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Emerging Issues in National Resource Sharing:
The Case of Japanese Collections
Warren Tsuneishi Library of Congress

This paper was presented at a Workshop for Japanese Collection Librarians in American Research Libraries, held in Washington, D.C., August 28-30, 1978, under the sponsorship and direction of the Association of Research Libraries.

Library cooperation in the United States has had a long and venerable history, with some signal successes on the one hand and numerous failures on the other. The need for cooperation in cataloging, for example, led to the adoption of the standard 3x5 card before the turn of the century, and to the standardization of cataloging practice. In cooperative resource development and sharing, however, the successes have been rarer or have been more in the nature of expectation and hope than reality. The Farmington Plan, developed in the aftermath of the disclosure of the weakness of foreign language collections in American libraries during World War II, can be termed only a partial success. Interlibrary loan, counted as everyman's panacea, applies only to a minute percentage of total library transactions in any given period. Nevertheless, a series of dynamic factors--including the transformation of society into a post-industrial, information-consuming organism, the knowledge explosion, increasing costs of libraries coupled with decreasing sources of revenue, and radical technological changes in the transfer of information by electronic means--is forcing libraries to adopt new approaches to one of the fundamental functions and responsibilities of libraries, viz. the rational development of collections to meet user needs.

We stand today, therefore, at a new point in American library development where we must re-examine old assumptions, methods, and techniques in the development of our collections generally and of our unusual collections such as those in Japanese and other foreign languages specifically. It is my purpose here today to attempt to identify and examine some of the key issues which I see as requiring attention before we can move into that brave new world that beckons us, a national library network of interconnected parts providing timely, economical, and effective services to a clientele scattered throughout the nation.

Before turning to the issues themselves, however, I want to spend a moment or two discussing certain other factors which must be examined before we can effectively evaluate certain proposals that are being pressed upon us by those advocating local, regional, and national coordination of collection development. These factors relate first to the constituency we serve, and second to the collections we administer. Both of these, of course, have been addressed in papers by Marius Jansen and Hideo Kaneko, but I wish here to focus on certain unknowns that relate directly to the key issues that we will be examining.
The nature of the clientele. Libraries are service organizations, and the very first question that needs to be asked concerns the size and characteristics of the constituency served. One assumes that individual East Asian libraries continuously monitor their readers, and accordingly have a very clear picture of the number of clients they serve, the specific interests by subject matter and format as governed by existing and planned academic programs requiring library support, facility in the use of Japanese language materials, the extent and nature of the demand for materials not held locally, and the extent of dependence on research resources elsewhere, including Japan, which obviate the need for locally held materials.

A number of studies have analyzed at least the academic component of the potential users of Japanese collections. Thus a survey conducted covering the 1974-1975 period revealed some 846 academic specialists on Japan in American colleges and universities, with 45.9% specializing in the humanities, 41.7% in the social sciences, and 11.4% in the professions and other disciplines. In addition, some 971 students were enrolled in various graduate degree programs. In short, the study revealed about 1800 potential academic users of American collections.

According to a related study of the language competence of American specialists on Japan, about 93% indicated that they were able to utilize Japanese language material, some with difficulty, but more than one half claiming good facility in reading. Moreover, language skills varied with academic specialization. Language and literature specialists rank highest in the three skills of reading, writing, and speaking. In the reading, the highest ranking went to language and literature specialists, followed by those in political science, history, religion, anthropology, art, economics, sociology, and other disciplines.

These figures present us with a series of problems. In the academic world, at least 93% of specialists constitute a potential clientele for the Japanese collections being amassed in American academic libraries both large and small. Yet as underscored by Richard De Gennaro in his prize-winning article on resource sharing published in the journal American Libraries, substantial numbers of the American professoriate neither conduct current research nor publish, contrary to the "publish or perish" stereotype popularly held by the public. Even in the top-tier universities in the United States, 22% of the professors said that they had never or rarely published, compared with 40% at the second-tier institutions, 44% at the third-tier, and 80% at the lowest-tier institutions. On the other hand, when academics are asked where cutbacks should occur if needed, they respond by suggesting athletic programs (73%) as the first to be cut, with libraries coming at the bottom of the list (4%, along with faculty salaries). The reason for this strong support of libraries is that by and large "...the American academic profession is a teaching profession... Large majorities of the professoriate are not engaged in research work, don't publish much of anything, and described their interests as primarily in teaching... Faculty showed themselves, on the other hand, to be strongly resistant to cuts in expenditures for libraries... You and I might think of a library as a research enterprise, but at most American colleges and universities, it is primarily an instrument in the teaching program." Moreover, even among those who utilize our library resources and publish, a substantial number may be conducting a large part of their research in Japan, since the same survey shows that Japan has received far more American faculty members than any other country outside North America and Europe.

