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The practice of interlibrary loans has long been recognized as a necessary adjunct to the more direct service functions of libraries. It has a place not only in the reference and circulation services but also as a consideration in the development of acquisition policies, administrative cooperation, and public relations. Intensive discussions of cooperation between libraries will inevitably touch upon interlibrary loans as a fundamental, basic concept as well as an example of successful interlibrary cooperation. Thus references are made to interlibrary loans in several previous issues of Library Trends. In one issue, Carl Melinat has written an article entitled "Interlibrary Lending." He briefly summarizes the growth of interlibrary loans in the United States from the oft-quoted first suggestion in print by S. S. Green in 1876 through the cost studies by J. G. Hodgson in 1951, with references to the 1940 Interlibrary Loan Code and its later revision by the A.C.R.L. Committee on Interlibrary Loans which is entitled "General Interlibrary Loan Code 1952." Most of his article, however, is a report on the 1949 survey he made on procedures, practices, and problems in interlibrary loans with the answers to his questionnaire given by 100 libraries, which included 50 university and special libraries, 30 college libraries, and 20 public libraries. His survey was made before the development and adoption of the A.L.A. Interlibrary Loan Form in 1951 and the General Interlibrary Loan Code in 1952. He does comment, however, that some of the specific problems and their recommended solutions have been handled by the national acceptance and use of these two instruments developed to facilitate interlibrary loans.

This article will not try to cover the area that Carl Melinat has done so well. Nor will it be an historical review of the subject of inter-
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library loans in this country. An exhaustive historical study on that subject by W. M. Luther, Direktor of the Niedersachsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek in Göttingen has been published in the 1955 volume of *Libri*. The reader who is interested in historical details is referred to that article with its extensive bibliography. We are concerned here specifically with interlibrary lending and allied extension services as they pertain to the circulation functions of libraries, one of the segments of L. W. Dunlap's "thin and wide slice" of librarianship.

Interlibrary lending is one of two interlocking circles of procedures that form the cooperative function known as interlibrary loans. The other circle is that of interlibrary borrowing, which is usually considered a reference function since it involves the bibliographical verification and location of materials not owned by the library but needed by one of its patrons. The term "interlibrary loans" is not, however, as definitive as it appears. The 1952 General Interlibrary Loan Code defines interlibrary loans as "transactions in which material is lent by one library to another library for the use of an individual borrower. Interlibrary loan service supplements a library's resources by making available, through direct loans for a short period of time, materials located in other libraries and not owned by the borrowing library." This definition does not delineate the relationship that the lending library may have with the borrowing one nor the method of the loan.

Some libraries use "interlibrary loan" to refer to loans made by a central library to its branches within the same legal system, while others include in it the extension responsibility of state libraries to the local libraries within the state. Students and faculty on a university campus are apt to think that the interlibrary loan service will procure materials for them from one of the campus branches or departmental libraries while special librarians record as interlibrary loans books that they themselves pick-up from a neighboring library although charged to them on a special borrower's card. Research librarians, including librarians in universities and colleges, think of interlibrary loans as a cooperative service between two or more libraries that are administratively independent with no statutory or legal responsibility to one another. They may have cooperative agreements to loan to each other as do members of a bibliographic center, but their loans fit the definition of purpose as stated in Section II of the 1952 General Interlibrary Loan Code: "The purpose of interlibrary loans is to make available for research and for serious study library materials not in a given library, with due provisions made by
the lending library for the rights of its primary clientele.” 6 This group of librarians, to the distress of the state and public librarians, emphasize the importance of the first part of Section III in the Code which states: “Interlibrary loan service is a courtesy and a privilege, not a right, and is dependent upon the cooperation of many libraries. Because of the cost of the service and the conflict in demands for certain classes of material, the interlibrary loan service should be restricted (especially when borrowing from large research libraries) to requests that cannot be filled by any other means.” 6

What is the basic conflict or confusion between these varying interpretations of the term? The types of materials loaned can range from an obscure nineteenth century novel needed by a professor of English literature to an Atomic Energy Commission report on industrial uses of radioactive isotopes needed by an industrial engineer—and could be requested through a college, university, or public library in the first instance or through a public, special, or university library in the second example. Though the type of materials requested by universities and colleges may be predominately what is termed research materials while that loaned between units of a public library system may be largely fiction and general interest titles, still the variety of publications lent by each type of library precludes an exclusive differentiation solely on the basis of materials loaned.

