



An even more political problem is the question as to whether and how all the scholarly libraries of a country can be welded into a meaningful whole and brought into purposeful cooperation. This problem will be solved differently in each country, depending on what the ruling principles of political and social order may be.

A university's book supply is organized differently in Germany than in the United States. In an analysis of the differences, one encounters immediately the two problems stressed by IFLA: the relationship of the main or central library to those of the faculties, divisions, and institutes, and the relationship of the university library to other libraries in the country. Library coordination and cooperation within the realm of the university are closer in the United States than in Germany, in fact very much closer. Contrarily, cooperation between university libraries and other libraries in the United States is less intimate and less commonplace than in Germany. True, there is coordination and joint action between American libraries in a regional pattern, but the giant university libraries stress their independence and have a low opinion of inter-library loan transactions.<sup>2</sup> The American concept is that it should not be the rule but a sparsely adopted exception. In Germany, on the other hand, all scholarly libraries are closely knitted together by means of a practically unrestricted, generally functioning inter-library loan service<sup>3</sup> which works almost automatically and by way of a system of central catalogs, which shows no gaps.<sup>4</sup> The continental dimensions of the United States, the contiguity of private and public libraries, the existence of numerous competing libraries besides those of the universities, and the desire to preserve, if possible, the autonomy of the university and its library did not permit the prospering of a unified system of all scholarly libraries in the United States. For the United States it may, therefore, be admitted that the German example, a typical product of state administration, has little attractiveness.

Those who have held posts as librarians for any length of time know full well how infrequent are the situations in which the librarian can freely and expertly act, without being bound or restricted by external decisions and special interests, or by financial or political situations. It is not the librarian who has the power to change the world, but the librarian must see how he can best adjust to the world as it is. This is an experience strongly impressed upon us during the last fifty years. It is not within the personal judgment of the librarian as

### *European University Libraries: Germany*

to how far he wishes to centralize the libraries of a university, or as to how far he can go in the direction of coordination or of autonomy, or as to what degree the libraries of a country, including the university libraries, should function autonomously or be administered centrally in a coordinated system.

The general trend is apparently in the direction of increased differentiation and specialization of library types and at the same time towards a growing coordination of all kinds of libraries within large regions or even an entire country. Methods for attaining such coordination differ widely. They stretch from “. . . coordinate decentralization . . .,” the term used by Metcalf<sup>5</sup> to describe the actual situation of the Harvard University Library, to the rigid centralism of the university library in Moscow.<sup>6</sup> Countries which are governed centrally and which manage their libraries according to a collective plan attempt to reach the necessary coordination through a system of country-wide regulations and by a meaningful allotment of financial support. Countries where these premises are lacking grant their libraries and their librarians a larger degree of freedom to make decisions. Modern scholarly research undoubtedly demands planning in all its institutions. Libraries being the auxiliaries of research, instruction, and information must try to conform to these needs. In those countries which are not run by a system of national planning, the development of commissions and corporations is the typical way of adapting the varying interests of all participants and of effecting a commonly agreed upon procedure.

In the Federal Republic of Germany there are the German Research Association (*Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*)<sup>7</sup> which is a self-administered organization of German scholarship with its own committee for research libraries; the Scientific Advisory Council (*Wissenschaftsrat*)<sup>8</sup> founded in 1958, which makes recommendations to the federal and state governments concerning the financial support of research libraries; and the Association of German [Research] Librarians (*Verein deutscher Bibliothekare*) which has its own subject committees for the discussion of library problems<sup>9</sup> and which submits recommendations for their solution. The ministries of education of the individual states (*Länder*) decide whether and to what extent the recommendations should be accepted. In East Germany, too, there are committees of library experts,<sup>10</sup> but they are not associations of individuals, but rather part of the machinery of the government. Di-

rectives are issued by the secretary of state for universities and other schools of higher learning (Staatssekretariat für Hoch- und Fachschulwesen) to which all scholarly libraries of Eastern Germany are subject. University libraries in West Germany may, therefore, be said to be administered on a federative basis while those in East Germany are governed centrally.

Before turning to a more detailed examination of the German university library, we ought to inquire as to what means of organization exist for arranging relationships between the libraries of a university, a region, or a state. It seems that three different modes of procedure may be distinguished.

1. *Coordinate decentralization.* Here the university librarian has administrative authority over all branches of the university library, and the main library possesses a union catalog of all library holdings. Beyond that, the administration is characterized by far-reaching autonomy. The university administration decides how the financial resources are to be distributed among the individual libraries comprising the whole system. Faculties and individual faculty members are actively engaged in collection building. Cooperation with libraries outside the pale of the university is weak.