Coming closer to home, Professor Robert Ward of Stanford University has recently conducted a study of potential regional users of the East Asian libraries in the
Hoover Institution and the University of California, Berkeley. Responses were elicited from East Asian scholars in California, Texas, Arizona, and Colorado. Questions were asked on the use of Japanese language materials, the adequacy of private collections, publications resulting from research, use of libraries in Berkeley and Stanford, use of interlibrary loan services, methods of off-campus library research, availability of library catalogs, adequacy of local Japanese language resources and use of other libraries.

The results of this study have not yet been published, but a basic desideratum for the field is obviously a nationwide survey of this type to identify and analyze in depth the academic component of our constituency and our potential users as well. As to the latter, we are on even shakier grounds because we know very little about either the absolute numbers or the characteristics of those in business or government or from the Japanese ethnic community who are potential users and supporters of our collections. This, of course, stems from the traditional division of American libraries according to their clienteles, and since most East Asian collections serve academics, they have had little or no occasion to work with public, government, and special libraries in the service of their readers. But some of our public libraries—notably those in New York, San Francisco, and Honolulu—have modest collections in belle lettres and juvenilia for public circulation. Moreover, the National Library of Medicine, the National Agricultural Library, the Library of Congress, the Engineering Library in New York, the Linda Hall Library in Kansas City, and other special libraries assist in serving the need for Japanese technical and scientific literature. We should ask ourselves, therefore, to what extent it is feasible and salutary for academic, public, and special libraries to cooperate in serving specialized clienteles whose needs are inadequately met at the present time.

To summarize: we need to have the answers to a series of questions relating to the actual and potential constituency for Japanese library services before we can embark on any national effort to rationalize collection development efforts. We need answers to such questions as the following:

1. What is the size and the distribution by geography and discipline of the community of academic specialists on Japan? What use does it actually make of our collections, by direct visit or by interlibrary sharing of resources?

2. What is the number of potential non-academic users and what are their characteristics?

3. What practical, theoretical, and legal barriers stand in the way of closer cooperation among all segments of the library world in making available to a clientele scattered throughout the 50 states of the union expensive and scarce resources which are relatively little-used?

The nature of the collections. If we do not know enough about our readers, we may also be inadequately informed concerning the collections we supervise. I am sure that we individually have a very accurate knowledge of our collections, with respect to size, special strengths, weaknesses, and usefulness in responding to the needs of our local patrons. What concerns me here is the extent and depth of information we have on the collections as a whole, from the national perspective.
Quantitatively we are well served, in having available statistics gathered over the past quarter of a century on the growth and total size of the collections, as well as selected figures on personnel and acquisition costs, through the quinquennial surveys compiled by Dr. T. H. Tsien of Chicago. Thus we know that there are some 51 libraries in the U.S. with Japanese language holdings ranging in size from 1000 volumes to over 500,000. We know that there are some 21--those represented here today--with holdings in excess of 20,000 volumes. It has been suggested in an earlier study that the country needed some 20 research collections with collections in excess of 40,000 volumes including three with collections of some 250,000-500,000 volumes. On the other hand, as substantial funds have become available in recent years--directly from Japanese and U.S. Government sources, as well as from government and private foundations--there has developed a clear practice of limiting the special funding to 10 libraries in this country.

What then is the optimum number of such collections? Three? Ten? Twenty?