Perhaps the statistics of loans can be used as a basis of differentiation, but here there is further confusion due to lack of definition of terms. The special librarian who borrows for her clientele directly on her own loan card from the public library records such titles as interlibrary loans, but the public library would include those loans to her in its general circulation statistics of direct loans. A regional library, such as the Regional Library Service Center at Watertown, New York,7 may record its loans to member libraries as circulation statistics but list as “Interlibrary Loans Handled” requests forwarded to the State Library of which it is an administrative division. A public library system, such as the Los Angeles Public Library,8 may consider as interlibrary loans those books lent to branches from the central “Interlibrary Loan Collection” and yet also include in this designation volumes procured from libraries outside of its own system.

In this difference of interpretation may lie the key to the confusion about the term interlibrary loans. If one looks at interlibrary lending from the viewpoint of the responsibility of the lending library to the borrowing library the picture becomes somewhat clearer. On the one hand are those libraries to which a specific library may have a legal,
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statutory, or contractual responsibility; while on the other hand are the many libraries to which there is a cooperative, courtesy service. To be more precise in use of terms one could say that to the first group one did intra-library lending within the legal responsibility, while to the latter group one did inter-library lending between two or more cooperating libraries.

Upon examination of the two types of loans one finds far-reaching disparities stemming from this difference in responsibility of the lending library. The basically different approaches to the problem affect policy as well as procedures, routines and forms used, and notably the quantity and type of materials handled. Those in the first group distinguished by intra-library lending have allied services grouped under the larger designation of “extension service.” On the other hand, among those in the group limited to inter-library lending are libraries associated in the cooperative developments of the bibliographic and interlibrary centers such as the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center.

Another way to point out the differences between these two services is to look at the primary clientele of the lending library. In a system involving branch libraries, whether they be a county or municipal system, a far-flung system of branches of a company library, or the branches and departmental libraries of a college or university, the primary clientele to the central library as well as to each of its branches is the borrower that comes to any unit of the system. The central library, in order to reach and better serve its widely spread or specialized groups of borrowers, has delegated part of its primary responsibility to these branches which are extended fingers of its service. Thus the branch libraries become service intermediaries between the central library and its patrons, acting only as carriers, as it were. Any loan made by the central library to its branches or made between branches of the same system are for their primary clientele.

A bit further removed from this closely knit responsibility are the state libraries in relation to the libraries of their own states. Here, however, library laws of the different states, though varied in detail, have established, definite statutory responsibilities to all the citizens of the state which includes extension service either directly or through the local libraries within the state. The extension service includes interlibrary lending although the actual loan process may be centered in the general state library, as indicated in the Role of the State Library, rather than under the extension service agency. In order to reach the citizens of the state, therefore, the state library becomes a “library’s library,” and lends through the local libraries to its own
primary clientele. Again, therefore, a form of intra-library lending under statutory regulation.

The loans to libraries that are independent and to which the lending library has no legal or statutory responsibility must be a secondary responsibility to that owed the primary clientele. Thus the Cleveland Public Library would lend as a primary responsibility to its own branches or to any libraries in the area with which it had contractual responsibilities and as a cooperative responsibility to Western Reserve University Library within the Greater Cleveland area, but it would lend as a courtesy loan to the University of Nebraska Library. In the two latter cases the loans would be made only if the requested material was not in use or in demand at that time by the library’s own primary clientele. Research libraries find that all of what they call interlibrary loans are secondary responsibilities, loaned willingly if requests do not conflict with the needs of their primary clientele. Even though they may be state universities or colleges, their primary clientele are their own faculty and students, members of their own institutions, and not every citizen of the state. In the case of the Library of Congress, the largest research library in this country, the primary clientele are the members of Congress and the personnel of the federal agencies in Washington, not every citizen in the United States. They try to satisfy the needs of those citizens that can not obtain the materials for research from their own local or state libraries, but can do so only after the primary clientele’s needs are fulfilled.

The distinction can be made, therefore, between the two types of interlibrary loans as primary and secondary loans, possibly less confusing terminology than intra-library loans and inter-library loans. In examining them from their circulation aspects we will take them up as separate responsibilities, even though many public and state libraries combine them into one administrative procedure.

