. Just as county library systems bring better library service to individuals, so national regional libraries would bring better library service to libraries. It has been suggested that the Midwest Inter-Library Center might well be the first of such a series. K. D. Metcalf in 1951 stated, "I think that, ultimately, there should be, in addition to the Midwest Inter-Library Center, a number of other regional libraries, one in the Northeast, one near Washington in which the federal libraries should join, one somewhere in the South, and one in the far West." The deposit function of the Midwest Inter-Library Center is the one most emphasized at present. Perhaps the member libraries of the Center should consider a change of emphasis.

A system of regional libraries has obvious advantages. Additional sets of worth-while publications are added insurance that these publications will be available when needed. Additional sets also make the publications more readily available to students of the sciences, including the critical social sciences. Regional libraries might serve as branches of the United States Book Exchange, thus eliminating the distance problem felt by libraries west of the Alleghenies. As an alternate plan to that of the U.S.B.E. securing non-governmental foreign exchanges (Part Two of the above program), the regional libraries could secure such materials through the use of the publications of the research libraries in their regions to exchange for the publications of foreign institutions. Close cooperation between the regional libraries in setting up exchanges and in relaying information to each other could have widespread benefits.

The cost of setting up such a system and of securing additional sets of publications for it may seem large, but it is infinitesimal compared with the arms program. The potential good which full availability of foreign publications could do in this country cannot be overlooked. The fact that additional publications would have to be sent from this country to secure additional copies is a further advantage. The State Department has recognized the importance of a free flow of information from this country to other countries, permitting the presentation of our points of view and making available to other areas of the world needed technical information.

In 1947 R. B. Downs wrote in Science, "The free interchange of cultural, scientific, and educational information is unquestionably one of the most critical needs of the world today. Society's progress depends upon the extent to which scholars and scientists have unrestricted access to all sources of information. Likewise, international
understanding requires that the cultural records of every nation be fully available to all other nations. Finally, intelligent and informed world opinion must be based upon the wide dissemination of educational materials. These are our stakes in efforts to perfect the machinery for international exchanges.” These are our stakes in all exchanges.
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Microreproduction and the Acquisitions Program

VERNON D. TATE

If the acquisitions librarian could somehow contrive to incorporate within the library all books and other materials needed by its users without superfluous items, his life would be serene and his days would be filled with gladness. There are simply too many books and other evidences of recorded knowledge, too little money, not enough space, and insufficient personnel. Problems do not disappear but grow in size and complexity. Paradoxically, a surging demand for basic research material endures as established libraries continue to grow and new ones are being formed. The several microtechniques are being called upon to assume ever greater responsibilities but their application has too often been dictated by expediency rather than enlightened planning. It is time to take stock.

When in the late 1920's the first of many microphotographic processes of documentary reproduction winked dimly above the bibliographic horizon, the event was viewed by some as a star of promise, by others as an apparition to be feared, avoided or circumvented. The path of microreproduction has been neither direct nor smooth; there have been mistakes, misconceptions, misapplications, dead ends, and controversies. Processes that are really complementary or supplementary have in some cases been regarded as rivals and proponents, rather than users, have separated into opposing camps to engage in vigorous conflict largely in the form of verbal charge and countercharge with scant attention to the facts. Nevertheless, bold pioneering efforts, experiment and experience by librarians, users, technicians, and perhaps most important of all commercial concerns, have brought these techniques securely and permanently within the spectrum of library operations. No acquisitions program can be valid without them.

Microreproduction may be divided in terms of the physical form
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of the product into seven classifications. Two major subdivisions are: microtransparencies, textual material on a transparent support read by transmitted light, and micropaques, textual reproductions on an opaque support usually paper read by reflected light. Microtransparencies may be further subdivided into three groups:

1. Microfilm, 16 or 35mm in width on rolls of up to 100 feet in length.
2. Sheet microfilm comprising a sheet of film of some convenient size containing rows of textual images.
3. Short strips of microfilm approximately a foot or less in length used and stored as strips or mounted in lengths or even as single images in cards of various sizes and kinds.

Micropaques are produced photographically or printed. The former include:

1. Microcards, or rows of textual images on a 3 x 5" card.
2. Microtape and microstrip comprising images on narrow lengths of adhesive paper sometimes supplied in rolls of up to 100 feet in length; these are cut to suitable length and mounted on cards 3 x 5" in size or larger.
3. Microsheets are sheets of paper approximately 8 x 10" in size sometimes containing as many as two to three hundred images arranged in rows.

The second micropaque variant is not in its final stage produced photographically; instead it is a product of the printing press. The only commercial producer at the present time is the Readex Microprint Corporation which prints one hundred pages on each side of a sheet of paper 6 x 9" in size.

To illustrate graphically typical library uses of the microtechniques and some limitations of various processes, the accompanying chart (see page 445) has been prepared. The microtechniques as described above appear at the top, while at the left are listed four types of activity with certain subdivisions in each case; the categories are not mutually exclusive. "Single copy to order" means production of a single copy to meet a specific need; multiple copy or project work means cooperative endeavor whereby a group of libraries agree to share the costs of a particular operation in return for a copy. File negatives usually result from other operations maintained in a library or other center as a source of additional copies to be made on request; publication or republication means edition production designed to
make available single units or appreciable blocks of material in the
same manner that a book publisher produces an edition for a general
audience.

Single or to order copying can best be considered under three sub-
headings namely, short run copying, as for example journal articles,
usually to meet the needs of an individual, the copying of manuscripts
and archival material which may be undertaken to meet the needs of
an individual or as a part of a program to enhance the resources of a
library, and a similar activity reproducing complete books either for
an individual or for a library, sometimes in lieu of interlibrary loan.
Most "single copy reproduction" is aimed directly at filling an imme-
diate need; larger programs not intended for immediate specific needs
partake of the nature of project copying except that in this instance
an individual library may organize, finance and carry out a program.
Many libraries, archives and similar institutions are equipped to pro-
vide microreproduction to order.

Multiple copy projects usually involve cooperative effort. A group
of libraries for example may decide to pool their resources and finance
the reproduction of a block of material each receiving a copy. By the
same token a commercial producer will often organize a similar project
on a subscription basis. There are many examples that might be se-
lected as illustrations. One of the early ventures involving printed ma-
terial was the microfilm reproduction by University Microfilms, Inc., of
Ann Arbor, Michigan, of English books printed before 1640. A recent
micropaque project is the microcard edition of Corporation Annual
Reports available through the Microcard Report Service at Middle-
town, Connecticut. The microprint edition of the British Sessional
Papers, a vast undertaking by the Readex Microprint Corporation of
New York, illustrates one application of printed micro images. Insofar
as multiple copy projects for manuscripts are concerned, an illustra-
tion is the microfilm reproduction of the Adams Manuscripts under-
taken for subscribers by the Massachusetts Historical Society in Bos-
ton. Over 300,000 pages of original manuscript are being delivered to
subscribing libraries in the form of 35mm microfilm positives. News-
papers in libraries constitute a particular library problem of massive
dimensions. Preservation, use, storage, and acquisition of back files
have been made possible through the microtechniques, principally by
microfilm although experiments with other variations have been under-
taken. This activity has become so extensive and widespread that the
Microfilm Clearing House at the Library of Congress in cooperation
with the Association of Research Libraries has issued a union list of
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newspapers available on microfilm. Similar activities for periodical files are common and are listed in the *Clearing House*, and publicized in its bulletin appended to the Library of Congress *Information Bulletin*.

File negatives often result from other operations. When, for example, a library copies a fragile, rare book, more frequently than not the negative is placed on file so that positives can be made without the need to rephotograph the original book. A most useful source for information about file negatives is the *Union List of Microfilms* edited by Eleanor E. Campion at the University of Pennsylvania. There have been, however, extensive programs for the acquisition of material which has subsequently become available for reproduction to order in whole or in part. In 1936 W. S. Jenkins began a fifteen year program that resulted in the production of 1,700 reels comprising "The Microfilm Collection of Early State Records" on deposit in the Library of Congress. It is worthy of note that activities of this type are possible only through the use of techniques which enable reproductions of a single copy at one time to be made economically. In practice this has meant microfilm or, in Europe sometimes, sheet microfilm. Presumably the same could be accomplished with microcards, although the handling costs might be excessive. File negatives of manuscripts are essentially similar to those for printed material. The National Archives has inaugurated a File Microcopy Program including for completeness or in anticipation of demand not only material which has been requested in microfilm form but also records for which no request existed. This activity on 35mm microfilm has been termed sub-publication. Theses are again essentially similar and many universities retain thesis negatives to supply future needs. An important distinction has been made at the Library of Congress between "expendable negatives" which may be used in reading machines as they can easily be replaced and "non-expendable" or file negatives which may only be used for reproduction.