The optimum number of collections cannot be determined in vacuo. The most important variables which might lead us to such a number would appear to be the following: the total number of readers to be served and their distribution; the number of centers of Japanese studies offering graduate level programs requiring access to Japanese language materials; an analysis of these centers according to graduate instruction and research by major discipline; adequacy of existing collections to support graduate instruction and research; geographic distribution of centers and libraries; and total funding requirements for varying numbers of collections of various sizes and service potentials.

There is a clear correlation between universities offering comprehensive graduate programs in the humanities and social sciences and the extent of their library resources and those offering limited programs and their libraries. For example, according to the Massey study, some 15 universities, all with substantial collections, led the list of graduate course offerings in Japanese studies; while 14 which offered limited Ph.D. programs possessed relatively minor collections (with one exception).

Thus, the question of determining the optimum number of collections of various types--ranging from comprehensive research collections capable of supporting instructional and research programs in depth in the humanities and social sciences with some attention also to the professions, through more limited collections supporting research and teaching programs in selected subdisciplines such as history, political science and literature, to collections consisting essentially of basic reference sources comprising highly selected encyclopedias, dictionaries, and bibliographies--obviously is related as suggested to the optimum number of language and area studies centers required nationally. To date, I know of no overall objective effort to address this series of related questions. But in fact, the academic market place may have done the job of analysis for us already in establishing the present pattern of existing centers created by the push and pull of economizing forces in academia. What remains is to analyze existing centers and collections in greater depth to determine the degree of synchronization of research programs with research collections. The analysis will necessarily be largely quantitative in terms of disciplinary or subject coverage.

This leads inevitably to the next major element lacking in our attempt to assess and then develop the collections from the national point of view--namely, a
qualitative analysis in depth of existing Japanese libraries. Aside from Naomi Fukuda's 1962 study of selected Japanese collections in the United States, there has been no attempt to critically analyze all existing collections and to provide a guide to their specialized holdings. Dr. T. H. Tsiien, curator emeritus of the Far Eastern Library, University of Chicago, has long championed a project for the compilation of a directory of East Asian library resources along the lines of similar guides available for African studies and for East European studies, but to date without success. Miss Fukuda has also pressed for a directory of Japanese resources.

Such a directory would not only permit a qualitative assessment of our national strengths and weaknesses in Japanese language and related materials, it would serve as the general key to the unlocking of those resources to the scholarly public, thus providing the initial step in improving access to the collections.

Bibliographic controls and their relationship to problems of access. If we do not yet have a general key leading to the overall treasures hidden in our repositories, we nevertheless do have available a number of general and special catalogs useful for providing both generalized information on specific library resources as well as a quick check on locating individual Japanese language publications wanted by readers. Generally speaking, however, existing national bibliographies, while valuable, are less than satisfactory in providing information on Japanese resources. One need only glance through the two published versions of the National Union Catalog, the Union List of Serials, New Serial Titles, and the National Register of Microform Masters to realize that the omissions of Japanese language titles are of such magnitude that they cannot function in any substantially useful way to satisfy user needs. Into this vacuum of unmet needs have moved specialized publishers and individual libraries seeking to make known the contents of East Asian libraries beyond the local campuses they serve. We are fortunate, for example, to have the G. K. Hall catalogs for four of the top 10 academic libraries with strong Japanese collections—viz., those at California (Berkeley), the Hoover Institution, Chicago, and now Michigan. In addition, a partial record of LC's holdings—books and periodicals cataloged from 1957-1971—has been issued by G. K. Hall as the Far Eastern Languages Catalog; and the same firm has published the catalog of the Oriental Collection of the New York Public Library. Individual libraries, too, have issued special catalogs and lists over the years, such as the Arai-Gibu Catalog of the Glenn Shaw Collection at the East-West Center Library (Honolulu: 1967); the University of Michigan Asia Library's A Select List of Japanese Serials (Ann Arbor: 1973); and the University of Chicago Far Eastern Library's Far Eastern Serials (Chicago: 1977). Other guides, such as the Union Card File of Oriental Vernacular Serials: Japanese Titles (Washington, D. C.: 1965, available from the Photoduplication Service, Library of Congress), need updating.