Primary (intra-library) loans. M. F. Tauber has said that: “Reduced to its elements, interlibrary loan is not basically different from the usual loan from library to reader. In essence, all libraries which are willing to cooperate become a single library with tremendous resources, and that library seeking a particular item for one of its patrons becomes, in turn, a patron of the inclusive system. Thus, in theory, any reader can draw on the resources of any library. In practice, there are certain limitations, based on the necessity for working out in detail the technicalities of the reasonable use of an idea of such vast scope.” 10 The libraries who recognize interlibrary lending as a primary responsibility in effect have accepted this theory as their state-
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ment of policy. They agree with L. R. McColvin that one of the four essential conditions of a library extension service is to "enable those particular books—any books, however specialized—required by any reader anywhere for his own special needs to be supplied." They have established their procedures to handle this service as simply as possible and integrated them with their direct loan circulation routines, in what Mason Tolman, of the New York State Library, calls "Call Card Simplicity." As such, the main library, whether it be the headquarters library of a school system, the central library of a county or city system, or the state library servicing local independent libraries, supplies its own call-slips (usually some form of a 3 x 5 slip or card used vertically or horizontally) for loan requests. These call-slips are filled-in by the local librarian, or the reader needing the material, and forwarded through established channels such as by a regular delivery service, or by mail. The bibliographical information supplied is usually barely sufficient for identification by the main library since most of the smaller service units have very limited tools for verification or reference.

The actual department to which these requests are sent may not be the circulation department, but may be called the department of branches, the headquarters library, the extension service, the "Mail Reference Unit," or some similar name—but whatever its name it is procedurally responsible for servicing these requests. It acts as a proxy for the borrowing library and its individual borrower. As such, this service unit checks the request in the central library's catalog, fills-in the call-number and sends the request through the usual channels for obtaining the book, whether this means going to the stack in an open-shelf library or sending the request through the loan desk for a closed-stack one.

The book is delivered to the extension or branch servicing unit where a record of the loan is kept, often on the original request slip. The book is then forwarded either by mail or via a regular delivery service. Where the branch or extension division maintains a union catalog of branch holdings or a special interlibrary loan collection, as at the Los Angeles Public Library, the request may be filled directly from within that department by charging the book from its own collection, or forwarding the request to the branch shown to own a copy. In many public libraries even if the book is drawn from the main stack collection the only charge record is kept in the branch department. This is apt to be particularly true if the main circulation records are kept by date due rather than by call number or author. The branch
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department thus becomes responsible for the due date, and it in turn passes this responsibility on to the branch librarian requesting the book.

Holds or reserves on books that are charged out to another borrower are handled the same as for the direct borrower, but the central extension service is notified and sent the book when it comes in. This unit then forwards the volume to the requesting branch, in some cases also mailing to the individual borrower his reserve postcard to show the book is now available for him at his branch.

These headquarters library service units are also the readers’ advisory or reference service for their primary clients—the smaller library units. This function is included under their purpose to supply the specific supplementary material needed by an individual borrower. Many of the state libraries, such as New York and California, have provided on their call-slips a space for subject requests. These can be used if the specific titles are not known. The slips so filled in are either checked by the extension agency or forwarded to the reference or other appropriate department in the central library. The catalog is checked, pertinent titles chosen, call-slips made out, and the appropriate books, with the original request slip, sent to the extension unit where the charge record is filed and the books sent to the requesting library. Again, the extension unit acts as proxy for the branch or local librarian and her borrower. In some of the smaller library systems the branch librarians actually do this “proxy” service themselves by making weekly trips to the main library where they select the books they think will fit their borrower’s needs and leave these books with the branch department to be charged and shipped to their own branch.

The type of material usually requested and lent as extension loans is similar to that normally available in the medium-sized or large public library but which is on a subject not adequately covered or a type beyond the budgetary limits of the local, smaller units of service. Many of the large city and county central libraries have collections of considerable depth and coverage and are therefore able to fill the majority of the needs of their borrowers. Carma R. Zimmer- man and R. J. Blasingame have written:

The unique function of the state agency in the inter-library loan program is to supply the more highly specialized, ordinarily more expensive, books rather than the items which are likely to be in heavy demand throughout the state. . . . In some instances, the term “more expensive” doubtless includes research materials of one type or
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another. However, it seems safe to assume that for the most part the phrase encompasses technical books, university press books, and other interpretative works which it would be uneconomical for any but the large public library to purchase for its own collection. Where these materials are held in a central collection available to all, they are more apt to be used a sufficient number of times to warrant their cost than they might be in the local public library.14

The above noted materials are usually in English with easily found bibliographical citations. The authors quoted above, however, were also interested in the extent of loans of materials in foreign languages. Of the fifty state and provincial libraries of the United States and Canada who answered their questionnaire, forty-eight of them reported that they lent books on interlibrary loan to their local libraries but only twenty-seven said that they lent foreign language materials.15 Since New York State Library had not answered the questionnaire, it was not included although it is known to have a large collection of foreign language materials which is used heavily by the foreign population of the state borrowing through local libraries.