Publication and republication involve the use of the microtechniques purely as graphic media. This is to say that instead of publishing in letterpress or offset, a publisher may produce an edition or reissue a former work in a microformat. Publication of original manuscripts, and in this category are included typewritten manuscripts as well as those produced by hand, have been undertaken by microfilm, sheet microfilm, microcard, microsheets, and microprint. Through a plan devised by the Association of Research Libraries over half of all doctoral dissertations currently produced in the United States are pub-
lished on microfilm. The University of Rochester publishes its theses in music, medicine, library science, and other fields in the form of microcards. Many other examples of original publication exist. Reproduction as in the case of the microfilm edition of The New York Times and of current periodicals is common. The catalogs of the Microcard Foundation are extensive and offer a great variety of items. The Microlex Corporation, Rochester, New York, is reproducing law "libraries" in a special sheet micropaque form. Similarly the Readex Microprint Corporation offers among other microprint reproductions a single unit comprising the complete bibliographies of Sabin, Evans, Harrisse and Church (New York 1940–41) for $50.00.

The final column at the bottom of the chart is entitled Edition Economy and refers to estimated production efficiency of the several micro processes used in producing multiple copies or editions. The essential difference between the photographic and printed reproduction of micro images rests in the fact that photographically sensitized material is considerably more expensive than plain paper. The costs for photographic reproduction in the last analysis cannot be less than the cost per square inch of sensitive material developed or processed ready for use. Similarly, the cost of any printed micro image can never be less than the cost of the paper stock plus the cost of making an impression and finishing the product.

In comparable graphic terms the curve of photographic reproduction costs begins at about the median, drops immediately to the production level and continues as a straight line. A similar curve for printed micro images begins much higher initially and slopes sharply to a much lower production level than that for photographic reproduction. Some edition economies may be achieved using the photographic process. In microfilm, for example, it is more expensive to make the negative which involves an operator and hand work than to make a positive, since the latter is printed and processed continuously by machine. If the cost of a negative therefore is $.30 per foot processed, the cost of a positive may be in the magnitude of $.07 to $.08 per foot. If several positives are made a small amount added to the cost of each positive will meet the cost of the negative. There is a point after the cost of the negative has been amortized when for all practical purposes the next microfilm copy will cost as much as its predecessor with the cost curve approximating a straight line. In sheet microfilm this tendency is even more apparent for it is comparatively more expensive to prepare the sheet microfilm matrix whether it is made by assembling strips of roll microfilm or entire as with a special
"step and repeat" camera, but the positives are much less expensive. A limiting factor for sheet microfilm is the fact that the printing, processing and finishing operations have not been mechanized. While the design and production of automatic machines for this purpose is not impossible it is difficult and would be expensive. Microcards and sheets must face similar problems although mechanization is much further advanced than in the sheet microfilm field. Printed microimages involve proportionately higher expenditures for the negative and printing plate but subsequently a great number of impressions on plain paper can be printed at extremely low costs. Obviously if the cost of preparing a printing plate is spread over 1,000 copies, the plate cost becomes negligible.

Edition economies therefore have been tabulated as “little” for microfilm, strip and card mounted films, microtape, and microstrip, “some” in the case of sheet microfilm, “considerable” for microcards and micropaque sheets and “great” for printed micro images. A rule of thumb on costs of production which is not always accurate in specific instances holds that up to 25 copies can be efficiently reproduced by microfilm while between 25 and 50 copies the process becomes proportionately less attractive. Microcard production is usually not economical below 25 copies; between 25 and 50 it becomes more desirable; between 50 and 100 real efficiency is achieved. Readex Microprint on the other hand may not be indicated for editions of less than 25; between 50 and 100 it becomes progressively less expensive; at 100 copies and above it represents the cheapest method of publication now known. Again it must be emphasized that there are notable exceptions to the foregoing; microfilm, for example, is the most practical existing process for newspapers and in some instances special circumstances may weigh heavily in favor of one or another technique.

In general the chart shows that microfilm has been used for all listed operations which is understandable enough, for it serves as the basis for all or most of the other methods. Sheet microfilm in the United States is of little practical significance at the moment. Strip and card mounted film for scholarly library purposes find limited applications (though this is not the case in special library and commercial usage). Microcards and printing press microprint are being used for publication and republication. Microstrip and microtape are special purpose techniques while photographic microsheets are being produced as a medium of publication thus far limited to law books. For all practical purposes the acquisitions librarian at the present time
is limited in his selection of microcards to the products of the Microcard Corporation and its licensees, for microsheets to the products of the Microlex Corporation and for printed microtapes to the editions of the Readex Microprint Corporation, while microfilm is available from many sources.

The production or acquisition of a microcopy in whatever form is only half the story. By definition a microcopy is too small to be read by the unaided eye, therefore short of optical magnification which is impractical for more than checking or brief consultation, or the making of enlarged paper prints which are usually too expensive to produce or to store for projects of any size, suitable reading machines are required. There are reading machines for each type of microreproduction but there is no single machine capable of accepting both microtransparencies and micropiques, and what is much worse from the standpoint of the consumer, no reading machine for microfilm will conveniently accept microfilm in all of its forms, and no reading machine for micropiques will accept all forms of micropiques with equal efficiency. This is another way of saying that there has been no standardization across the entire breadth of the field. In passing it may be noted that difficulties inherent in projecting by reflection as opposed to projecting by transmission cause the image on the reading screen of the microtransparency reader to be somewhat better in quality than the image on the micropaque reader screen. In practice, however, serviceable reading equipment for any microreproduction process can easily be procured, and there is considerable latitude for selection.

While the lack of a reading machine that will accept both microtransparencies and micropiques in whatever format is a limiting factor in the selective use of the microreproduction techniques, its importance can be overestimated. If an acquisition is otherwise desirable, the cost of a suitable reading machine can be computed as a part of the cost of an operation or more justly apportioned to all projects that may benefit from the use of the machine. In the last analysis if reading machines are needed in order to build library resources and make them usable, then they become as much a part of the library equipment as book shelving, circulation desks, catalog trays, tables or chairs. It is often said that one reading machine means one user at any one time and this is quite obvious. A little more thought will reveal the fact that the materials most likely to be found in micro form are rarely those that great numbers of people will wish to consult at the same time. A great public library whose back files of newspapers are largely maintained on microfilm finds it possible
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to meet current demands with less than a dozen machines and these are not in use all of the time. There is moreover no reason why reading equipment cannot be handled on a reservation basis as for study carrels and music listening rooms. Some libraries maintain a stock of portable reading machines which are loaned out to users with microreproductions. Relatively few scholars and scientists have thus far provided themselves with personal reading equipment for microimages but the number is growing steadily. The situation resembles the period when the typewriter was coming into general use. In the early days it was regarded as a fad or luxury; nowadays it is a necessity and there are few indeed who do not own or have access to a typewriter. A fair decision on the merits of a plan involving microreproductions cannot be made on the basis of hardware, that is cameras or reading equipment.

There are certain myths about microreproduction that although long exploded continually reappear. One of these is eyestrain. It has been conclusively demonstrated that there is no reason to expect that proper use of microreproduction differs in any way from similar use of the printed or manuscript originals. Either can cause eyestrain if heedlessly used. Here as everywhere common sense is the rule.

A second phantasma now of uncommon incidence is that microreproductions are not permanent. Properly made, processed and stored, microfilms are as permanent as letter press printing on rag stock paper. This does not mean that they may be treated precisely as if they are letter press on rag stock paper; microreproductions require different though no more rigorous handling schedules and present different problems. File negatives, for example, should not be used in reading machines, for the handling and possible scratching will reduce the quality of any subsequent prints made from them.