Despite the availability of these catalogs, there still remain major libraries whose contents are not readily known and accessible beyond the confines of the campuses on which, in effect, they are imprisoned. Notable in this group are the Japanese collections in the Harvard-Yenching Library in Cambridge; in the East Asian Collection at Yale; in the East Asian Library at Columbia; in the Gest Oriental Library and East Asian Collection at Princeton; in the highly specialized East Asian Collection at the University of Maryland; in the Oriental Library of the University of California, Los Angeles; in the Asian Collection, University of Hawaii; and of course in the Library of Congress. All of these are substantial collections, ranging in size from 50,000 to over half a million volumes. Inability
to locate wanted titles through published catalogs in six of the top 10 collections is a major deficiency in the national bibliographical apparatus. The problem was addressed in the recent study conducted by the American Council of Learned Societies on problems affecting East Asian libraries, with a recommendation that an East Asian National Union Catalog project be given first priority attention.21

Once a desired collection or work is located, there remains for the scholar the problem of gaining physical access to the collection or title. The traditional method of intramural consultation on the library premises is, of course, a popular and still widely used remedy for the lack of local resources, and will continue to play a major role in the provision of service to Japanese language materials. Possible ways of assisting readers who have come from substantial distances need to be explored with a view to facilitating such visits. Already individual libraries which have been the recipients of major grants are offering grants for travel and living expenses. The Asia Library at the University of Michigan and the Gest Collection of Princeton are cases in point. Others offer a waiver of substantial user fees—for example Harvard and Yale. Moreover, the Northeast Asia Council of the Association for Asian Studies has been making available small travel-research grants over the past two years to enable American scholars in Japanese and Korean Studies located in colleges and universities lacking strong library resources to travel to centers of strength to utilize their collections.

We are clearly seeing the emergence of a certain pattern: scarce financial resources are being channeled to a small number—ten—of research centers and collections. The services offered by such collections are being broadened to include non-local patrons. Put in other words, a small percentage of funds potentially available for national development of collections is being diverted not to purchase publications but to move researchers to the publications. This is a trend requiring close attention since its implications for national funding for certain collections are quite obvious.

In addition to direct access; there are also the usual extramural remote-use methods, primarily interlibrary loan and photoduplication. The frustrations of interlibrary loan are so well-known that they need not detain us here except to list them. They include the lack of comprehensive union catalogs and union lists already mentioned; intolerable delays in the processing of requests22; delays in the U.S. Postal Service which have led, in some communities, to the establishment of commercial library express services; unavailability of materials located but not-on-shelf or not sendable; and libraries being disproportionately besieged by loan requests. In the Japanese case, this imbalance may become even greater as funding agencies set as one of their conditions the making available of works freely to regional as well as national users.

The photoreproduction of desired materials also has its defects, including lengthy lead times and high costs for filming or reproduction. There are, in addition, hidden costs to the lending library since books photocopied are susceptible to damage in the copying process. In some cases, the loosening or cutting of bindings is necessary, thus leading to the excessive or premature deterioration of works and the attendant costs of preservation measures. In our eagerness to serve the present reader, we often overlook the danger of placing heavy costs on future use. There is also the additional problem of copyright protection of photocopied material, although at least one observer concludes that the new U.S. copyright law will have little or no effect on photocopying by libraries.23
In the future looms the possibility of telefacsimile transmission of entire texts. For ordinary library purposes, existing devices appear to be too costly and too slow. Recent advances in telecommunications equipment, however, both in increasing capacity to transmit and in lowering of capital and operating costs, suggest that the facsimile transmission of at least relatively short texts may well become an important feature of library service in the not too distant future.

Problems related to coordinated collection development. The ACLS Steering Committee for a Study of the Problems of East Asian Libraries in its report suggested action on four basic categories of material requiring attention in the development of a national resource sharing system. They are: 1) national cooperation on the acquisition of retrospective materials, including a greater effort on the part of LC to acquire older publications and some division of labor in acquisitions efforts; 2) inclusion of East Asian materials in the program of the proposed National Periodicals Center; 3) inclusion of East Asian books in the planning for a national current foreign monograph collection dedicated to interlibrary loan; 4) support of national documentation centers with special attention to ephemera and fugitive materials not easily acquired by libraries.

