



Introduction

LOUIS R. WILSON

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS who gained their experience in building up college and university library book collections before the end of World War II will find the papers in this number of *Library Trends* exciting. They will be impressed with the fact that while they were familiar with many of the conditions, procedures, and formulas with which their successors have been confronted, they never had to cope with the tremendous expansion and procedures which present-day librarians daily experience.

These new conditions have arisen not only from the great increase of students at the undergraduate and graduate levels, but also from the equally extensive expansion of library materials, the proliferation of new subject areas, and the growth of language requirements. The number of book titles published in the United States alone increased from 13,462 in 1958 to 28,451 in 1964, 111 percent in seven years.¹ The number of Russian monograph titles listed in the Library of Congress *Information Bulletin* for 1963-64 was 17,863, while the total number of monograph titles listed in the Library of Congress *Monthly Index of Russian Accessions* from 1957-58 to 1963-64 was 103,555.²

The earlier practitioners will also find that the funds with which to meet the new demands have risen significantly, though not in sufficient amount to offset the notably increased costs of materials and service. A few statistics will make these points clear. The median annual additions to the book collections of forty-two university libraries noted in the annual statistics of both 1950-51³ and 1964-65⁴ were 33,631 and 73,562, respectively, and the median book funds for the same institutions and periods were \$126,338 and \$580,429. The range of the additions of books added annually for the two periods was from 12,198 to 145,388 for 1950-51 and from 20,967 to 257,631 for 1964-65. The range of the book funds for the first period was from

Louis R. Wilson is Professor of Library Science and Administration, Emeritus, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

\$46,880 to \$480,886 and for the second period was from \$209,340 to the fantastic \$3,813,068 of the University of Texas. The median increase in books added was 39,931, the median increase in money spent \$454,091. The median cost per book added in 1950-51 was \$3.76 and in 1964-65, \$7.65.

Although no statistics are available to support the statement, it is obvious that the number of languages in which materials are secured has risen sharply. Area studies have multiplied in many institutions, and materials have appeared in thousands of new periodicals, paper backs, and various forms of microtext. Complexity and added copies to match enrollments are the order of the day.

Though *Library Trends* is concerned principally with emerging patterns, a certain amount of history is to be found in this group of papers. That was inevitable. However, where it appears, it serves to emphasize the changes and sharpen the patterns of procedures in book selection and acquisition.

James Babb, of Yale, traces briefly the early role of three men, including Elihu Yale, who served as agents abroad, buying classics. He refers later to the Linonia and Brothers Society libraries which added other types of books. In the early 1800's, Benjamin Silliman made extensive purchases abroad. Librarian Addison Van Name, with the help of alumni, increased the Yale collection from 44,000 to 300,000 volumes from 1865 to 1905. Babb notes that Librarian Andrew Keogh, always an astute observer, commented that Yale professors married for money and spent their salaries on books which were mostly willed to Yale. Then followed the rapid development through the Yale Associates, the curators, and the bibliographers of the present day. Quality was the major objective and still is, though recently the current has run so swiftly and strongly that certain concessions have had to be made to meet the mounting pressure. Acquisitions have been made in expanding fields through the purchase of collections *en bloc*, cooperative programs such as the Farmington Plan, Public Law 480, standing orders, foreign agents, collectors and donors. However, although the tempo of acquisition has stepped up greatly and pressures have mounted, the librarian has retained control of the book funds.