A third delusion is the fifty dollar reading machine. Many librarians and some users have often wondered why a reading machine cannot be produced to sell for fifty dollars, and of course it can be if one is a member of the “do it yourself school,” for all necessary optical and electrical parts can be purchased for much less than this amount. When they are properly assembled the resulting instrument will read microreproductions, but it will not possess all of the features of the large commercial models. It is also possible to purchase all of the parts for a midget automobile for a few hundred dollars. When these are assembled the car will provide transportation, but it will compare adversely with a new 1955 model in all aspects except price.

Most difficult of all to understand is the assertion, formerly much
more common than at present, that a faculty or group of users will not use microreproductions but demand the originals. If this is really true, then the alternatives are to acquire them or for the prospective user to prepare to travel to the location where the originals may be located and make arrangements which may involve fees of one kind or another to use them. The mechanism of interlibrary loan which has served so well in the past is now taxed to the breaking point; indications are that this most useful cooperative venture will contract rather than expand in the future. The building of a research library on the basis of originals is not a matter to be approached lightly involving as it does the expenditure of vast sums of money for purchase, housing and maintenance and more importantly time which may extend into generations. Money conceivably could be procured but time may not be bought; money is of no avail if the materials in the original are not for sale. The philosophy of the collector holds that anything is for sale if one can but wait until it appears on the market. Few users can or will wait. The outlook for the future is not bright. World War II destroyed much material and its aftermath which happily includes concerted efforts to improve library resources in all parts of the world have combined to create a demand which is increasing as steadily as prices in the used book market.

The fact is that faculties, graduate students, and the general public are using microreproductions, perhaps with some grumbling on the part of the older individuals but with progressively less "sales resistance" on the part of the younger. This use, moreover, is not restricted to the consultation of research materials but, as in the case of theses, may include publication of original material in micro form. With the growing popularity of television, a new generation is progressively more accustomed to the screen image as a source of entertainment; the transition to reading textual material on a screen is much less difficult. It is possible to trace a somewhat similar reaction in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries when printing began to replace the manuscript. Conservatives deplored the loss of beauty, individuality, and value of the manuscript and heaped contempt on the cheap ugly machine produced book. That the substance not the form is the important element escaped many, and the eyes of some of those who inveigh most strongly against the microtechniques seem to be equipped with similar blinders.

Enthusiasm for the microtechniques must not be allowed to obscure judgment in planning acquisitions. There are areas and uses wherein microreproductions may not serve as adequate replacements for origi-
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nals or full scale facsimiles. A classic area is advanced bibliographic criticism. It is obvious that relatively little information can be obtained about paper stock, ink, water marks, binding, and the like from a microreproduction of a manuscript or rare volume. Similarly in translating, the original or a full sized facsimile copy is often indispensable. A manuscript full of paleographic problems or replete with scribal abbreviations may necessitate side by side comparison of pages which is often difficult on a reading machine screen. Fine arts material with plates in color while not impossible to reproduce in micro form do present difficulties and entail considerable expense. Tabular material requiring detailed study and perhaps comparison with a text or other charts is sometimes more difficult to use on a reading machine than in the original. A bibliography or index is much more usable at full size than in miniature. In fact any source or reference handbook that is constantly used should be full size. Some librarians have expressed strong objections to serials on microcards or in sheet microfilm form. In some libraries microreproductions are maintained in one place, reading machines in another and the books or other materials to which the microreproductions relate may be in still a third location. The amount of personal service required to bring all of these divergent elements plus the reader together should be weighed. The problem of instructing readers unfamiliar with the use of reading equipment and the proper handling of microreproduction is elementary but necessary.

An important aspect of library use is keyed to the educational system. A summary of recently published data reveals certain interesting facts relating to higher education. Enrollment, 2,148 million in 1952 is expected to increase 34% by 1960 and around 100% by 1970 to 4.4 million; with the existing student faculty ratio of 11.1, a total faculty of 210,350 (in 1950) must be expanded by about 20,000 per year beginning in 1955. There are around 9,000 doctor’s degrees granted each year (16,000 estimated by 1970), perhaps half in science and engineering; only about 10% in engineering and science enter the educational field; of the remaining fields a larger percentage may enter education. Of the 1,800 colleges, universities and professional schools, 65% are privately controlled; doctor’s degrees are awarded in some 490 schools, but most of the training is done in some sixty institutions. Large scale growth is indicated but it is reasonably certain that many private institutions cannot expand. Tax supported institutions may indeed be forced into a vast program of new buildings and even new schools. The library outlook for the next twenty years will be ex-
tremely interesting. Books will have to be provided to equip new and enlarged facilities for current work. Of equal importance and greater difficulty, resources will have to be found to train the teachers who will staff these institutions and fill vacancies caused by normal attrition in the existing faculties.

It is reasonably certain that enough new books, periodicals and the like can and will be printed to supply the demand. There will be a sharp increase in full size reprinting of much used basic material. Graduate instruction, particularly in the humanities and certain fields of science, requires first-class research libraries. It is by no means certain where, if not from microreproductions, many of the resources can be supplied. Through consolidation of research facilities, regional planning and the like, some original material may be released as in fact has already been the case. The plan evolved by a committee headed by Keyes D. Metcalf of Harvard University to sell the library of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Boston to Linda Hall in Kansas City is an example of intelligent, long range library planning. Resources that were duplicated and really superfluous in a strong center of research were transferred to an area less abundantly supplied.6 Unfortunately the number of possible transactions of this type is strictly limited.

All microreproduction excepting of course the large field of recording original data which has no practical bearing on the discussion at hand involves recopying or reprinting. Operational reprinting exemplified by short-run copying and similar services will involve the microtechniques when they may be advantageously employed instead of such competitive systems as photocopying in all of its various forms. In the larger sphere of library planning the microtechniques offer methods that in many instances cannot be matched by other and more conventional methods for reproducing blocks of material. In Europe at the present time extensive full size reprinting programs are under way to replace in part material lost during World War II. The costs for printing in Europe are such that these projects are economically feasible. Similar activities have not been lacking in the United States and should be encouraged whenever the edition demands are large enough to warrant the attention of a publisher. As has been earlier indicated reprinting at full size is necessary when large numbers of people may need to use the same material at the same time. The Engineering Index which was recently reprinted by photo offset can best be used and consulted in this form. A microreproduction would be easy to make but vastly more difficult if not impossible to use effec-
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tively. There do exist, however, vast areas where one or another of the microreproduction techniques can render real services.

At the time of writing a project is under way to reproduce all of the titles in Evans American Bibliography. In fact there are three more or less competing projects, one proposing to supply all of the titles in Evans in the form of microcards apparently without much editorial supervision or attention to bibliographic revision; it will cost $462.50 per year for 20 years. The second proposal will supply in the form of Readex Microprint a version carefully edited under the auspices of the American Antiquarian Society of the contents of Evans for a subscription fee of $750.00 per year for a ten year period. The third proposal will involve a selective reproduction organized in cooperation with a special Committee of the American Studies Association of significant items in Evans and related material that is normally not accessible in microfilm form totaling perhaps 500,000 pages in increments of 100,000 pages at a cost of $500.00 per year for a period of five years. Each project will be implemented through a commercial concern.

What does an acquisitions librarian do when confronted with an opportunity of this type? The first step is to decide whether all or most of the items in Evans are wanted at any price; if not, no further thought need be given. If yes, the next consideration should be an estimate of probable use. Obviously, material should be added to the library for use and not for the sake of completeness. The bibliographic quality of the products proposed to be supplied is a factor to be carefully weighed. It is as easy to acquire a miscellany of microreproductions as it is to acquire a personal library of books or an accumulation of family papers. Unorganized material brings with it the obligation which may be expensive in time and money of arrangement and preparation before use. One of the great benefits of cooperative activity, and one of the perils of hasty project organization, is the orderly planned arrangement of the product in useful form at one time for all participants. Even though libraries generally have been unable to achieve cooperative cataloging, in projects for microreproducing source materials they may be afforded a new opportunity for real cooperation. Some thought might be given to the fact that even though some or a considerable number of the titles in Evans might already be in the library, the burden of use of the originals would be eased by the presence of the facsimiles. The librarian would be wise to review the matter thoroughly with appropriate faculty members and even graduate students to enlist, hopefully, financial support, and weigh
carefully the opinions for and against the proposal. If the opportunity is judged to be sufficiently attractive as compared to other calls on library funds, then the technical considerations can be examined. These include format, the number of reading machines estimated to be required and if not available their cost, the costs of processing for use and of servicing the materials in the library. If after this survey the acquisitions librarian is unable to make a recommendation then he had better forget the whole thing. The pity of it is that with so much to be done three discrete proposals should revolve about a single bibliography. The time will come when no bibliography will be regarded as complete unless it serves as the index or finding list for a complete edition of its contents in some micro format which may be purchased entire or selectively from a deposit, pool or commercial source.