2. *Divided administration of main and departmental libraries.* In this case each library encompassed within the university manages its own funds, purchases independently of the others, and maintains its own catalog. The main library is administered without faculty participation and belongs to a network of state libraries operating through interlibrary loan service and regional union catalogs.

3. *Centralization.* Here the main library has the function of a central library and is entitled to make decisions on purchase and distribution of all books, while the institutes merely have the privilege of making recommendations. The central library acceptions and catalogs all new acquisitions and is part of a system of centrally guided research libraries of the state.

Fitting the type of the German university library into this scale of possibilities, it appears that it belongs to the second group with divided administration of main and departmental libraries. In Germany only the main library is called the "university library." This shows unmistakably that the complex of the main library and the institute libraries of a German university is no administrative unity. There are other distinctive characteristics of the type of the German university library:

### *European University Libraries: Germany*

*a.* The library is without exception established by a state or a municipality. Thus there are in Germany no large private university libraries such as at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton.

*b.* It is always staffed and administered by professional librarians, who are not appointed by the university. The chief librarian decides, independently of the faculties, how the financial resources, budgeted annually by the state, are to be distributed.

*c.* The main library has closed stacks and circulates books, in contrast to the institute libraries which have open access and are non-lending libraries. It chiefly answers the needs of teaching and research of the university, but it must at the same time function as a scholarly municipal or state library. Its interlibrary loan service is impressive since its holdings are listed in regional union catalogs and thus accessible to all other libraries.<sup>11</sup>

*d.* The main library does not form an administrative unit with the libraries of the university's institutes. These are headed by the institute directors who are university professors. Institute libraries have their own budgets, not dependent on that of the main library, and they maintain their own catalogs. Union catalogs of all the institute libraries within a university are found only occasionally.

In East German universities there has been a change in the relationship between main and institute libraries during the last ten years. But in West Germany the traditionally complete autonomy of the institute libraries from the main library is still typical. In East Germany the tendency, engendered by centralistic library policies, is to permit the director of the university library to assume growing influence over the administrative processes of institute libraries and to unify the administrative apparatus of the main library and the institute libraries by appropriate means.<sup>12</sup> In this connection there are demands for union catalogs of all the holdings in the several libraries of the university. Earlier attempts of this kind soon lost impetus in the Prussian universities. Today it will be found difficult to adopt such measures for long established libraries with large holdings, but even in West Germany the conviction is growing that they are justified in the case of newly established universities.

To sum up, the German university library is a state institution, associated with the university, but not under the authority of the faculties. At the same time it is a part of a cooperative system made up of all German state and municipal research libraries. It is, therefore,

placed in a position along the borders between the university and the public domain. Similar to the clinic of the university, it is an institution which is to serve not only professors and students, but all citizens equally.

This defines what is common to all German university libraries. But even before 1945 there was no absolute uniformity among these libraries. In fact they had less of it than one might imagine with state institutions. They differ not only, as a matter of course, with respect to age and size, but also, to a smaller or larger degree, in their way of doing their work, in the number and character of their catalogs, in the way in which books are shelved in the stacks, in the number and training of their employees—even in the case of libraries with similar objectives. These differences have posed some eminently practical problems, as for instance when, some years ago, the resources of several university libraries, which had not been cataloged according to uniform rules, were to be listed in a regional catalog.

#### *The History of German University Libraries*

The lack of conformity is based on the fact that there never was a single unified German state and that there is none today. Thus it was not possible for a uniform type of university library to develop. This was true for the Empire (1871-1918), for the Weimar Republic (1919-1933), and for Germany since 1945.

The Empire was a federal government which comprised princely states of great differences in size and power. The most important of these was Prussia. Education and schools, universities and their libraries (with the exception of Strassburg), and archives and museums were not within the responsibility of the central government, but rather of the individual states (Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Württemberg, Baden, etc.). The Federal principle in the field of education was a consequence of the political situation after 1871 and remained significant for the universities and their libraries. Not much was basically changed during the time of the Weimar Republic, except for a few simplifications and corrections.