I should like to take a somewhat different approach in the discussion of cooperation and coordination in collection development at the national level. But before we contemplate the problems faced by individual libraries in attempting to meld their collections into the developing network of libraries, let me first outline very briefly a certain emerging consensus on how the problem might be attacked from the national perspective.

The concept of a national library network has been with us for some time. Its essential rationale was clearly spelled out in the report prepared by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science in its 1975 report entitled Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services. Networking may be seen as an attempt to use modern electronic transmission and information processing equipment to solve a number of major problems faced by libraries, such as increased costs of acquiring, organizing, housing, preserving, and servicing of library materials; difficulties in recruiting and compensating skilled staff knowledgeable in a wide range of languages and subjects; the growth of knowledge; varying levels of resources and funding; costs of sharing relatively little-used materials; and the need to serve ill-served constituencies. The Commission suggested that library functions which could obviously benefit from networking include cataloging, interlibrary lending, and "coordinated acquisition" programs.

Unique collections and major resources are to be made available nationwide with "unique collections" being defined as "a body of materials and information which share a common characteristic, such as form (newspapers), period (Renaissance), language (Japanese), or subject (chemistry)." Very heavy responsibilities are laid on the Library of Congress, envisioned as functioning as the National Library in the National Program. Included are: 1) expansion of lending activities to those of a National Lending Library of final resort, together with improvements in photocopying-preservation programs and in interlibrary communications and document and text delivery systems; 2) expansion of NPAC; and 3) operation of a National Serials Service.

The establishment of a national collection of monographs dedicated to interlibrary loan and housed at the Library of Congress is still very much a vision for the distant future. Prospects are dim for the further expansion of NPAC either to
extend country coverage or to expand coverage of library materials beyond monographs.

The development of such a national library network assumes, among other things, a well-developed system of bibliographic controls and a mature system for the computer processing of multiscript bibliographic data. We have observed that bibliographic controls for Japanese language materials are in an imperfect state of development. Moreover, in the case of East Asian language materials written with Chinese characters, a major problem arises in the electronic processing and transmission of bibliographic data. As to technical solutions there is no end, as we have seen in numerous text processing systems developed in Japan, Taiwan, Korea, England, and the U.S. Currently the Library of Congress has the capacity to incorporate only Roman letter cataloging data into its MARC data base, and it is still several years away from Chinese character text capabilities. OCLC recently received an NEH grant to experiment with the computer processing of non-Roman data--except for bibliographic data in East Asian scripts. The California Library Authority for Systems and Services is investigating the feasibility of utilizing existing computer systems to handle Chinese character texts.

Several problems remain before a system can be developed which can be employed in an American environment. First, there is the problem of the development of a standard character set for Chinese logographs usable not only in the U.S. but also in China, Japan, and Korea. This includes technical orthographic problems, but the primary issue is probably political, since any solution should ideally involve international agreement among the five governments of East Asia alone. Second, there is the further problem of the development of digital coding necessary to generate Chinese and other characters by computer on a CRT. The U.S. interagency group known as the Chinese-English Translation Assistance (CETA) project has digitalized some 14,000 Chinese characters, and this coding has been adopted by the Cambridge University Chinese Language Project. It is possible that this coding will become an Anglo-American standard. Third, and most important, there is the cost-effective problem. Simply put, the question is whether the amount of traffic generated for cataloging and reference purposes by the American library community can ever justify the substantial capital and operating cost requirements of a national system. Even for other non-logographic, non-Roman alphabet scripts--such as those used for the transcription of Cyrillic, Hebraic, and Arabic texts--the interim solution being proposed is conversion to Romanized forms. While the Committee on East Asian Libraries has taken the stand that Romanized texts are unacceptable, economic requirements may well force the use of Romanized bibliographic entries, at least for the immediate future.