In the late 1930's, Douglas Waples frequently commented upon the relative effectiveness of building up collections through dependence principally upon faculty members and principally upon bibliographers. It was his opinion, based upon his use of American and

Introduction

European research libraries, that dependence upon faculty members in building up collections was less effective than dependence upon staff bibliographers. The trend since 1950-51 in this particular has been decidedly in favor of the staff bibliographer. The number of volumes ordered daily has made it difficult for a faculty member to give the time necessary to cover his subject field. The faculty member, however, has not been entirely by-passed. In a number of instances, notably at Duke University, he has become curator, or bibliographer, or rare-book specialist, or has continued to serve as formerly or as a collector of his own books which later find their way into his institution's library through bequest or purchase. But the responsibility for building up the library's resources has been transferred in large measure to the bibliographer, the bibliographical organizations, the divisions, the reference departments, the groups of special librarians, and staff members of the library. The paper on the Cornell Library admirably presents the philosophy underlying this changeover. Other papers, notably those on the North Carolina, UCLA, and Southern Illinois University Libraries, provide notable examples of the ways in which the idea has been applied. Cornell also serves as an example of an institution that combines under one administration both private and public institutions having very diversified interests.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Duke University furnish a notable example of what may be termed "public and private institutional cooperation." They have built up a combined total of more than 3,500,000 volumes, with duplicate catalogs and with library delivery service, the latter being extended to North Carolina State University and the State Library at Raleigh. This has been done over a period of years. But a similar plan of cooperation in acquisitions has not been formulated for the libraries of the four campuses of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Greensboro, Charlotte, and North Carolina State at Raleigh and the state senior colleges. A comprehensive plan might well include these institutions with suggested programs for the state's community colleges and technological institutes.

The development of the collections at North Carolina and Duke present marked differences in the period from 1925-1950. The former suffered a severe lack of funds in the period. Duke, on the contrary, had extensive funds for books during the years of depreciated currencies in Europe and of depression in America, while the physical

plant of the new university was being built and members of the faculty were assembled. Consequently, it bought extensively through faculty members abroad and *en bloc*, and adopted a number of the devices of acquisition during that period which have characterized institutions assuming university status suddenly since 1950. Librarian Powell also attributed much of the success of the Duke Library, in attaining genuine university status quickly, to the informed support of four generations of the Duke family and each of its presidents.

Since 1957, North Carolina has also greatly increased its collection program which is centralized under the direction of a chief bibliographer. It has likewise benefited extensively from endowments for special collections in language and literature, North Carolina history, and manuscripts relating to Southern history.

The papers on the libraries of the University of Indiana and Purdue University describe an achievement in what is styled "planned complementation." Each library is being built up in general in accord with the plan and the specializations of the institutions. The plan has been used less extensively in the recent changeover to full-fledged university status of Ball State Teachers College and Indiana State College.

The University of Indiana emphasizes the liberal arts, professional studies in law and medicine, chemistry, and geology; Purdue, agriculture, engineering, applied science, and professional studies in veterinary medicine, pharmacy, and nursing. All four of the universities prepare coordinated budgets, and a regional campus plan seems to be emerging, although no library council has as yet been organized.

The University of Indiana attributes its principal success in building up its book collections to the strong support of President Wells from 1937 to 1962, dependence upon its staff and representatives of the scientific and professional departments and schools, and "bonanzas" in the form of a considerable number of donations of splendid special collections. In fact, the collections led to the erection of a rare book library. Purdue has concentrated on current periodicals and monographs, and has used special funds to wipe out deficiencies in its fields of specialization.

R. B. Downs, in his paper on the University of Illinois Library, features the roles of President James, 1905-1925, and Librarian Phineas L. Windsor, 1909-1940, in building up the book collection from 45,000 to 750,000 volumes. In that period, faculty members played an important part in the selection of materials. More recently, the

Introduction

Library has placed dependence primarily on staff members, departmental library heads, and bibliographers.

Today the Library, numbering about 4,000,000 volumes, is rich with many extensive special collections on a wide variety of subjects acquired through purchase and donations. It participates in various nation-wide cooperative programs of acquisition, has adopted many devices for securing materials from countries in which the book trade has been poorly developed, has extensive Chinese and Japanese collections, and is adding materials on limited areas of Africa. It builds its collections to meet current needs and looks to cooperation and specialization of libraries as necessary principles of research library development in the future.