The greatest percentage of materials requested through the primary or intra-library lending service is for the general reader, but there is the occasional request from a scholar, teacher, budding genius, or independent research man not attached to a college, university, scientific, or technical organization with its own research library through which he can satisfy his bibliographic needs. The retired or "lone wolf" research men and women are apt to be the ones that confound the local librarian with requests for material beyond her facilities to routinely supply or even understand. One such local librarian, Dorothy B. Thomas of North Carolina, writes: "If the average reader actually existed, it would make library service much simpler for the small public library. Our libraries are more average than our borrowers . . . Prodded on by grimly determined borrowers, some of us in small libraries have braced ourselves to make requests of the larger public libraries and the college and university libraries. Frequently and generously the larger libraries have lent."16 She goes on to describe the interlibrary loan arrangement that has been developed in North Carolina where requests are channeled through the North Carolina Library Commission (the state agency charged with extension service within that state). This demand for service has resulted in the establishment of a union catalog of the public libraries in the state with subject specialization agreements among the participating libraries.17

The North Carolina interlibrary loan plan represents a step between
the extension service responsibility to a primary clientele and the cooperative agreements of the bibliographic centers and their members. However, it is still based on the concept that public libraries within a state have a major responsibility to supply the book needs of the citizens of that state. Former restrictions of limiting a library's circulation and other services to only its own tax area are gradually being lifted by such agreements and by contractual and reciprocal agreements between public library systems, extending the privileges of a borrower's library card to adjacent communities. These extensions of the direct loan privilege, as developed in several metropolitan areas in California\textsuperscript{18, 19} and elsewhere, reduce the need for interlibrary lending between the contracting independent libraries since their borrowers can obtain needed materials directly from the other participating libraries. By such contractual and cooperative agreements and with the direct assistance of the state libraries the theory of an extension service providing library service to every citizen is coming closer to fulfillment.

Secondary (inter-library) loans. Interlibrary lending as a secondary responsibility embraces the large area of loans referred to in the 1952 General Interlibrary Loan Code. Although the greatest percentage of these loans are made by the larger research libraries in the country, still many of the same libraries that handle a large volume of primary interlibrary lending also lend on this secondary basis. Some include both kinds of service in the same procedures and under the same service division and do not differentiate between them in their statistics. Others separate them, recognizing that the usual intra-library requests are for patrons that do "not need or demand access to technical and complete collections [but that] the more specialized students and research workers frequently find the material in any one library inadequate for their needs,"\textsuperscript{20} and for these the service of lending between independent, research, and specialized collections is necessary.

To understand the more complicated procedures that have developed for these secondary interlibrary loans one needs to examine them not only from the difference of responsibility to the borrowing library but also from the type of material most often requested, the historical development of this interlibrary loan concept, and the accepted purpose of such loans.

The purpose of the interlibrary loans to the secondary-clientele has become liberalized within our generation. The 1940 version of the Interlibrary Loan Code, which reflected an expansion in detail of the
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1917 and earlier codes, stated that “the primary purpose of the inter-library loan service is to aid research calculated to advance the boundaries of knowledge by the loan of unusual books, after due provision has been made for the rights and convenience of the immediate constituents of the lending library. . . . Some libraries may find it desirable to lend material for other than research purposes to institutions within their own territory or toward which they may have some particular obligation. Such transactions should be considered as part of an extension service rather than as interlibrary loans.”21 The framers of that Code were fighting a losing battle. The interpretation of the term interlibrary loan, as we have pointed out, has been expanded to include those extension services, albeit adding confusion thereby, and the material acceptable for loan is no longer restricted to the “unusual book.”