The Third Reich attempted to place all scholarly libraries under the authority of a central ministry of education; this had its origin in the Prussian ministry of education. An all-German council for library affairs (Reichsbeirat für Bibliotheksangelegenheiten) served in an advisory capacity and as such was fashioned on the Prussian advisory council, dating back to 1907.<sup>13</sup> The practical results of this state of

### *European University Libraries: Germany*

affairs, which lasted only from 1936 to 1945, were minimal. Preparation and conduct of the war devoured all available strength, and the interest of the state in research libraries was far from vital. The old rivalries and tensions in library affairs were sharpened rather than settled. The lack of foreign exchange made the purchase of foreign publications difficult, all new construction came to a standstill, and buildings as well as book collections were decimated by evacuations, destruction, and fire.<sup>14</sup>

The federal structure of German educational policy explains why there has never been a real German national library, such as the Bibliothèque Nationale in France. The tasks of a German national library were performed by two libraries, which substituted for this lack: The Prussian State Library in Berlin<sup>15</sup> (the largest and most modern research library in Germany besides the Bavarian State Library in Munich), and the German Library in Leipzig (Deutsche Bücherei)<sup>16</sup> founded in 1912 by German bookdealers as a repository and central bibliographic institute for all publications printed in the German language.

The Prussian State Library and the ten Prussian university libraries (Berlin, Bonn, Breslau, Göttingen, Greifswald, Halle, Kiel, Königsberg, Marburg, and Münster) formed a closed system. Their chief librarians were responsible not to their universities but directly to the ministry of education in Berlin. This type of political centralism can be either good or bad; in this case it was good. Especially through the activity of the ministerial director, Friedrich Althoff (1882-1907), the Prussian libraries became the object of energetic reforms and models for well-planned library cooperation.<sup>17</sup> The effect on all German libraries was deep and is noticeable in part even today in the training of academic and certified librarians, in the Prussian Instructions for alphabetical cataloging, in the forms of inter-library loan service, and in assigning special fields of collection development (Sondersammelgebiete) to different libraries.

There were also some failures, as for instance in the ordering of the relationship between main and institute libraries of the universities, and in the cataloging of manuscripts. The Second World War was responsible for much destruction, such as of the printed union book catalog (originally the Prussian, later the German *Gesamtkatalog*). Other undertakings came to stagnation, such as the general catalog of incunabula (*Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*). No matter what one may think about political centralism, Prussia set a model

for all German libraries of what may be reached with limited means if there is conscientious, intelligent, and coordinated effort.

It is impressive to ponder in how short a period the type of the German state university library was developed. It is a creation of the late nineteenth century. It assumed its characteristic features after 1870. It reached its full flower between 1890 and 1914.

In that period the university libraries were supplied with their own buildings planned for their special purposes, with reading rooms, catalog rooms, and bookstacks. This development began in the 1870's in Halle, after 1880 there followed Kiel and Greifswald, about 1890 Leipzig, in 1895 Strassburg, about 1900 Marburg, Königsberg, Freiburg, Heidelberg, Giessen, and after 1910 and before the First World War Tübingen, Berlin, Erlangen, and Jena.

In this period it also became accepted practice that university libraries should be run and administered by librarians who were scholars but who became librarians by profession and who concentrated their professional work on the library.

Up to that time the university library was a collection of books, more or less imposing, and, apart from the truly famous and frequently cited example of Göttingen, the haphazard result of purchases and bequests by professors and of gifts. The library was administered by professors for professors. It had usually some assistants who were poorly paid and who frequently held only part-time positions. The library served scholarly studies, chiefly philological and historical investigations. It was open only a few hours a day. It was not a public service institution open without restriction to any reader from any calling or profession; it was not even open for any student, but was rather an internal and fairly exclusive institute of the academic corporation. It was, measured against modern examples, not very large. The five largest German university libraries in 1875 had collections of between 300,000 and 400,000 volumes; these were Göttingen, Heidelberg, Leipzig, Breslau, and Strassburg. Approximately one-half of the twenty-one German university libraries in 1875 held only between 100,000 and 200,000 volumes.<sup>18</sup> Scholarly publication lacked the linguistic and subject diversity of the present day and its world-wide comprehensiveness. A professor possessed the most important publications in his subject field in his own private library.

It is recorded in the handwritten Acts of the University Library of Heidelberg that when Jakob Wille (director of the Heidelberg University Library, 1902-1922) for the first time, in the fall of 1873 as a



### *European University Libraries: Germany*

young student, visited the reading room of the old university library in Heidelberg, he described his impressions in these words: "On the following day I was sitting in a small reading room, together with a few visitors, who returned time after time like habitual guests in an inn. Along two walls was arranged the small catalog, whose volumes the very helpful librarian Dr. Bender pushed back and forth, sometimes provoked in bad humour because Gutenberg ever invented the art of printing. This he did while walking about in large, silent felt slippers, unless he was engaged in entering new titles in his firm handwriting. In the center of the so-called hall there were a few clumsy tables which reminded one strongly of the furniture of an old inn."