Insofar as the microtechniques are concerned the early years were distinguished by an infinity of cooperative plans, usually centering around microfilm application. Groups of libraries banded together to finance the reproduction of a master negative of the file of a particular newspaper in return for a copy, and perhaps ten or twenty sets of reproductions were scattered more or less haphazard over the country. It is easier to justify an acquisition on the basis of participation in a cooperative effort than it is to study it in terms of coldly calculated future needs. An outgrowth of these efforts has been a proposal whereby libraries allocate a comparatively small sum of money each year to a pool devoted to the production of master negatives and loan positives as for example of newspapers. The participating library does not receive a print in return for the contribution; instead the right to borrow is assured from the existing pool of positive prints as needed for current research.7

The foregoing discussion is directed toward the uses of the microtechniques in the acquisition of material for the library. From the indicative examples cited, and these can be multiplied many times over, it is apparent that documentary reproduction will be employed on an ever increasing scale. The impact of novelty has come and gone leaving a foundation of tested practice and many unexplored areas. A rule book for the use of the microtechniques in the field of acquisitions remains to be written. The deficiency is understandable enough in view of the diversity of individual library requirements and the array of available techniques from which selection can be made to meet them. A joint approach to some common problems would insure faster progress; indications are that this development will not be too long
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delayed. Meanwhile the serious librarian must continue to study the field of microreproduction and to employ proven methods boldly when they are indicated as to the best means to resolve a problem; he may and should continue the exploration of new fields and applications. As they acquire the patina conferred by familiar, daily use, these tools will add immeasurably to the satisfactions gained by a skilled and competent workman demonstrating mastery of his craft.

**Typical Library Uses of the Microtechniques**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Use or Application</th>
<th>Microtransparencies</th>
<th>Microfaques</th>
<th>Photographic</th>
<th>Printed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Microfilm 16 and 35 mm.</td>
<td>Sheet Microfilm</td>
<td>Strip + Card Mounted Film</td>
<td>Microcard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single copy to Order</td>
<td>X₁ X₁₀ X₁₁</td>
<td>X₁₂ X₁₈</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts and archival material</td>
<td>X₁ X₁₀</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete books etc.</td>
<td>X₁ X₁₀</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Copy &quot;Project&quot;</td>
<td>X₂ X₁₀ X₁₃</td>
<td></td>
<td>X₁₇</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Material, Books etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>X₃</td>
<td>X₁₃</td>
<td>X₁₈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>X₄</td>
<td></td>
<td>X₁₈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Negative</td>
<td>Printed Material</td>
<td>X₅ X₁₀</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>X₆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theses</td>
<td>X₇ X₁₀</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication and Republi-</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>X₈</td>
<td>X₁₄</td>
<td>X₁₈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cation</td>
<td>Printed Material</td>
<td>X₉ X₁₀ X₁₃</td>
<td>X₁₀ X₁₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edition Economy</td>
<td>Little Some Little Considerable Little Considerable Great</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NOTES ON MICROTECHNIQUES CHART

Notes to accompany chart on "Typical Library Uses of the Microtechniques." These notes have been compiled to assist readers to verify and extend the chart; they are purely illustrative and are by no means complete. The selected list of references compiled by Blanche P. McCrum, Microfilms and Microcards: Their Use in Research, Washington, Library of Congress, 1950, is an excellent guide to further information.

1. This service is available from many archives and libraries.
2. The "English Books" project begun in 1935 was subsequently extended to include English books printed before 1660. It provides reproductions on 35mm microfilm. University Microfilms. Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms, 1945.
10. In Europe the uses of sheet microfilm in the fields indicated are fairly extensive. In the United States library uses of sheet microfilm are experimental.
11. Film strips (microfilm) are supplied by many libraries; mounted microfilm strips are important for certain commercial purposes.
12. The Eastman Kodak Company Color Control Laboratory has developed a large scale microcard plan for reports and research data. The system is used within the organization.
13. The publications of the Microcard Foundation are the best source of data illustrating these activities. The Microcard Bulletin, (No. 1, June, 1948—date; the most recent is dated April, 1954, No. 14.).
15. Microtape and microstrip have been developed primarily for commercial purposes. Some experimentation in the field of library use is being undertaken.
18. Experimental.
19. In 1941 the Readex Microprint Corporation reproduced the complete bibliographies of Sabin, Evans, Harrisse, and Church in microprint. The entire reproduction occupies the space of a thin small folio volume.
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The Public Library Acquisitions Program

JOHN D. HENDERSON

This effort to produce a précis of the public library's special problems of selection and procurement is based primarily on the returns from a questionnaire sent to 105 libraries throughout the country. Eighty-five replies were received and a number were accompanied by policy statements and procedures followed in book selection. Of the 19 large libraries receiving the questionnaire — those with a book fund of more than $100,000 — all replied; in the next group which ranged from $10,000 to $100,000 the questionnaire was sent to 62 libraries and 53 replies were received; and of 24 sent to libraries with less than $10,000 to spend for books, 13 answered. Current practice as revealed in the returns suggests that the smaller libraries are more beset with problems than are the larger libraries, and almost all are coping with budget limitations, book selection and procurement difficulties, and need for a policy statement.

It is appreciated that the limiting factor in all library service is the budget but this article is not concerned with questions of support except as related to acquisitions policy. East coast libraries near the publishing centers have many advantages in selection and procurement of in-print and out-of-print titles over libraries in other parts of the country. However, regardless of location, size, and support there are problems common to all public libraries.

The abruptness with which so much material goes out of print is frequently a serious matter. Such a recent and needed title as Turkish Delights by M. N. Kelly, published by Transatlantic Arts in 1952, is out of print, and so are L. Scarfe's Venice—the Lion and the Peacock, Roy, 1953, and W. M. Inge's Come Back Little Sheba, Random House, 1950.

Certain titles by such well-known authors as Havelock Ellis, H. J. Laski and Rabindranath Tagore cannot be obtained from the publishers. Book of the Dead cannot be located in a suitable library edition, the Barnes & Noble reprint being out of print. Examples of out-
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of-print titles that should also be in every library are: Alphonso Jen-
nings' *Through the Shadows with O. Henry*, The H. K. Fly Co., New
York, 1921; and William F. Cody's *Story of the Wild West*, Historical
Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 1888, also B. F. Johnson & Co., Rich-
mond, Va., 1888. Others are such basic books as Froude's *History of
England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Ar-
mada*, which is only partly in print in the Everyman's Library; and
H. A. Giles' *Introduction to the History of Chinese Pictorial Art*,
Quaritch, 1918.

The type of material needed will vary with local interests and ac-
tivities. Early editions of certain classics, such as Seneca's *Morals*,
Lippincott, 1879, may be wanted in connection with a Great Books
program. Early indexes to magazines, such as *Harper's Vol. I-XL* (June
1850–May 1870) cannot be obtained from the publisher. Older titles
in the fields of art, religion, history, and literature are in the "want" file
of most libraries and will be obtained by only those who are
staffed to check second-hand catalogs and the stocks of the local book
shops, or engage the service of a book scout. For instance, there is
considerable interest today in the writings of Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu,
the Irish writer of terror stories and the macabre, and all of his books
appear to be out of print. Contemporary accounts of the Titanic dis-
aster have gone out of print and were asked for by readers long before
the recent movie stimulated further interest in the subject.

Technical books and titles on military history tend to disappear from
the library shelves and many can only be replaced through the second-
hand market. Haven and Belden's *History of the Colt Revolver*, Mor-
row, 1940, and Marshall McClintock's *Story of War Weapons*, Lippin-
cott, 1945, are two examples.