The recent conversion of separate land-grant and teachers colleges into universities, with concomitant pressures for rapid expansion of resources, is well illustrated in the articles on Michigan State and Southern Illinois. These libraries have employed many new devices in meeting their needs. Both now have approximately 1,000,000 volumes and have made additions in general fields as well as those of original specialization. They have grown very rapidly, with less time to insure quality than was available to institutions which developed earlier. They have likewise given priority to periodicals in the sciences, organized themselves on a divisional basis, used staff bibliographers, and featured purchasing of collections and *en bloc* buying. However, non-availability of early files has limited the strength of materials in some fields.

Pressure for securing materials in many subjects not previously considered important and from sources seldom utilized has emphasized the necessity of turning to new methods of acquisition. Area studies and the need for materials in languages other than English and in the vernacular of the areas studied have made necessary the adaptation of old procedures or the development of new ones.

Planning in the development of collections of different types of libraries of the publicly-supported colleges and universities in a state shows itself best in the two papers on California libraries. The roles played by the California Library Council and the Institute of Library Research in formulating the plan appear in the way the libraries of nine campuses have been developed as a unit in coping with the new conditions.

The paper by Librarian Donald Coney on the University of California Library at Berkeley, the first of the nine California campuses

developed as a university, pays tribute to two of its presidents and its first professional librarian. President Daniel Coit Gilman had been librarian at Yale and set high standards for building the collection. President Robert Gordon Sproul sensed the importance of California's orientation to China and Japan, with resulting distinctive collections from those and other eastern countries. The Berkeley Library also played an important part in carrying out the acquisition policies set by the Library Committee of the Berkeley Academic Senate to which may be attributed much of the Library's success in the development of a remarkably fine collection of materials and special collections.

Joseph Cummings Rowell, the first professional librarian, began in 1875 to set the library in order as an organization, and, with severely limited funds and personnel, concentrated on two methods of acquisition. He solicited gifts of materials and collections, and he laid the foundation of an extensive exchange system based upon the series of the University of California publications which was to become one of the most extensive in the nation.

In 1931 and again in 1946, the Library Committee adopted acquisition policy statements. The first established "three main goals: to build systematically, to avoid duplication of special collections, and to reduce fund-raising competition among libraries of the West by promoting agreement on mutually exclusive aims." The influence of this program is seen in the collecting of the campuses in the University system. The second statement defined aspects of the Pacific Basin which might be desirably covered by the Library.

The paper by Richard O'Brien, of the University of California at Los Angeles, deals extensively with the other eight campuses, including the Research Library of UCLA. The institutions range from three new senior colleges organized in 1964-65 through a number of older institutions which specialize in oceanography, agriculture, citrus culture, medicine, and education to the research library at Los Angeles. Most of the libraries have been built up in a relatively short time, each being developed in accord with its needs, frequently providing for doctoral level resources in the fields of special interest with undergraduate and M.A. levels as required. In three instances, identical libraries of 75,000 volumes were provided in the summer of 1965 for new senior colleges from a list of basic titles now being published by the ALA, replacing the *Shaw List* of 14,000 titles of 1931.⁵

The paper discusses in detail the nature and extent of the resources of each of the libraries and the means employed in coping with the

Introduction

problems of acquisition. It likewise furnishes an excellent illustration of what state-supported institutions can achieve in library development through a wisely conceived program of library cooperation.

The final paper, "National Planning for Resource Development," by James E. Skipper, looks at the problems with which these libraries have been confronted, from a national point of view. It describes the various plans which have been formulated by library organizations, learned and scientific societies, national foundations, the federal government, and international bodies to devise appropriate solutions. Although the difficulties are great, he looks at the future with restrained optimism.

World War II caught the United States short of maps of places where its armies were fighting. Post World War II and the Space Age have confronted the libraries of the nation with the compelling need to discover and invent new ways and means of locating materials and book dealers in the rapidly emerging new nations of Africa and Asia and the relatively little known countries of Latin America and the Middle East.