This then was the appearance of the university library at Heidelberg in October 1873: a *small* reading room, *few* readers, a catalog of *small compass* handwritten by an academic librarian. In the same year Karl Zangemeister took over the management of the university library as its first professional librarian. The university directory lists four persons as employees during the winter semester of 1873/74: the chief librarian (Zangemeister), the librarian (Dr. Bender), a curator (Dr. Hinck), and a servant by the name of Bischoff. During this semester the university was attended by 640 students who were instructed by 41 professors *ordinarii*, and 27 professors *extraordinarii*. There were also two honorary professors and 29 *private dozents*.<sup>19</sup>

These were small and easily manageable conditions. There were such outstanding scientists as Kirchhoff and Bunsen who lectured that semester on experimental physics and experimental chemistry in Heidelberg University. The hours of the library were Wednesday and Saturday from 2 to 4 p.m., and on other weekdays from 10 a.m. to noon. The problems of organization which nowadays occupy university libraries came into existence only after the tremendous expansion of modern universities, and through an ever-increasing degree of specialized investigation and teaching, and because of an ever-faster growing number of students. Even in 1873, although Heidelberg was one of the oldest and largest German university libraries, it was administered in a way which nowadays would not even be considered sufficient for the library of a small college.

From this incompletely cataloged, haphazardly collected bookstock, such as Zangemeister met in Heidelberg, there developed within the span of a few decades a huge library with new catalogs, in a new building, with holdings continuously increased on a planned basis.

This expansion is typical of the history of most of the German university libraries. It was cut short by the First World War. Between 1914 and 1954 there were approximately normal conditions in Germany only between the years 1925 (the end of inflation) and 1930. These near-normal conditions were ended all too quickly by the world economic crisis, political confusion, and in 1933 by the advent of the Third Reich. In 1925 Hugo Andres Krüss had been named general director of the Prussian State Library. It was mainly thanks to him that the German research libraries regained contact with the scholarly libraries of other countries after the end of the First World War. But this initiative and this new beginning of the late twenties remained without solid results and in the end perished in the catastrophe of National Socialism. This was no time for libraries to flourish. The consequences were incisive, and present day German libraries cannot be judged unless seen against the background of these political events.

A new beginning was possible only when political and economic conditions in Germany began to consolidate. The most important presupposition for this was the introduction of a new monetary system in 1948. The conceptions of the four occupying powers as to what to do with German universities were quite dissimilar. In the French zone a new university was founded as early as 1946 in Mainz with its own library. Together with the entire university, it was first quartered in a former barracks. Now a new building has been constructed to be opened in 1964. Also on French initiative a "European" university was established in Saarbrücken in 1948. After the Saar referendum in 1956 the library, built between 1952 and 1954, was given a German director. The building has the classic division of the three area groups (public rooms, administrative offices, and a bookstack which is housed in a towerlike part of the building).

Similarly, the peculiar political situation in Berlin led to the erection of a new university and a new university library. Generous funds granted by the American Ford Foundation made possible the construction of a modern library building for the Free University in Berlin-Dahlem (West Berlin); the main building was ready in 1954 and the bookstack in 1956. Almost simultaneous (1952-1954) was the construction of the American Memorial Library, also made possible through American grants. This was a new departure for Germany in its internal library organization and its architectural shape. Because the Technical University in Berlin-Charlottenburg had provided modern

### *European University Libraries: Germany*

quarters for its library as early as 1951, German librarians had already been pressed into thinking about the problems involved in modern library building. It was evident how unacquainted they were with building trends and how greatly German university libraries lagged behind the modern building and equipment standards of the United States, Great Britain, and the Scandinavian countries. As a matter of fact not a single university library had been built in Germany from 1914 to 1950.

The founding of the three new metropolitan universities—Frankfurt (1914), Hamburg (1919), and Cologne (1919)—had not led to epoch-making new buildings. The library of the university of Cologne (1934) did not get its own building but was given space in the upper floors of the central university building. In Frankfurt, planning began in the late 'twenties for a large new library building, the drafts of which provided for a bookstack in a tower according to contemporary American models. There was discussion about it as late as 1938 at the library convention in Passau, but it remained unbuilt because large building plans during those years were not accepted unless they served military purposes. In 1939 Rostock built new bookstacks, but with this the building of university libraries ceased completely for a while. It is characteristic that Erich von Rath in his essay on the German university libraries,<sup>20</sup> published in 1930, shows illustrations of the bookstacks of Bonn (1891) and Heidelberg (1905) and the reading rooms of Leipzig (1891) and Tübingen (1912). In 1914, one epoch in the building history of German university libraries was closed, but in 1930 a new one had not yet begun.