With the realization by even the large research libraries that no library could supply all the needed materials in any given intensive research project, cooperative library programs moved from theoretical hopes into needed realities. The bibliographic centers at Philadelphia, Denver, and Seattle materialized to make available through union catalogs, cooperatively developed and maintained, the interchange of library materials needed within their areas. The need for subject specialization and for responsibility in collection building rather than competitive duplication between libraries was increasingly recognized and culminated in the formation of the Farmington Plan. Through this plan sixty-two research libraries voluntarily agreed to an experiment in specialization “to make sure that at least one copy of each new foreign book and pamphlet that might reasonably be expected to interest a research worker in the United States will be acquired by an American library, promptly listed in the Union Catalogue at the Library of Congress, and made available by interlibrary loan or photographic reproduction.”22

Thus the type of material recognized as justifiably interlibrary loan material moved from the “unusual” books to foreign publications outside the subject responsibility of the borrowing library, and these sixty-two cooperating libraries agreed to make them available on interlibrary loan. However, “current fiction; current issues of periodicals; . . . [excepting foreign or little used titles]; inexpensive items currently purchasable in this country; books for class use; a high percentage of books basic for a thesis being written for the borrowing institution; current books for which there is anticipated a recurring demand in the borrowing library”23 are still listed in the 1952 General Inter-
library Loan Code as types of materials that should not be requested on interlibrary loan. It should be pointed out here that many of the categories above, specifically restricted from interlibrary loans, are the very ones accepted as the responsibility of a lending library in its intra-library loans to its primary clientele. During the compilation of the 1952 Code the research libraries that were asked to comment and give suggestions for the Code strongly expressed their convictions that this type of material if needed should be supplied by a library through its own acquisitions not by dependence on loans from the collections of other administratively independent libraries.

Therefore, the materials most acceptable for interlibrary loans are still the unusual titles, the foreign publications, whether monographs or serials, and the expensive materials not easily procurable in this country, as well as the out-of-print research books and periodicals. These publications are not only “unusual” to the majority of non-research libraries but they also involve complicated bibliographical entries that are often difficult to identify, especially through the limited reference tools found in most small libraries. Many of them are publications of committees, learned societies, government agencies, academic institutions, and other corporate bodies for which the author entry may be two or three lines long instead of the two or three words of a single author entry. The need for accuracy and verification increases the more complex the entry becomes. One learned society, for instance, may have five to ten subject divisions each of which in turn can have two or three sub-sections, any one of which can publish several serial titles and a great variety of monographic works. Unless the correct name of the society, the subject division and the sub-section are given, as well as the exact title of the publication wanted, it will be difficult for the lending library to determine what to send—and the individual borrower is not at hand to be questioned in person by the lending library. Thus the borrowing library must determine in advance all the necessary bibliographic information pertaining to the publication wanted and include it in the original request if it expects to receive the correct title. A call-number provides a short-hand designation to identify a publication but without this, completeness in entry is required.

The larger 5 x 8 A.L.A. Interlibrary Forms were developed not only to give sufficient area for these complex bibliographical entries but also to provide space to indicate the reference tools used by the borrowing library in verification of the publication, or, lacking that, the source of reference of the original citation. Space was also needed,
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and provided, for (1) the printing of the most frequently used reports in answering interlibrary loan requests; (2) the name and status of the individual borrower (often an element in getting material released for interlibrary loan that would not be available for an unknown individual); (3) noting the method, date, and cost of shipment; (4) the loan period and any special instructions as to use; and (5) the addresses of both the borrowing and lending libraries. Since some libraries had been using from eleven to fourteen different printed forms to handle their interlibrary loan correspondence, the multiple-copy form was also designed to materially decrease the clerical cost of correspondence previously required in interlibrary loans between two independent libraries.

In the early days of this type of cooperation between libraries the loan of a book to another library was a policy decision made by the librarian himself and arranged between his office and the requesting librarian whom he knew well, at least by reputation. Each loan was an exception to the general policy and routine of loans to his own clientele. Since the material loaned was unusual and apt to be hard to replace, careful wrapping, high insurance, and acknowledgement of receipt at each end were required. There was no standardization of correspondence forms, each library developing its own and having them mimeographed or printed as the quantity of loans increased. On each one of the forms, the bibliographical entry for the title requested had to be typed or written; and on half of them the name and address of either the borrowing or lending library, while on the other half the name and address of the individual borrower. In addition to the forms interchanged between the two libraries, there were the request forms received from the borrowing library's own patron, notification to him of the book's arrival, notification to him if a renewal had been granted, recalls for overdue books, and a receipt that he had to sign when he took the book out and paid the transportation costs. Exchanged by the libraries, in addition to the initial request letter, were forms for notice of shipment, acknowledgement of receipt, renewal requests and renewal granted forms, emergency recalls and overdues, notification and acknowledgement of return, and forms for reporting that a requested book was not available. As the quantity of loans increased the clerical costs increased also, both in printed forms and in the clerical personnel required to handle the extensive paper work.