Even if bibliographic control and technical requirements can be met, there is, as many recent observers have suggested, a human factor to be taken into consideration. For example, in an address at the 1978 annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies, Warren J. Haas, the new President of the Council on Library Resources, stated that he saw four issues dominating the academic research library scene during the next few years. He described these as: "1) the development of a comprehensive computerized bibliographic system pulling together fragmented and disparate elements which have been created to date; 2) the establishment of a national collection of materials, commencing with a National Periodicals Center...; 3) the evolution of a national library system as bibliographic controls and national collections slowly develop; and 4) the promotion of changes in the library and information science professions which are needed to respond to fundamental changes occurring in the field." He emphasized the need to promote
change in the attitudes and values of professional librarians and information scientists, and argued for "the basic need to come to grips with the conflict between centralization of services and the autonomy of individual libraries."  

Robert F. Moran of the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, makes much the same point on the need for attitudinal change in a recent article on "Library Cooperation and Change." Moran points out that despite a long history of proposals and projects for cooperative acquisitions and resource sharing, in fact such programs have had little impact, and he concludes that before significant improvements can occur, "basic attitudinal and methodological changes are necessary." He dubs changes that have been made "essentially cosmetic;" suggests that "librarians are not really committed to cooperation as a key means to the achievement of library goals;" and that the "majority of academic librarians continue to believe and act as though almost all needs of their clients can or ought to be met through the client's library." Patricia Battin, Mr. Haas's successor at Columbia as University Librarian, suggested in a recent luncheon address to Washington, D. C. area librarians that the reason for the tenacity with which librarians hold to outmoded views of libraries as autonomous institutions lies in the quintessentially American "philosophy of expansionism and infinite resources."

Whatever the ultimate sources of our dysfunctional lack of cooperation, it is clear that when we consider concrete programs of action the problems appear to be of such an overwhelming nature that very little of substance is accomplished, as Moran suggests. Take, for example, proposals relating to: 1) the National Periodicals Center; 2) the Center for Research Libraries; and 3) coordinated collection development.

The National Periodicals Center. American libraries appear to be facing a crisis in periodicals because of rising costs—of subscriptions, of processing, and of servicing—at a time when acquisition budgets are static or shrinking. A national program to address the problem has been recommended by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences, and the benefits to be derived by the East Asian library community include: broader access for local users, greater selectivity in local serials collection development, better use of limited storage facilities, and improved preservation control.

There is envisioned a 3-level program commencing with local, state, and regional library systems responsible for meeting routine requests at Level 1; then moving to a National Periodicals Center or Centers possessing comprehensive sets of periodicals dedicated to lending and photocopying at Level 2; and ending with existing national library and other specialized collections as libraries of last resort at level 3.

The Library of Congress, the Center for Research Libraries, and the Universal Serials and Book Exchange are mentioned as possible bases of the National Periodicals Center. The Task Force has recommended that LC operate and manage the Center. LC in turn requested that the Council on Library Resources study their recommendation, and as of the date of this writing, the Council was momentarily expected to submit its study.

In the Japanese field, Hideo Kaneko earlier this year conducted a survey of costs of Japanese periodicals for the Japan-U. S. Friendship Commission, and his report suggests that the major academic libraries are subscribing to varying numbers of titles—ranging from 164 to 620 at a cost of around $6,400 to $13,000 per year—
with the Library of Congress subscribing to some 1,248 serial titles at a cost of about $38,000 a year. The smaller libraries appear to be apportioning a larger percentage of their book budgets to periodical subscriptions. This is a good beginning on the problem of journals, but obviously more is needed. For example, we need not only to update the *Union List of Oriental Vernacular Serials: Japanese Titles*, but we also need a master survey of journals important to Japanese studies. From such a list, we can commence planning for a possible division of collecting responsibilities to insure adequate coverage of the journal literature. In a recent check of LC's current Japanese serials holdings against such a standard list—*Current Contents of Academic Journals in Japan: the Humanities and the Social Sciences*—we were startled to discover that we were not receiving 48 of the 214 titles indexed. Whatever LC's role may be in the national program to rationalize periodicals control, LC will have to improve its accessions to be able to discharge its responsibilities.

Another promising project is the proposed publication of Japanese government serials in microfiche by the National Diet Library. We need to investigate why this project was received so coolly when first proposed some years ago; and to what extent the currently revived plan will meet our needs. In this connection we need to consider the national responsibilities of two current depositories of government documents, LC and the University of California, Berkeley.