This happened only after 1950, not only in the case of the new establishments in Mainz, Saarbrücken, and West Berlin, which were mentioned above and which were engendered by political motives, but also in the case of the older universities.<sup>21</sup> Münster began as early as 1947, but its rebuilding of the old library was not a very fortunate experience; Leipzig renovated its destroyed bookstack in 1950, and Hamburg moved in 1951 into a school building which had been remodeled as a library. Buildings which were out of date were energetically remodeled and enlarged (1954 Greifswald, 1955 Heidelberg, 1957 Würzburg, 1959 Freiburg, 1963 Tübingen), or new buildings were constructed (1960 bookstacks in Hamburg, 1961 Bonn). At the present time there is great activity by way of new construction or of reconstruction and enlargements. Some of this is already nearly com-

pleted, some is still in the planning stages (Erlangen, Freiburg, Göttingen, Greifswald, Hamburg, Heidelberg, Jena, Köln, Marburg, Münster, Rostock).

A parallel development in the schools of technology (Technische Hochschulen) or other scientific institutions of advanced learning cannot be detailed here. They are in the process of seeking modern solutions for their particular purposes which are greatly different from the traditional style of other German libraries (Stuttgart, School of Technology, opened 1962; Karlsruhe, School of Technology, and Clausthal, Mining Academy, both under construction in 1963; Hannover, Library for Technical Information, 1963, under construction). In Stuttgart, as well as in the new building of the university library in Frankfurt, the open shelf system and flexibility are applied to a degree not heretofore customary in German research libraries. An early indication of this development was the American Memorial Library in Berlin (1954) which, however, is not a research library but a public library.

There have been new building solutions also for the institute libraries of universities. Examples of this are the institutes of the faculty of philosophy in the multi-story seminar buildings in Tübingen and Hamburg (1963) and the institute libraries of the faculty of economics and social sciences in Cologne. Here, too, the last few years finally ended the stagnation which was the result of two wars and their sequelae. The buildings themselves provide the best indication as to whether the libraries of a nation are prospering and in step with new demands.

Of equivalent importance for the existence of a library are the financial means allotted to it for the purchase and binding of books. No research library can do without the continuous acquisition of essential internal and foreign literature. Not only the destruction caused by war but equally the lack of money and foreign exchange have dire consequences on the quality of a book collection. With difficulties of this kind, German libraries have had much experience. At the present time the libraries of Eastern Germany must operate within the strictly controlled framework of a fiscal system in purchasing the publications of West Germany and other countries outside the Eastern Communist bloc. Since 1953/54, the libraries of West Germany have been able to buy practically any foreign book with ease. They spend 40 per cent and more of their funds for foreign books and periodicals.

Especially significant was the initiative taken by the German Research Association (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft). It provided

### *European University Libraries: Germany*

considerable funds to research libraries of West Germany for the purchase of additional foreign monographs and periodicals. It compiled a list of foreign periodicals,<sup>22</sup> which on principle ought to be in every university library (Group A) or of which there should be at least one copy in some library of the Federal Republic (Group B). The periodicals of Group B, as well as foreign monographs, were distributed to libraries on the basis of a program of special fields of collection development (Sondersammelgebiete).<sup>23</sup> The selected libraries had to agree to make these publications available for German interlibrary loan service.

East German libraries have, of course, no difficulty in the acquisition of Soviet Union publications or those emanating from the peoples' democracies. In fact these are acquired in increasing amounts. In 1961, the twenty-nine research libraries under the authority of the East German secretary of state for universities and other schools of higher learning received 27,625 volumes, compared with 15,980 volumes in 1959. This tendency is supported for political reasons. The secretary of state has recommended in a "plan of action" (Massnahmenplan) for all research libraries to spend 25-30 per cent of the total budget on the purchase of publications from Soviet Russia and the peoples' democracies.

The separate budgets of research libraries in East Germany are not known,<sup>24</sup> but from a published article<sup>25</sup> some facts can be derived. In 1961 the above mentioned twenty-nine libraries (the German State Library in Berlin, Deutsche Bücherei in Leipzig, seven university libraries, six state libraries, eleven libraries of technical and economic schools, and three libraries of medical academies) received a total of 4,256,253 Dm. for the purchase of books and periodicals. Against 1959 this was an increase of 639,337 Dm. The outlay in 1960 in West Germany for the fifty-six libraries mentioned in the recommendations of the Scientific Advisory Council (eighteen university libraries, fifteen libraries of technical and other schools of higher learning, twenty-three state libraries) was a total of 9,685,100 Dm. for purchase and book binding; in 1961 the sum total in the budget was 11,275,800 Dm.<sup>26</sup> The budget increase over 1958 was more than 50 per cent. The average outlay of a West German university library for book purchase and binding in 1960 was 270,000 Dm. The actual amounts, however, varied from 96,000 to 393,000 Dm. For 1961 the average was 323,000 Dm.; the range was from 120,000 to 480,000 Dm. It must be stressed that expenses for the institute libraries

are not included in these figures. They surpass considerably the budget of the university library. This fact must be kept in mind when comparisons are made with the figures for holdings and the budgets of American university libraries.