It was in an effort to cut the high cost of all the duplicate typing and the printing of a great variety of forms that the A.C.R.L. Interlibrary Loan Committee in 1950 investigated the possibility of national use
of the 4-part, multiple-carbon, unit-request form developed the previous year by the University of California libraries for use between their own eight campuses. Convinced that the savings effected were so great that all libraries should be able to use the form, and require its use by their interlibrary borrowers, the Committee revised the form for more general use and persuaded three library supply firms to stock it, selling it at a low enough price so that even the smallest college library could afford to purchase it. The Committee presented it in 1951 to the A.C.R.L. Executive Board and had it accepted for sponsorship as the recommended interlibrary loan form. As such, it was recommended in the 1952 General Interlibrary Loan Code, and described in Appendix II of the Code.

In 1955 a new interlibrary loan committee was set-up by the Reference Section of A.C.R.L. to find out, among other duties, whether any changes were advisable in this now standard, nationally used interlibrary loan form. After circularizing 150 libraries that handle varying loads of interlibrary loans, the Committee found that there were a number of changes recommended, principally regarding difficulties with the interleaved carbons and a need for more white space for complicated bibliographical entries and explanatory notes. These suggestions were used as the basis for revision of the form and have been described in detail by Foster Palmer, the present chairman of the committee, in the Library Journal. There were no changes made in the size, number of copies, nor basic format but changes were made in details of phrasing and condensation of instructions. These changes have been incorporated into the 1956 revised edition of the General Interlibrary Loan Code.

Most of the libraries wrote expressing themselves as well-pleased or even enthusiastic about the convenience and time-saving factors of the form. However, those libraries that consistently preferred the call slip 3 x 5 size interlibrary loan form reiterated their objections to the larger size. These included the state libraries which, although they all prefer the 3 x 5 size, have been unable to agree among themselves on a standard form acceptable to all of them. Consequently each one continues to supply free to its borrowing libraries a supply of its own forms. The same is true of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Library and the National Library of Medicine, each having a 3 x 5 call slip type request form but materially differing from each other. Thus, if a college library borrows occasionally from its state library,

* Effective March 1, 1957, the National Library of Medicine discontinued its AFML Form 141 and adopted the standard A.L.A. Interlibrary Loan Form.
the U.S.D.A. Library and the National Library of Medicine it must keep stocks of each of these different forms and, in using them, not only fill in the forms themselves but also have to type envelopes and separate notifications of return as well as any requests for renewals. While for its interlibrary loan requests to all other libraries in the United States and Canada the standard A.L.A. Interlibrary Loan Form may be used with only the initial typing of the form necessary, because it supplies a renewal request form and notification of return shipment and may be used in window envelopes.

Within the lending library the routines for handling the secondary clientele interlibrary loans are geared to the circulation and reference procedures, which vary from library to library even as do their call-slip in size and format from 2 x 3 cards, 3 x 5 slips to IBM cards. The requests may go to a person, or a division—depending upon the size of the operation—either in the circulation or reference department, or a special interlibrary service department. As in the extension agencies of the public and state libraries, this service librarian acts as a proxy for the requesting library, checking the request through the main catalog, procuring the book through established routines from the particular unit that shelves it, and shipping it to the borrowing library. Most university libraries have from three to thirty branches, fragmentations from the whole collection, determined by subject matter rather than by geographical placement. These subject branches and departmental libraries are service units having their own circulation files, usually arranged by call-number, and need to know where and to whom their materials are charged. The service unit, therefore, whether it is the main loan desk or a branch or departmental library, retains the call-slip record of the interlibrary loan, sending the book itself to the interlibrary lending service division. The latter division keeps its records on the A.L.A. Interlibrary Loan Form, sometimes supplemented by a duplicate call slip file for checking on overdue books. This division is responsible for shipping the book and notifying the borrowing library of this shipment as well as of any special instructions for use and due date; and it also collects the reimbursed transportation charges from the borrowing library.