It is clear then, that in the problem area of the control of periodicals flowing into our collections from Japan we need to adopt a multi-pronged attack in order to facilitate the work of the National Periodicals Center and its objective of reducing costs to us individually while, at the same time, improving service to readers. We need an informed assessment of the universe of Japanese serials with an eye to selecting—or having selected for us, preferably by our colleague specialists in Japan—those journals indispensable for Japanese studies programs. We need an updated union list of Japanese serials showing current holdings, thus indicating the extent to which Level 1 libraries can be expected to respond to needs of local scholars. We need, if it is possible to do so, some allocation or division of responsibilities for the coverage of lesser used journals, perhaps by subject. We need to be able to recommend to the National Periodicals Center a list of those journals for which it should take responsibility. And finally, we need to know what is held, especially by the Library of Congress and other specialized libraries.

**Center for Research Libraries.** The closing of European libraries to American scholars during World War II was the impetus behind the Farmington Plan idea of having at least one copy of a research work in an American library. That idea, considerably modified, still governs selections for the collections of the Center for Research Libraries, which concentrates on certain types of material for which, predictably, there will be low demand at the local, regional, or even national level. CRL has, as a consequence, accepted responsibility for such material as retrospective journals, foreign dissertations, and microfilms of archival documents. In the case of foreign language material, CRL has established a series of organized programs to acquire, especially in microform, highly specialized material through its cooperative microform programs covering Africana (Cooperative Africana Microform Program, or CAMP), South Asia (SAMP), Southeast Asia (SEAM), and Latin America (LAMP). CRL also acquires for its member libraries individual microforms of East Asian language materials, e.g., the *Asahi Shimbun* microfilm. Such material is of course available on interlibrary loan to researchers belonging to member universities. One question which has been raised often, so far without
results but which now needs to be considered seriously, is the establishment of an EAMP—an East Asian Microform Program, one component of which would be Japanese microfilm and microfiche publications. The knowledge that sets of certain high-priced documentary collections from Japan repose in the collections of CRL should comfort Japanese bibliographers seeking to squeeze the last yen out of tight book budgets.

Collection analysis and coordinated acquisitions. In his pessimistic forecast of hard times ahead for research libraries, Richard De Gennaro, whose article has been cited previously, concludes that while resource sharing is essential, it is not a panacea, and that major economies will not be possible through interlibrary lending, regional consortia, or networking. "The importance of resource sharing mechanisms," he states, "and particularly the most cost-effective ones—the centralized libraries' libraries, such as the Center for Research Libraries and the British Lending Library Division—is not so much that they will save us funds we can reallocate to other purposes, but that they will permit us to continue to have access to a large universe of materials we can no longer afford, spending our diminishing funds on the materials we need and use most."37

How then do we determine "the materials we need and use most?" How do we insure that we will continue to have "access to a large universe of materials" we can no longer afford? One way is to re-examine the basic assumptions undergirding our collection development efforts, and here we are fortunate in having available a very interesting program being conducted by the Collections Analysis Project (CAP) of the ARL Office of Management Studies. Essentially CAP attempts to examine traditional methods of allocating funds for collection development based on virtually automatic increments to existing programs. It seeks to develop a more rational system, taking into account a whole host of variables, including university program needs, book and journal prices, availability of publications, forecasts of price increases, and a continuous and continuing review of the collections and their relationship to changing instructional and research programs. Moreover, the impact of resource sharing projects must be taken into consideration since an obvious tactic to reduce cost is not to allocate scarce funds for low-use or expensive materials known to be accessible elsewhere.

In a report of CAP to ARL, Jeffrey J. Gardner pointed out a paradox when he observed that research library collections "are supported primarily to serve local program needs, but they are--individually and in the aggregate—a national resource. This dual role has brought with it special responsibilities which create tension between serving university program needs and serving national needs."38 The problem is, of course, that local institutions have traditionally borne, and will probably continue to bear for some time, a national burden without major compensating subsidization from either the national treasury or from national sources. On the other hand, some relief is already in sight in programs funded by, for example, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission where one requirement is that the applying institution must justify its proposal in terms of serving regional or national needs.