The reprinting of a series of basic scholarly works of limited but
permanent interest, such as J. L. Stephens' *Incidents of Travel in Cen-
tral America, Chiapa and Yucatan*, Harper, 1841, reprinted in a fine
two-volume edition by Rutgers University Press in 1949, would be
a worthy project. Admireable reprint work has been done in the field
of Californiana by the Grabhorn Press of San Francisco but even these
go out of print. Many of the titles in Dawson's *Early California Travel*
series, short accounts of classic and semi-classic works, have served to
strengthen library holdings but now they are out of print.

A special alertness to the publications of local societies, individuals,
and publishers is necessary to insure that this material which is so
often issued in limited editions is added to the library. In the field of
local history the public library has a particular obligation and oppor-
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tunity for service. In a number of fields public libraries cannot meet the reading interests and needs of their communities because of a dearth of printed material offered by the publishers. Subjects on which one library is seeking suitable material include: installation services and ceremonies for clubs, laying out miniature golf courses, pigeon raising, making wax figures, La Savotte (French foot boxing), and building a trampoline.

Where approval copies are not supplied for titles under consideration the inadequacy of reviews is a problem; too many reviews are written to gain interest in the books rather than explain their contents. Many reviews are too late to be helpful in book selection and often publications of merit from individuals and small publishers receive no notice in the reviewing periodicals. For certain fiction titles, reviews are not always satisfactory; more evaluative, critical and comparative reviews are needed for fiction and non-fiction. These are pressing problems where most of the budget must be spent on current publications, and where there are insufficient staff and time to survey and analyze the book collection it is unfortunate that so much reliance must be placed on inadequate reviews. Libraries some distance from publishing centers deplore the lack of adequate reviews for technical books especially because the libraries are isolated and they rarely have the chance to examine books before they are purchased.

Implicit in such questions as obtaining a representative collection of new books, balancing demand against value in book selection, surveying, weeding, and building the book stock, providing housing space for books needed only occasionally, is the matter of financial support, as well as policy. Many libraries have adopted the American Library Association's Bill of Rights as a policy guide and, of course, there is no better statement of principle that should govern the service. This, however, should be incorporated in a policy statement adapted to local conditions and it should include the procedures followed in developing the collection of books and other reading material selected for local community use.

In regard to policy statements, practically none of the small libraries, and not many of those in the medium group, have put in writing anything setting forth the criteria by which their books are selected and the techniques for applying the criteria. Statements from the large libraries include several that were carefully worked out and that should prove of value to the profession. The excellent statement of the Enoch Pratt Library has been drawn on by others and it, along
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with the policy statements of the Buffalo, Cleveland, Indianapolis, and New York Public Libraries, the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, and for smaller libraries the Long Beach, California, guide to buying, deserve careful study.

It is conceded that book selection is an art, that the decision to buy or not to buy is a personal judgment, but with clearly laid down objectives and guiding principles giving direction and a frame of reference to the acquisitions program many of the problems of book selection and service will be illumined and simplified if not solved. Trustees, staff, and the community will be served by having a clear statement of the library's goals. Coupled with this should be a step-by-step account of the book selection process: the information assembled on each title under consideration, the criteria applied and their interpretation as related to the library's policy and objectives. It is appreciated that full approval from all segments of the community cannot be expected; moreover, it must be recognized that in a free democratic society complete uniformity of opinion is neither feasible nor desirable.

A further point to note is that in only a few significant characteristics can books lend themselves to objective analysis. It is the subjective opinion that determines to what degree a book meets the required criteria. Careful scrutiny and documentation should be given to the following points in evaluating a given title: 1) Qualifications of the author, 2) Factual accuracy, 3) Timeliness of the publication, 4) Presence of propaganda or objectionable material, 5) Degree to which the contents present representative points of view and objectivity of treatment, and 6) Literary and esthetic standards. While each title must be considered on its merits the decision to buy or reject must be based on its contribution to the objectives of the library. Where several staff members are involved in the selection of books with variations in reading background, training, and experience, a sound policy statement will guide and make the decisions more articulate.

A degree of statesmanship is required in giving direction to the library's program in resisting the pressures for the most popular reading, in promoting the use of the more significant books and other material, and in building a book collection for the next generation that will represent what is most significant in this one as well as in the past. The policy statement should describe the community in general terms and the trends evident in its development, the library's place in the present and future community, and its contribution to the
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community's growth. Account should be taken of the service resources and future program of other libraries in the area, inter-library loan service, and reciprocity arrangements among local independent libraries.

A policy reported by one library is the limiting of the number of titles to be added in any given year. By doing this the flow of work through all processing departments can be accurately estimated and controlled. It is a sound practice to anticipate demands wherever possible although admittedly all needs cannot be foreseen. Book selection is controlled when a definite number of titles to be added is known in advance. The allocating of the book fund among the several subject classifications in the library is general practice and has proved though experience to be sound. A fair proportion of the book appropriation is set aside for titles of significance in the several classifications. From this allocation a book committee reviews approval copies, checks the book reviews, and makes recommendations for purchase. A contingency fund is usually held in reserve to be spent by the chief of circulation or by the head librarian. In most cases the libraries request approval copies; many unsolicited approvals are books that do not come up to the library standards and they are not welcome because of the amount of clerical time involved in returning them. Where a large number of requested approval copies are received the inadequacy of reviews is not too serious. Usually all books in question are read by members of the staff; in some cases this reading is assigned and is done on the staff member's own time.

In at least one library the book selection committee is not made up strictly of professional staff. Questionnaires were issued to all employees to ascertain their academic background, their professional or avocational interests, and their willingness to serve on the book selection committee. It was found that a number of the staff did have special interests and were pleased to volunteer their service on the committee. This committee determines which of the older titles are to be discarded as well as the new publications to be purchased. An index to all fiction reviews is maintained for public use; also the reviews by members of the staff are kept on file. In large systems with branch libraries the general policy is to duplicate for the main library everything that is at the branches. Branch staff members serve on the book selection committee. The branches develop their book collections pretty much tailored to the local community interests with no effort or emphasis placed on so-called balanced book collection.

In one of the larger libraries a concerted effort to reduce the num-
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ber of fiction titles is made and stress is placed on the purchase of only the most significant fiction books. Mediocre fiction is not replaced. The attempt is made to encourage and promote the use of non-fiction by display, publicizing, and reviewing, and wherever possible non-fiction is substituted for fiction. Some libraries depend on the pay-duplicate collections to satisfy the demand for new fiction. One library located in an area where there is a large number of good rental libraries leaves the providing of the light popular fiction titles to them and has a very limited pay-duplicate collection. It is the general practice in the large systems with good book budgets to increase automatically the number of copies of a given title with an increase in the requests received. A number of libraries add a copy of a book for every five requests received. In cases where the book is not of particular significance the readers are expected to wait their turn and the initial order is not increased.

A book collection of maximum utility will be developed when the public library's selection is based on a knowledge of the resources and service program of the college, university, special, and research libraries in its region. The first steps in coordinating library resources on a large scale have been taken with the establishing of bibliographical centers for the Pacific Northwest at Seattle and for the Rocky Mountains area at Denver. These repositories of bibliographical information have demonstrated their value as agencies contributing to the coordination and development of public and other library book collections in their respective regions, as noted by David and Hirsch elsewhere in this issue. The practice of referring all proposed last copy discards to the center for clearance has preserved for the regions many valuable titles that would otherwise have been lost.

The consolidating of secondary material and titles rarely used in regional collections would relieve local libraries of housing and shelving problems that are acute in numerous instances. The adding of housing facilities to the Denver and Seattle Bibliographical centers and equipping them with resources comparable to those established at the Midwest Inter-Library Center for the participating universities in that area would provide agencies of far reaching influence in the development of public library book collections. Thus the archival function of the local public library in a given region could be consolidated and coordinated with the program of the other public libraries in the region and all would gain. Problems of selection and procurement are simplified when all units of library service are integrated on a regional basis through union catalogs, reserves of second-
ary books, complete bibliographical information for the region, inter-
loan service, and a full cooperation by all local libraries in the
program.