Since many of the titles requested involve complex entries and foreign languages that may range from the common western European ones to Slavic, Indic, and Oriental, the librarian in charge of this service needs to be familiar with bibliographical reference tools as well as foreign languages, or be able to call upon the reference personnel for help in identification. If the requested title is not found immedi-
ately in the main catalog it is checked through published catalogs of the Library of Congress, British Museum, Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, or similar appropriate ones. If not found there, it is checked in the national trade bibliographies and even, if the request seems to warrant it, in abstracting journals and subject bibliographies. Frequently the publication is found under a different form of entry through this verification process, and the book is located, under this new entry, in the lending library. Large research libraries often have extensive collections of unanalyzed monographic serial sets and, unless the series is indicated in the original request, the title though actually owned would not be apparent in the main catalog. Even when the title is still not found in the library’s collection the corrected or new entry information is forwarded to the borrowing library, especially when it has been found to be part of a series, by annotating the yellow copy of the form, sheet B, so that the borrowing library may cite it correctly when asking the next library on its list.

Those libraries that fortunately belong to a bibliographic center have this type of verification service, as well as checking for locations, performed for them by the Center. The process is well described in a recent issue of the Philadelphia Bibliographical Center News Letter,26 which also tells how its own union catalog is searched for locations and, if not found there, the staff of the National Union Catalog is requested to check its files of some 15 million entries showing holdings from about 700 libraries in this country.

Reference was made earlier, in the quotation from the Farmington Plan Handbook, of the availability of materials either by interlibrary loan or by photographic reproduction. The alternative of photographic reproduction is also included in the 1952 General Interlibrary Loan Code, Section IX,27 where reference is made to the Gentlemen’s Agreement between libraries and publishers regarding the photocopying for research purposes of copyrighted materials. As a result of two articles on the Code and the availability of interlibrary loans that appeared in the Law Library Journal in 1953,28,29 L. C. Smith,30 senior attorney at the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress, wrote two articles for the same journal explaining and amplifying the Gentlemen’s Agreement. There is not space to explain it here, but it is wise to know that the larger research libraries, including the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library, follow it rigidly regarding copyrighted materials and will supply only one microfilm or photostat copy of a journal article or part of a book that is still in copyright. The materials for which no copyright is extant in this country can be
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copied more freely. Because of the heavy local use of scientific and technical periodicals many libraries will not lend their originals but instead will make photographic copies of specific articles at a nominal charge. Special librarians find this substitute of particular value for their clientele who thereby procure copies for their own files. Prices for photographic copies vary somewhat from library to library but at the present writing are usually around 5c per opening (two facing pages) for microfilms and 50c for the same for photostats no larger than 11½ x 14, with a minimum photographic and shipping charge of about $1.25.

The microfilming of theses represents a special development in the substitution of a photographic copy for the loan of the original. Upon the recommendation, in 1952, of a special committee of the Association of Research Libraries, many university libraries now make their doctoral dissertations available only through the purchase of microfilm copies—procured either through their own laboratories or from University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan, a microfilming publishing house. The latter organization publishes the monthly Dissertation Abstracts which lists, with abstracts, all doctoral dissertations that they have available on film, with the number of pages, price for positive microfilm or paper copy, and their publication number. Theses listed here are available only through purchase, which is also true of theses from institutions that provide their own microfils such as the University of Chicago and the University of California at Berkeley. The microfilm cost for the student or scholar needing a particular thesis is often less than the transportation cost for shipment of the original typescript. In spite of efforts by librarians to have bound theses included in the special book-rate, the U.S. Postal Regulations still require that they be sent first-class mail for domestic shipment so the usual practice for libraries is to send them by express, first-class, with $50.00 insurance, (which is actually less than the usual cost of replacement for a thesis) at the minimum cost of $4.04 round trip.

The cost of interlibrary lending, over and above the transportation costs, has been of considerably more concern to the research libraries than to those handling intra-library lending to their primary clientele. To the latter group the cost is usually included in the general extension services, grouped with similar services such as regular shipment of supplementary collections to branches, bookmobile service to outlying units, or regional centers for the use of local librarians. Even though the Los Angeles Public Library survey listed as a separate item the personnel cost of the interlibrary loan division within the
branches department, they did not attempt to give a unit cost, for their listing did not include the costs of delivery, time of the branch librarian making the request, nor the time of other central library departments who may have assisted in procuring the requested title.