In a paper accompanying Gardner's report, Duane Webster describes four specific aspects of CAP--operating practices, collection assessment, resource sharing, and preservation. With regard to resource sharing, he explains that "it examines the influence of evolving national and regional programs in the library's collection programs."39
It is this dimension—the influence wielded by neighboring, regional, and national programs on local decisions on collection development—that will be most interesting to watch during the coming years.

Equally vital under CAP is the attempt to formulate a clear statement of developmental policy. This attempt to rationalize the collection development process includes such features as a statement of general purpose (e.g., support of teaching and research), language restrictions, geographical and chronological limitations, types of material collected or excluded, breakdowns by discipline or subject, and levels of collecting. Typically there may be five levels of collecting, as defined in one of the earlier guides, available and issued in 1970 by Stanford, entitled *Book Selection Policies of the Libraries of Stanford University.* The levels are as follows:

A. Intensive. Sufficient to support doctoral and postdoctoral research.
B. Comprehensive. A step below A, with certain restrictions on materials e.g., mss.
C. Beginning research.
D. Teaching level.
E. Reference level.

The specific "Book Selection Policy" for East Asia indicates that the purpose is to support doctoral and postdoctoral research; that Japanese language materials and the geographic area of Japan are to be covered; that all historical periods are to be covered but with emphasis on modern times; that the humanities are to be covered at level D (Teaching); history and the social and political sciences at level C (Beginning research); and pre-modern history at level D. There is no mention of the natural sciences.

It will be interesting to monitor the evolution of Stanford's collecting policy as cooperation and coordination of activities between Stanford and the University of California broaden and deepen, particularly in view of the "multi-level system" advocated by the University of California. The concept here is multiple levels of libraries as contrasted to the traditional view of a single level autonomous campus library ("level" here is, of course, used in an entirely different meaning from that of the preceding paragraph). The system as proposed is to consist of six levels of libraries, including departmental and college, campus, regional, university and state, national, and international libraries. At both the regional and university/state levels, there is to be coordination with private and other state local libraries in the entire "system." Already in existence is the U.C. Berkeley-Stanford Research Cooperative Program in which the library resources of two major universities within 75 miles of each other are made available to users on both campuses through such means as improved telecommunications, and the provision of jitney service (the Gutenberg Express) to move both researchers and books between the two campuses on a twice daily basis. If this experiment is continued and further developed, it cannot help but influence the collecting policies of each of the libraries, especially since, in the East Asian field, the two tend to complement each other.

In summary. Throughout this paper I have pointed to a number of issues requiring attention before we move on to the next stage in the national development of Japanese collections in American libraries. These are, in a sense, preconditions to further progress, since little movement is possible without additional analysis and development. In summing up, let me merely list these issues as an indication...
of the magnitude of the overall problems facing us:

1. An in-depth study of our clientele, actual and potential.
2. An in-depth analysis of our collections leading to the determination of the optimum number of collections needed as well as to the publication of a directory of resources and of essential union catalogs and lists.
3. Improvements in interlibrary sharing, including improving access to collections by scholars wherever located through direct visits and extramural lending and photocopying activities.
4. Developing the capability to process Chinese and Japanese character texts by computer.
5. Compilation of a master list of serials required to support research in Japanese studies, and providing recommendations for the proposed National Periodicals Center.
7. Possible establishment of an East Asian Microform Program under the auspices of the CRL.
8. Drafting of collection analysis statements taking into consideration evolving regional and national resource banks, thus leading eventually to the coordinated development of collections at the regional and national levels.

Related issues which I have been unable to touch upon include provision for documentation centers which focus on contemporary political, economic, and social trends and which collect specialized materials—such as social science data and ephemera—not easily acquired by libraries; the role of the Library of Congress in the evolving network of libraries, especially with respect to the responsibility for collecting Japanese material; and problems relating to the staffing, housing, and preservation of our collections. The list of our problems is long indeed, but we are fortunate in one respect in having available for the first time the financial resources needed to address the problems that have bedevilled us for so long. The result is that instead of merely reacting to the crises of the day, we now have the opportunity through workshops such as this to examine long range solutions to our problems. I trust that this will be the first in a series of workshops.
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