In summary, a balanced acquisitions program is possible only with
a well-trained and well-informed staff, an adequate budget, and a
broad and varied service that is described and given direction in
a policy statement. Current experience points directly to the limita-
tions of the middle group and smaller libraries in regard to policy,
support, and service, and suggests strongly that they would gain
much by a study of the procedures and policies of the libraries men-
tioned earlier in this paper. The limitations of the small independent
library are only mentioned to point up the interdependence of all
units and areas in developing a book collection and service that will
meet the reading interests and needs of the local community and the
individual reader.
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The Selection and Acquisition of Books for Children

FRANCES LANDER SPAIN

The scope of this paper will be limited to a discussion of the methods of acquisition of books for children by public libraries and by public school libraries. It will avoid on one hand the Scylla of principles of book selection and on the other the Charybdis of order work. Both have been covered ably in books and periodicals.

Material on the general practices and variations in the area of acquiring new titles and replacing old ones for schools and children's collections is scarce. Order procedures and routines are reviewed in the standard works on school library administration and in public library work with children. A few articles in periodicals handle the topic briefly. However, the over-all programs followed by librarians generally to maintain a collection of books for children are not described in detail. Librarians throughout the country have furnished the data upon which this paper is based. They represent school and public libraries in large, medium size, and small governmental units in several parts of the United States.

Librarians working with children have established criteria, principles, and standards for books that are to be used with children. In order to build up working collections of suitable books, it is necessary to survey the output of books published for children, to apply standards to them, to select and reject new and old titles, and to establish procedures for accomplishing this.

Supervisors of library service to children in public libraries and in school systems regularly check, or have checked by an assistant in their offices, book announcements from publishers, book lists, and reviews in such standard publications as: A.L.A. Booklist, New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Saturday Review, Bulletin of the Children's Book Centre University of Chicago, The Horn Book, Junior Bookshelf, Junior Reviewers, and the like. School librarians also check
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reviews appearing in general professional education and subject field periodicals. From these announcements and reviews, check lists of books to be considered for their collections are compiled and books ordered for evaluation.

Review copies of books suitable for school and public library children's rooms are sent by publishers to some large, strategically located systems. Other books are ordered "on approval" from publishers and jobbers, and single copies of some titles are bought for examination before quantity orders for branch and school distribution are placed. Most large school library systems and children's library departments approve for inclusion in the collections only books that have been examined, that have been read and reviewed by staff members, and that are available for further examination by the individual librarian selecting books for his school library or public library children's room.

All librarians responsible for selecting books for children would prefer to see books before ordering. However, those who live and work in small towns and out-of-the-way locations have little access to many children's books and must depend upon reviews and selected lists. They see books only when they go to cities with good book stores, when they attend professional meetings where book exhibits are held, or when they visit Book Fairs, Book Week celebrations, and other special exhibitions. State departments of education, especially if there is a school library consultant in the office, and state library commissions often have sample or display collections of books that are open for examination. Small collections of books are available to school and public libraries from some of these state agencies. School librarians in some systems are allowed school time to visit such exhibits. One of the great problems in the acquisition of books for children is the availability of books for examination before a decision to purchase them must be made.

Book selection and recommendation of books are done by all professional school and children's librarians in a system. They are appointed to book reviewing committees for periods of from two to four months. All members of the staff have an opportunity, therefore, during a year to participate in this basic activity connected with book acquisition. Appointment may be to a general book reviewing committee or it may be to a subject committee; in either case, the librarian's interests and particular knowledges are used. Specialists in subject fields are often invited to review books and in the schools, teachers, elementary supervisors, and often administrators sit on review committees.

[456]
New books, after they have been recorded in the offices of supervisors of school and children’s library services, are sent out to committee members to be read and evaluated. Reviewers make definite recommendations about each book. The Office of Children’s Services of the New York Public Library, for example, has two categories of recommendation: for reading rooms—a book that is distinguished and should be in the collection of fine books kept permanently in the children’s rooms for reading and enjoyment there; and for circulation—a book that is good, but not outstanding enough to become part of the reading room collection. Besides essential and approved titles, the Department of Work with Children of the Schenectady County [New York] Public Library designates some books “revolving.” Two copies are bought to circulate among the branches as a try out before extensive ordering is done.

In many libraries recommendation for purchase by a particular branch is a common practice. Because of neighborhood needs or local interests, a book not suitable for the collection in general may be approved for a special children’s room. An example of this is the great demand in sections of New York City for Spanish language books for the Puerto Rican children.

If there is a question about a book, it may be read by a second or third reviewer. Problem books are always read carefully by the supervisor with final decision left to him. In the Los Angeles and Denver school systems there is an advisory or reviewing committee which is called in to settle serious problems.

Reviews are written on “p” slips or order forms for permanent filing in the supervisor’s office where they may be consulted when needed. In many public libraries the reviews are also given orally at regular meetings of the whole staff of children’s librarians. Here books may be discussed and questions about the reviews asked. The Work with Children Department of the Los Angeles Public Library invites to its monthly meetings children’s librarians of the surrounding smaller cities so that they may participate in and benefit from the discussion and examination of books not otherwise available to them. School librarians do not generally have regular system-wide meetings for book discussion. In the Los Angeles area, though, the Southern Section of the School Library Association of California sponsors a monthly book breakfast on Saturday mornings during the school year when current books are reviewed and discussed.

Many supervisors of work with children in public libraries and some in school libraries issue lists of titles approved for purchase. These lists are based on the reviews and recommendations of staff book com-
mittees and in some systems become the order form. Large public libraries seem to use lists more than small public libraries or large and small school library systems. In some school systems lists of approved titles are offered for discount bids and thereafter for the period of the bid carry the discount price. These lists then may be used as order forms without further bids. Instead of issuing separate lists of approved books many school systems recognize standard lists—the three Basic Book Collections for elementary, junior high, and senior high schools, The Children's Catalog and its supplements, The Standard Catalog for High School Libraries and its supplements, and state lists—and accept for inclusion in their collections any titles appearing on them. Special lists are compiled where needed. Because of the great range of books used in the high school libraries, their librarians are generally free to order books they require, clearing titles with their supervisors.

Lists of approved titles are sent to the children's and school librarians prior to the book order period and are used in conjunction with ordering. They are not for public distribution, but are kept as a record of books that have been approved for purchase, as a second check of the titles ordered by each unit, and in some systems as an order form from which composite order slips are made. The Boys and Girls Department of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, has discontinued its monthly annotated lists, but continues a list, revised every five years, of titles that form the nucleus of every branch children's collection. In Chicago, the supervisor of school libraries issues an annual list of three to four hundred books which is a supplement to the Approved List of Library Books for the Chicago Public Schools.

Whether books approved for inclusion in the collection appear on a list or not, they are available for examination by all children's and school librarians in those public libraries and school systems where review and on approval copies are provided. Regular book order periods are scheduled at which time the individual school or children's librarian handles the books; reads the reviews, or listens to them as they are given orally in a meeting, or both; and makes his decision regarding the need his unit has for them. Books not approved are also available for examination with reviews suggesting the reasons the book was not recommended. Usually a school or children's librarian may question a review or request a reconsideration. He may also ask that a book not being considered for the collection be reviewed.

Each school and children's librarian is free to select and order the books he wishes and the number of duplicates his library can use.
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When inexperienced or untrained persons are responsible for school library or branch children's room service, the supervisor's office through the supervisor or an assistant, gives a great deal of direction in book selection. Experienced librarians of good judgment and extensive book knowledge require little supervision. Though each librarian is given wide freedom in selecting books for his library, some departments of children's services have over-all system-wide requirements for all units. In Pittsburgh every children's room of the Carnegie Library must have a copy of the approximately 500 books on the basic list which is the nucleus of the children's collections.

The frequency with which children's books are ordered varies greatly. Orders for books to be used in children's rooms of public libraries seem to be placed more often than those books to be used in school libraries. The former are placed generally on a monthly basis, the latter on an annual or semester basis.

Books selected by individual school and children's librarians for units within a system are cleared generally through the office of the supervisor. He is responsible for checking orders, approving or disapproving them, and forwarding them to the order department or business office for purchase. In secondary schools books ordered, especially if from a previously approved list, may go through the office of the principal directly to the business office for purchase.