The plans of the German Research Association were models and induced several of the states to raise the budgets for their university libraries. The book budgets of the three university libraries of the State of Baden-Württemberg (Freiburg, Heidelberg, Tübingen) are 500,000 Dm. for 1964 (without the special funds of the German Research Association). West Germany is striving for equal support of all university libraries, in order that those which suffered the greatest destruction during the war (e.g. Bonn, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Munich, and Würzburg) and those which were founded after the war (Berlin, Giessen, Mainz, and Saarbrücken) should be enabled to build efficient collections, too. At the present time both the quantity and the quality of the collections are understandably rather unequal.

The eighteen university libraries in West Germany and West Berlin in 1960 had total collections of about 16,000,000 volumes; the six university libraries in East Germany and East Berlin owned approximately 8,000,000 volumes. When the libraries of the other schools of higher learning and the state libraries are added, then the totals for West Germany in 1960 were ca. 29,000,000 volumes and in East Germany about 16,000,000 volumes. These figures are not entirely precise, but they do offer an approximate impression of the holdings of German research libraries. The scholarly municipal libraries, the special libraries, and the libraries of the theological academies are omitted from these figures. Also omitted are the considerable totals of the libraries of the institutes. In Heidelberg, for instance, the institutes contain approximately 800,000 volumes. The average holdings of a university library (without the institutes) amounted in 1960 in West Germany to about 900,000 volumes. In 1960, the smallest university (Giessen) had 200,000 and the largest (Göttingen) 1,765,000 volumes. The annual increase varies between 10,000 and 30,000 units.

A larger West German university library employs as a rule about twelve librarians, all of whom have completed their university education and have a doctor's degree. A librarian may have studied in one of many different fields. Our university libraries employ philologists, historians, jurists, theologians, natural scientists, and physicians. East German university libraries have scholars on their staffs, too. In East Germany, however, it is possible for a librarian to rise to the higher

### *European University Libraries: Germany*

positions without a university degree, as it is no longer necessary for him to hold a doctor's degree. Library science courses and examinations are offered by East German universities. In the universities of West Germany such courses are not offered. Professional library training in West Germany requires two years; the first year, after finishing academic studies, is spent working in a library, the second in attending a training institute for librarians at Cologne or Munich. The program is completed by undergoing an examination in librarianship.

Besides this academic group, there are employed in a German university library about twenty to thirty certified librarians (*Diplombibliothekare*). They have successfully graduated from high school and received further training in librarianship, lasting two to three years; then they are admitted to the examination for the diploma in librarianship. This program is generally taken by women, and there is a general shortage of applicants even though the number of available positions is constantly increasing. It must be remembered that the social prestige of the library profession is not very high in Germany.

Besides the academic and certified librarians, there is generally a larger group of assistants without previous library training, so that a university library on an average gives employment to approximately sixty to seventy persons.

The constitution of the university does not confer much influence upon the director of the library of a university. He very infrequently has the rank of a full professor and is, therefore, as a rule not a member of the faculty or the senate. Things are different in East Germany because there the chief librarian in some cases may have membership in the senate. However, the responsibility which this constitutional position of the director emphasizes is not in reality very significant. He is bound by the directives of the party and the state. He is expected as a matter of course to subscribe to the tenets of Marxism-Leninism and to practice "socialistic partisanship" (*sozialistische Parteilichkeit*) in his professional activity.<sup>27</sup>

The West German librarian is exposed to the danger of giving all his time to the purely technical and administrative aspects of his position and of becoming a victim of his managerial duties. The number of research librarians who continue to pursue scholarly work is becoming regrettably smaller. However, this is due to the fact that the circle of his administrative work increases to a frightening degree. So he has to resign himself to seeking the sense of his profession not in research activities but in the service of scholarship.<sup>28</sup> The title of

"honorary professor" now frequently conferred upon the director of West German university libraries cannot blind one to this situation.

The preceding account presents some summary information on building activity, budgets, size of collections, and personnel of German university libraries. I have omitted discussion of accessioning, cataloging, loan activity, and of reading rooms and bookstacks. Nor have I paid attention to the frequently very precious collections of papyri, medieval manuscripts, incunabula, old bindings, and autographs. Library procedure and technique in German university libraries does not differ greatly from that customary in other German libraries and abroad. Nor are historical special collections particularly characteristic of university libraries. It seemed, therefore, more important to describe the administrative organization of German university libraries and their historical and political origins.