References in the papers in this issue to the Farmington Plan recall one of the earliest methods of achieving the goal of acquiring certain foreign publications. The Midwest Interlibrary Center represented another means of assuring librarians of the ability to have little used materials at hand when necessary. As the paper by James E. Skipper shows, the last two decades have called forth a multiplication of such devices and have demonstrated the need of others.

Today in many subject fields, especially in the humanities and the social sciences, the foreign agent and foreign book dealer are used extensively. The roles of the Friends of the Library, of Library Associates, of curators, of interested faculty members, of collectors, and of benefactors have always been important and are being enlarged. Historical and manuscript collections have been acquired through such agencies and individuals. Current materials and collections for undergraduate libraries are being selected and acquired in other ways. Complete senior college collections have been acquired within a matter of months. Some libraries check current bibliographical publications and place standing orders for important books in all subjects checked. An occasional library places blanket orders for all the titles published by selected publishers. Others make extensive use of paper backs. Rental collections are maintained here and there to assure availability. Microtext is frequently used in acquir-

ing serials, abstracted media, and important sets in science. State institutions have adopted cooperative relationships and have found them an effective means of stretching their budgets and acquiring for joint use rare or expensive materials they otherwise could not secure.

To house the vastly increased materials for different levels of users, four types of libraries have become commonplace on American university campuses. They are: (1) the undergraduate or senior college library, (2) the branch scientific or professional library, (3) the research library, and (4) the special collections library. Each type requires a definite level of materials and special procedures of selection and acquisition.

The authors of the papers which follow have made little reference to the relative pressures exerted upon libraries by increased enrollments, rapid change in the status of institutions, the rising flood of titles published, the burgeoning of area studies, and the multiplication of languages, both classic and vernacular, in which materials have had to be acquired. However, it is apparent that area studies, languages, and the underdeveloped state of the book trade in many parts of the world have probably imposed the greatest difficulties which libraries have had to overcome. They have imposed the thorny problems of personnel and book funds—problems that can be successfully solved only by greater specialization in the training of personnel and by stepped-up effort by university and library administrators in financing the libraries.

The papers show, however, how and with what degree of success these difficulties have been met. National foundations, learned societies, the federal government, through NDEA, the Library of Congress, through Public Law 480 programs, and the Farmington Plan, through a wider inclusion of countries and languages, have contributed to the solution of these problems. Such aid, however, will have to be increased if libraries are to perform their tremendously important function adequately.

The comment made at the beginning of the Introduction bears repetition here. These papers reveal an exciting development in American university libraries in the past fifteen years. This development has been extremely rapid. Book collections approximately requisite to the needs have multiplied across the nation. Librarians have adopted new procedures and have developed personnel to meet new conditions. University administrators have secured greatly enlarged

Introduction

library funds. The importance, rather the indispensability, of the library to teaching and research has been recognized as it never was before, a fact which present federal governmental support and the prospect of further, greater assistance heavily underscore.

References

1. "Book Publication Statistics for 1958," *Publishers' Weekly*, 175:39, Jan. 19, 1959; "1964: Subject Analysis of American Book Title Output," *Publishers' Weekly*, 187:57, Jan. 18, 1965. (Annual summary of statistics published each January.)
2. U.S. Library of Congress. *Monthly Index of Russian Accessions: History and Current Status*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, March 12, 1964, p. 7.
3. Figures based on Princeton University Library. "Statistics for College and University Libraries for the Fiscal Year 1950-51." Princeton, Princeton University Library, [1951]. (Mimeographed.)
4. Figures based on Research Libraries. "Academic Library Statistics, 1964-65." Association of Research Libraries, [1965]. (Mimeographed.)
5. Shaw, Charles B. *A List of Books for College Libraries*. 2nd preliminary ed. Chicago, American Library Association, 1931.