Orders for school library books are usually sent out for bids. Small orders may be placed without bids, and in some systems comprehensive discount bids cover all titles on approved lists for a specific period. Public libraries are not so frequently required to have bids on book orders. However, books are bought where best discounts are obtained. Books for children are usually purchased from jobbers and publishers, and only occasionally from local bookstores. Foreign children's books are ordered directly from importing houses and stores, and prebound books directly from prebinding companies.

Books in prebound, library, and school editions are purchased more extensively for use in the elementary school libraries than in children's rooms of public libraries. However, when publisher's bindings are weak or books will have hard and long use, the general practice seems to be to order them in reinforced bindings whether they are for elementary or secondary school libraries or for the children's rooms of public libraries. Picture books, large flats, paper bound books, fiction, and titles that promise to be popular are most often bought in prebound editions.

School libraries and children's rooms of public libraries usually have
portions of the budgets of their central agency allocated to them to cover the cost of book orders during the year. For the school library the amount is based on the average daily attendance in the school and is, in many states, governed by state adopted school library standards. For children's rooms the amount is based on circulation, special needs of the children who use the rooms, high percentage of replacements, additional language requirements, condition of the book stock, and other pertinent factors. The librarians in charge of these units may order books—new titles and replacements—as they wish under the general direction of the supervisor.

While school librarians and children's librarians of public libraries are selecting new titles they are also concerned with the maintenance of their collections, with the replacement of specific titles and with the evaluation of their holdings. Methods of accomplishing this vary from simple, incidental reordering of single books by individual librarians to highly organized checking of scheduled lists.

The collections in children's rooms of public libraries are re-evaluated according to a carefully developed plan that in many systems is almost as important as the acquisition of new titles. In order to keep their collections live and active, children's librarians are constantly reviewing their contents. In Atlanta, Los Angeles, and New York the departments of work with children have monthly lists of replacements which cover fiction, picture books, easy books, and subjects by classification so that in any year the whole collection is revised.

The quality of service given in school libraries and in children's rooms of public libraries depends upon the over-all collection. The selection of new books, re-evaluation of older ones, decisions to withdraw or replace specific titles are professional responsibilities of the librarians developing these collections of books for children. There are many details, numerous steps, multiple forms, and procedures to the process of acquiring books. The larger the system and the greater the number of units, the more elaborate the process seems to be, but large or small, the reason for the procedure is to determine for any library the books that will be of most value in it and to set up routines for acquiring those books economically and quickly.
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General References


[ 461 ]
Management and Operation

FELIX REICHHANN

This report is mainly based on a questionnaire which was answered by thirty-one American university libraries. The findings, are primarily applicable to the work of the acquisitions department of large research libraries. In keeping with the thoroughly individualistic nature of these institutions there is a great diversity as to the place of the department in the general library structure; a similar heterogeneity can be found in the definition of its function and duties.

In the early thirties a proposition was discussed which would integrate acquisitions and cataloging into a technical service division. This movement gained great impetus during the forties, but seemingly has slowed down during the last years. No definite trend can be predicted at the moment. The ratio in the libraries investigated is twelve technical service divisions against nineteen. In the new organizational pattern also evoked strong objections, for instance, the thoughtful criticism of R. C. Swank. One of his points is undoubtedly well-taken: cooperation between acquisitions and cataloging can be achieved without organizational change. The answers to the questionnaire do not reveal that the libraries with technical service divisions have achieved better cooperation than their sister institutions. However, the merits of the new plan are not so easily dismissed. The fundamental points, such as decrease in cost, increase in speed of processing, flexibility of personnel, and adaptability to new methods, have not been documented by either party.

It is accepted by everybody that cooperation should exist between the two departments. Either a superior administrative officer or meetings between the two department heads should establish adequate channels of communication. Generally, parts of the multiple-order form are used to forward bibliographical information. In one library the catalog department is responsible for searching. However, in more than half of the libraries the relations do not seem close enough to

Mr. Reichmann is Assistant Director of Cornell University Library.
Management and Operation

streamline the operations and to prevent duplication of operations. Entries are not established by acquisitions, or, when established, they are not accepted by cataloging without rechecking, and the flow of work between the departments is not regulated.

Almost all acquisitions departments have organized their work in two to six sections; the most common division is to differentiate between ordering of books and work with serials. A number of institutions, however, have a more complicated breakdown. The University of California in Berkeley, for instance, which seems to have the best organized and best staffed acquisitions department, has organized the work as follows: bibliographical identification, searching out-of-print books, ordering books, serials, receiving and processing, and bookkeeping. Another thoughtful organizational breakdown is used by the University of Washington with the following sections: bibliographical identification, accessioning and typing, book orders, serials, gift and exchange, and binding. This example also shows how much work not directly connected with the purchase of books is administered by the acquisitions department. Of thirty-one reporting libraries, twenty-six have a gift and exchange section, seven control binding, seven supervise documents and four administer photoduplication. A great number are in charge of interlibrary loan wrapping and mail distribution, three administer the payroll for the entire library, two supervise book-plating and one acquisitions librarian is the main public relations officer of the institution. There is undoubtedly a good internal reason to burden the department with such a variety of duties, but a word of caution against too heavy a load of heterogeneous functions is appropriate.

The variety of work assigned to the department makes it difficult to establish a standard for staffing. One finds generally a ratio of two and one-half to three clericals to one professional; such a staff unit is needed for every $35,000 spent through the department.

No matter how the individual library distributes its responsibilities for book selection, every acquisitions librarian should have an ardent interest in this problem. In seven institutions his work is guided by a formal statement of acquisitions policy, in twenty libraries the department head is fully aware of a formulated, although unwritten policy; only four departments do not participate in the selection process. The majority of the departments have the responsibility of filling in gaps in serials and purchasing general reading material; five cover bibliography; and two purchase and suggest in all fields. In many libraries the acquisitions librarian participates in book se-
lection committees; in two institutions he holds the chairmanship (the general book committee in Louisiana State and the weekly book selection committee in the University of Washington). Ten departments read *Publishers Weekly* regularly; three check the different national bibliographies; three consult the book review sections of leading newspapers; and three select from, or distribute, L.C. proof sheets. Other book selection tools used by the departments are: *New Serials Titles, East European Accession List, L.C. Information Bulletin, Stechert-Hafner Book News, U.S. Quarterly Book Review,* and *Books Abroad.* All departments have the obligation of routing publishers' announcements and second-hand book dealers' catalogs to the respective selectors, and also accept budgetary responsibility.

The statement of the Postwar Planning Committee of 1946 suggesting a re-examination of order routines still rings true today. The complexity of operations performed by an acquisitions department will never permit librarians to rest on their laurels, at least, not with good conscience. The process of testing regularly the efficiency of operations is facilitated if all procedures are described in a manual. Ten of the thirty-one libraries have such a guide.

As no manual was available for examination, no description of searching and bibliographical identification can be given. Five libraries have a time limit for searching; Cornell University library stipulates a maximum of fifteen minutes per title—however, the regulation is not strictly enforced. Most libraries give as time limit, "Reasonable," or, "According to common sense." The ordering proper is commonly done with multiple-order forms. Twenty-four libraries in the survey used this device. The form generally comprises seven parts. In addition to this method, an efficient department will also resort to a variety of other forms and form letters. Unfortunately very few libraries make use of machines or other mechanical appliances to streamline the order work. Practically every large library utilizes McBee cards or IBM machines, but the application of these techniques is largely confined to circulation records and to work with serials. Of the thirty-one libraries investigated in this survey, three use IBM equipment for order work, a fourth, for accounting only; two profit by McBee cards; and seven apply photographic techniques, however, generally only for claiming and copying bills.

Speed is, next to accuracy, an important feature of the department. Orders should be ready about two to three days after selection. Most libraries seem to adhere to this rule; only a few mention a time lapse of approximately one week; one library, on the other hand, reports
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that all orders are ready within twenty-four hours. As the flow of selection cannot be regulated, only a library with a very large staff will be able to follow this example. In case of second-hand book dealer catalogs utmost speed is mandatory. Cornell's routine asks for selection within twenty-four hours and for the placing of the order on the same day the checked catalog has been returned to the department. Other libraries have a three-step routine: selection, immediate request for reservation, and orders placed within three days. Most libraries report that they place daily orders for new books, both with American and foreign dealers. Orders for jobbers or main agents in foreign countries are better consolidated into one or two letters weekly. Greater frequency will increase the workload, both in the library and with the bookdealer, and may result in less favorable discounts. Domestic orders should be filled within two weeks; for foreign ones, the approximate time lapse is six to ten weeks.