*The Administrative Organization of German University  
Libraries*

I have not attempted an *apologia* for German library politics. It is doubtful whether there is a single and solely correct solution for the two problems focused upon by IFLA. The German solution may be stated as follows: separation of the main university library from the libraries of the institutes, cooperation among university libraries and with all other research libraries in the country; no unity in the area of the university, but definitely unity among the research libraries of the state. This does not really imply that complete independence of the institute libraries was intended; however, this very event took place in the face of the state's plans and principles. The intention in Prussia aimed in the direction of certain common standards for the totality of state research libraries: uniform cataloging rules, an acquisition program with local differences in emphasis, interlibrary loan service organized by the state, a uniform training for all professional librarians, a printed union catalog of all holdings of state supported libraries, and printed periodical lists. The university libraries (e.g. Bonn, Breslau, and Königsberg) were ex officio given the tasks of provincial libraries. The attempt in 1891<sup>29</sup> to trespass on the responsibilities of the institute libraries by orders and directives (requiring central cataloging) met determined resistance by the professors and completely failed. The result within the university's library organization was an apparatus in which there was a juxtaposition of coordinated effort by the state and autonomy on the part of the university.



### *European University Libraries: Germany*

In East Germany there are at present attempts to reduce or abolish the autonomy of institute libraries. This is not surprising. Such measures, as was previously the case in Prussia, are the natural consequences of the need for fiscal economy and the centralistic practice of an authoritarian philosophy of the state.

In West Germany, too, there is concern as to whether one should resign oneself to leaving large sections of the book collections of a university completely fragmented.<sup>30</sup> The increasing size of the institute libraries makes ever more apparent the lack of organization of the "wild growth" of this type of library. The dilemma is that these faults, simply because of the present day magnitude of the collections, can scarcely now be remedied.

The imminent founding of new universities (Bochum, Constance, Bremen, and Regensburg) is reason to question the conventional form of the German university library.<sup>31</sup> There is a feeling that something must be done to give greater weight to the library in the totality of the university and to assign new functions to it. The university campus of the United States is an impressive model. The complete fusion of the library with its university seems attractive, because it would make it possible to do away with the dual system of university library and institute libraries side by side. In a decentralized system, it would be possible to distribute the books in suitable ways throughout the university, with a union catalog maintained by the central library. Such a library, however, would no longer be a useful partner for German interlibrary loan service. The system of German interlibrary loan service rests on the principle of cooperation of all research libraries, made effective by means of union catalogs. It is not possible to extend loan privileges to entire groups of libraries which demand that their needs be satisfied by outside libraries but which, because of their organization, cannot participate in supplying the wants of other libraries. German librarians, therefore, will have to ask themselves if interlibrary loan service as a system of automatic cooperation is to be retained, before they can think about the reorganization of university libraries. A high degree of cooperation does not simultaneously allow a high degree of autonomy for the particular members of a library system.

For the university, the most important aspect of the problem is: who decides which books the university buys and who decides where they will be shelved, the librarian or the professor? Both face the same difficulty of reconciling in a rational manner certain common

purposes, as well as both long term and short term interests. To give the ultimate decision only to the professor or only to the librarian does not seem proper to me; both ought to participate. The German system of divided responsibility and divided budgets for university and institute libraries leads to this consequence: in the university library the professional librarian makes the decision, while in the institute libraries it is the professor who decides which books are to be acquired and where they are to be shelved. My own personal conviction is that this system is not in principle a bad one. I admit that it has faults, but these faults are inherent in the imperfection of men and not because the method is unsuitable. Both parties, professors and librarians, have an important and full share in the decision as to what books are to be acquired. It does not require continuous discussion nor can conflicts arise, because both parties act independently.

The expertise of the professor, his individuality as a researcher, and his intentions as an academic teacher determine the collection building of the institute libraries, which are to be manageable and to contain books of current interest and of research value. In this connection it is no disaster when the next professor follows a path different from that of his predecessor. The main library, on the contrary, requires a uniform and continuous development according to objective criteria for selection insofar as that is possible. It collects the basic literature, and with special care such forms as encyclopedias, bibliographies, dictionaries, sources and texts, periodicals, and publications of academies. It also covers subjects which are not yet represented in the institute libraries. This division of tasks and interests permits the main library to pursue a meaningful program of developing its resources under the guidance of professional librarians, and gives to the professors full freedom of decision in the institutes.