The research librarians, however, from time to time have become very disturbed by the mounting costs of the lending service to libraries and individuals who do not contribute to their budgets. During the depression years the University of California Library at Berkeley assessed a service charge for each transaction sent to a library within the Far West. This was discontinued in 1946 when it was realized that the amount collected did not justify the bookkeeping costs nor the expense for research borne by the faculties of small colleges whose libraries could not afford to buy needed research materials nor pay the interlibrary loan service charges for them. In 1948 Ruth Harry and Harald Ostvold of Washington University at St. Louis, concerned over the rising costs of interlibrary loan service, made a survey of other libraries to see how this was being handled elsewhere. Their findings were largely inconclusive but did show definite opposition to a service charge against the borrowing library. Harvard University Library later brought the question up at meetings of the Association of Research Libraries in a discussion of the fee that they charge for non-university users of their library. Charles David, librarian at that time of the University of Pennsylvania, in a paper presented in June 1949 at an A.C.R.L. College Section meeting asked for an investigation of interlibrary loan procedures in order to "make [the] service faster and less expensive." It was in answer to this mounting pressure for either charging fees or cutting costs that the A.C.R.L. Interlibrary Loan Committee was asked to investigate methods of reducing the cost of interlibrary lending, which investigation resulted in the present widely used interlibrary loan form and the 1952 General Interlibrary Loan Code.

Varying estimates appear in library literature regarding the cost of interlibrary loan service. Most of them were made before the national use and acceptance of the A.L.A. Interlibrary Loan Form and the 1952 Code. Furthermore, a figure given in dollars and cents has little validity in the present spiral of rising costs and increasing salaries. Transportation costs, however, are an out-of-pocket charge that can be easily determined and therefore most lending libraries request reimbursement for them, as specified in Section VI of the 1952 General Interlibrary Loan Code. One might make a very rough estimate of the over-all costs in interlibrary loan service of
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personnel and materials (forms and wrapping supplies included) without consideration for overhead costs, by saying that the cost of lending is about half that of the borrowing side, providing the A.L.A. Interlibrary Loan Forms are used; and these personnel and materials costs per item are from five to ten times the transportation costs.

The cost of interlibrary loan service is of course considerably increased if the library utilizes teletype service, as do the campuses of the University of California among each other and to eastern libraries having installations. But, since it is a cost borne by the borrowing library even to the extent of asking the lending library to answer by TWX-Collect, it can be just referred to here as a utilization of a rather costly means of communication in order to give faster service to ones clientele. Teletype service has been, however, the basis of the fast and successful contractual service for interlibrary loans between the public libraries of Racine and Milwaukee, Wisconsin, referred to by them as Racmil;37 and it is one of the services installed by the Midwest Interlibrary Center38 to communicate with its member libraries, although several of the latter have dropped within the past year their installations due to increased cost and insufficient usage.

At present the trend of libraries in this country is toward more cooperative acquisition programs based on subject specialization and responsibility and toward less duplication in little used materials. The success of such programs is predicated upon well organized inter-library loan service or comparatively inexpensive photographic reproduction. The cooperating libraries still recognize that the needs of their primary clientele must be served first but now see that by cooperative agreements they are making available more research materials for their clientele. Conflicts of usage can be handled by the photographic reproductions.

At the same time that this inter-library loan service is becoming less an exception and more of a necessity for research needs the intra-library service is also increasing. With the passage by the second session of the Eighty-Fourth Congress of the Library Services Act the goal of supplying library materials to every citizen is nearer accomplishment. More and more, the library resources of this country and Canada are being considered as one great reservoir that should be able to supply according to need, and through some form of inter- or intra-library loan, library materials to every potential reader.

Libraries are also establishing interlibrary loan arrangements with libraries abroad. The A.C.R.L. Committee on Interlibrary Loans has been working for over a year on a procedure for integrating the re-
quirements of the 1952 General Interlibrary Loan Code with the International Federation of Library Associations’ International Interlibrary Loan Regulations, adopted at Zagreb in 1954. The Committee has consulted those libraries most heavily represented in our National Union Catalog for an expression of their willingness to cooperate in lending, as well as borrowing, abroad and from these replies is now developing an international interlibrary loan procedure, which will be presented to the A.C.R.L. for official action. Thus interlibrary lending has moved from the occasional loan to a library that was well known to a potential world wide service to provide needed research materials to scholars as well as the less erudite materials for readers everywhere.
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