In his section on "The Current Bookmarket" Fleming Bennett provides detailed information on the choice of agencies for supplying in-print books. The sections on serials, on books for children and on government publications give further attention to this matter, which is a major problem in acquisitions work.

Most probably only the fortunate institutions which have mechanical equipment have claiming under complete control and can claim all outstanding orders at stated intervals. A great many departments report that they are dissatisfied with their claiming procedure, but lack of personnel makes an improvement impossible. They commonly use various techniques, such as form letters, part of the multiple-order form, double postcards, or similar methods. If the dealer reports the unavailability of an item, the department has to find it in the second-hand book market. This is a difficult, time-consuming, often frustrating, but a very important operation. The good public relations of the library will be influenced by whether or not the department can "deliver." Most libraries put a bevy of devices into operation, such as monthly advertisements in the Antiquarian Bookman and similar journals, mimeographed want lists, and letters to special dealers. Some libraries prefer to give their want list to one dealer on a six-month's exclusive basis. Wing gives special attention to the complicated matter of the antiquarian market in another article in this issue.

Another irksome question, for which hardly any library has found a completely satisfactory answer, is the disposal of duplicates.\textsuperscript{10, 11} A small number should be added, some can be destroyed, and many items should be given to other institutions. Periodic sales to students
and faculty may bring some relief and bulk shipments can be sent
to the U.S. Book Exchange. Selected books can be used for exchange
purposes or offered for sale. To put duplicates in storage is too ex-

tensive; besides, it does not solve the question but only postpones
it. Miss Welch's article on "Publications Exchange" discusses dupli-
cates at greater length.

The efficient work of the department depends to a large extent on
the quality of records. Since no library has an abundance of staff,
the number of records has to be kept to a minimum. An outstanding
order file is indispensable. It consists of main entries filed alpha-

etically and is kept in the department. Twenty-eight libraries fol-
low this standard procedure. Three institutions find it more useful
to file outstanding orders in the main catalog. Other supplementary
files are arranged by fund (necessary to calculate encumbrances),
and by order number (as possible aid in claiming). Four libraries
keep an additional file arranged by dealer. After receipt of the book
the card is removed from the outstanding order file and control is
exercised through an in-process file. This file need not be kept sep-
parate, but can be integrated into the main catalog. The necessity of
an accession record has been seriously questioned. Very few libraries
still keep an accession book,\textsuperscript{12} where entries have to be made by
long hand; but a card file accession record remains and may have a
limited renaissance. In those European libraries which shelve their
books according to current numbers, the accession record becomes a
shelf list. In American libraries it has two objectives: it gives a chrono-
logical record of acquisitions and its serial number helps to match
books and cards.\textsuperscript{13} The first item may have mainly sentimental value,
although future historians may think otherwise, but the second is
often very useful. Some libraries which have abandoned accession
records have therefore reintroduced the serial number. Of the thirty-
one libraries, eight have an accession record, one has serial numbers
without a record. The individual parts of the multiple-order form
are used for these files; sometimes one part can be utilized for two
records. For instance, in Cornell the slip which registers the encum-
brances according to funds becomes, after receipt of the book, the
in-process record; the card in the order-number file is transferred to
the accessions index; and the entry in the outstanding order file is
used for bookkeeping purposes.

Lena Biancardo\textsuperscript{14} has written a thoughtful dissertation on de-
siderata files. Files which are to be advantageous to the day-by-day
operations of the department should be small, under 1,000 titles, ar-
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ranged by author, and kept separately. Subject-arranged files are useful if there is a possibility or an intention of making a concentrated drive for the acquisition of the titles listed. Of the thirty libraries which answered the question, four have no desiderata files, twenty-four follow the standard procedure, one interfiles with the outstanding order file, and one combines outstanding orders, in-process cards, and desiderata.

Many libraries keep a multitude of other files, generally to record past and unsuccessful transactions. In this category belong records like: cancellation, sold and cancelled, and dead file. One institution keeps an index of quotations received, one department reports twenty files, and one says bluntly, “Too many to list.” It is impossible for an outsider to pass judgment whether all these files are worth keeping; however, every department should periodically scrutinize its records and eliminate the non-essential ones according to Metcalf’s standards. “A record should not be kept unless in the long run it saves more time or money than it takes to make and use.”

Most libraries divide their book funds into two parts; roughly seventy per cent is allotted to specific subjects, thirty per cent is kept in a reserve fund. Only one institution has no reserve fund, and four have no subject allotments. The allocation of funds to subject departments has been widely discussed in the literature and is of great interest to the acquisitions librarian as he needs a well-thought-through formula of fund distribution to correlate intelligently the requests of the different selectors. The allocation of funds, however, does not mean that the financial authority of the library is confined to reserve funds. Two-thirds of the libraries report that they can buy on all funds without authorization of the subject department.

This freedom to purchase entails the grave responsibility of having at all times a complete control of the financial status. Only five departments do not carry on bookkeeping operations; in these institutions the library administration has taken this responsibility and shares it with the accounting office in the central administration. In all other libraries the standard operating procedure is roughly as follows: the central accounting office of the university keeps the entire money available in a lump sum, writes the checks for the bills duly authorized for payment, and sends a monthly statement of the account; the acquisitions department is responsible for processing the bills and recording the expenditures according to subject allotments or endowed funds. The department should also know how much money has been mortgaged for orders posted but not yet received. Some libraries
calculate the encumbrances only during the second half of the fiscal year. That seems to be like locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen. It is hardly worth the effort to calculate the encumbrances exactly in dollars and cents, but the department should always have a fairly accurate conception of its financial obligations.

Six libraries report a supervision of their accounting systems by the university comptroller. In most institutions the relationship between the central accounting office and the acquisitions department is limited to the auditing of bills and sending of twelve monthly statements; two libraries report a yearly audit; and two check the total of their free balance against the general book account in the auditor's office. Two-thirds of the libraries state that accounting regulations do not limit their freedom to decide purchasing procedures. The restrictions reported from the ten other libraries seem to be of a slight nature; for instance, bids are requested for single orders over $2,000.00. There is the possibility that the wish of the accounting office has influenced the frequency of bills forwarded for payment. In twenty-nine of the libraries queried, eight pay daily or several times a week, fourteen weekly, and seven monthly. The division of labor between the comptroller's office and the acquisitions department has worked well, thanks to the chief financial officers of the universities, who have shown understanding for the peculiarities of book purchasing and confidence in the bookkeeping abilities of the acquisitions department.

The department generally submits monthly statistics and consolidates these statements into one, more formal, annual report. The data reported include the number of orders placed, money spent, and a breakdown of expenditures according to allocations. Cornell adds figures for encumbrances every second month. It is advantageous to make short statistical analyses periodically to test the efficiency of operations. The department should be able to answer the following questions with fairly accurate figures: discounts (broken down according to material or agents), time interval between placing of an order and its receipt (according to agents), unfilled orders, unintentional duplication, response to advertising for out-of-print books, and frequency of bookkeeping errors.

Most selectors like to be informed when their requests are filled. Many libraries report, however, twelve perform this service only if requested; in two institutions the circulation department takes over this function, in two others, the catalog department; three libraries do not report at all. In addition to individual reports, general acquisition lists are fairly common. No library can publish a complete list, but
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sixteen institutions distribute selected ones at intervals, varying from twice a month to twice a year. The list is generally prepared by the acquisitions department; in one institution it is made in the director's office, and in three others, by the catalog department.

Acquisition work has many facets. It needs knowledge of books and familiarity with the book trade, it demands broad vision and respect for the minute detail, it requires understanding of the scholar's problems and of the needs of the accountant, but most of all it calls for an outgoing personality who loves both books and people, loves them in their glory and in their foibles. No one will meet all the qualifications of an ideal acquisitions librarian, but everyone takes pride that he works for the library's most important objective, the development of its book collection.
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