The incidence of duplicate and multiple acquisitions is, as shown by a statistical compilation of the Marburg university library (according to the director of the library), not as high as is generally surmised. Moreover, the presence of the same work in the main library and available for circulation, and as a non-circulating copy in one or several institutes is not only useful but absolutely essential. A particular advantage of the art of printing is that it affords several readers simultaneously the opportunity to use the same text.

Even though responsibility for the selection of books is guaranteed under the German system, it is quite another question whether this necessitates a strict division between the university library and the

### *European University Libraries: Germany*

institutes in the areas of accessioning, cataloging, and library administration. From small beginnings, this condition developed in Germany almost by itself. The disadvantages become more and more evident as the size and the budgets of the institute libraries keep growing. Professors and assistants can no longer find time enough to take care of all the administrative work to be done in a library. The assistants suffer from overwork. All institutes emphatically demand trained library personnel. But high-class, experienced personnel are scarce and expensive, and ought to be occupied reasonably. Therefore, it may very soon prove necessary to centralize the technical processes of all libraries in the entire university. Otherwise, one day the libraries of institutes and also the university library, because of lack of personnel, may find themselves face to face with serious difficulties. Although as early as 1891 the Prussian experiments in this direction remained without practical results and although later attempts<sup>32</sup> were no more successful, it will be necessary again to look out for means better adapted to the present situation than the present hopeless attempt to assign to each of the sixty or eighty institutes in each university its own certified librarians. This exceeds the reasonable limits of decentralization. Centralized processing would be a legitimate assignment for the university library and would result simultaneously in a union catalog of all new acquisitions in the university. The most pronounced disadvantage of the German system is undoubtedly the lack of cohesion, the dissimilarities in procedures, and the nonexistence of a central record of all works held in libraries of institutes. These are capable of being corrected without disturbing the divided responsibility of the university and institute libraries in the selection of new acquisitions. Neither autonomy nor coordination are infallible principles of organization. Independence should be given free reign wherever it promises better and more fruitful results. But just as resolutely should efforts be concentrated, when independent and thoughtless action of the parts threatens the existence of the larger whole.

### *References*

1. International Federation of Library Associations. *Libraries in the World*. The Hague, M. Nijhoff, 1963, pp. 45-47.
2. Metcalf, Keyes D. "Problems of Acquisition Policy in a University Library," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 4:293, Autumn 1950. See also Danton, J. Periam. *Book Selection and Collections. A Comparison of German and American Uni-*

CARL WEHMER

versity Libraries. (Columbia University Studies in Library Service, No. 12). New York, Columbia University Press, 1963, pp. 116-117.

3. Koschorreck, Walter. *Geschichte des Deutschen Leihverkehrs*. (Beiträge zum Buch- und Bibliothekswesen, Vol. 7). Wiesbaden, O. Harrassowitz, 1958.

4. Zunker, Ernst. "Die regionalen Zentralkataloge der Bundesrepublik und ihre Einschaltung in den Leihverkehr," *DFW. Dokumentation Fachbibliothek Werkbücherei*, 10:149-154, August 1962. In 1964 the following article will be published: Koschorreck, Walter. "Das gegenwärtige Bild des Deutschen Leihverkehrs von einer Universitätsbibliothek aus gesehen," *Bibliothek und Wissenschaft*, 1, 1964. For East Germany, see "Richtlinie über die regionalen Zentralkataloge in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 76:308-316, July 1962.

5. Metcalf, Keyes D. *Report on The Harvard University Library*. Cambridge, Harvard University Library, 1955, p. 48. See also Bauhuis, Walter. "Probleme einer Grossbibliothek. Aufgezeigt an der Universitätsbibliothek von Harvard," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 71:26-37, Jan.-Feb. 1957.

6. Seuberlich, Wolfgang. "Die Universitätsbibliotheken der Sowjetunion, insbesondere die Universitätsbibliotheken Moskau und Leningrad," *Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie*, 9:155-171, 1962.

7. *Bericht der Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft* [later: . . . der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft] *über ihre Tätigkeit vom 1. März 1949 . . . bis zum 31. Dezember 1962* [14 volumes, not for sale]. See also *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. Aufbau und Aufgaben*. 5th ed. Wiesbaden, F. Steiner, 1963.

8. *Empfehlungen des Wissenschaftsrates zum Ausbau der wissenschaftlichen Einrichtungen*. Bonn, Bundesdruckerei, 1960, Vol. 1, Wissenschaftliche Hochschulen. See also *Anregungen des Wissenschaftsrates zur Gestalt neuer Hochschulen*. Bonn, Bundesdruckerei, 1962. For Vol. 2 of the *Empfehlungen . . .*, see reference 26.

9. *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Bibliotheken*, Herausgegeben vom Verein Deutscher Bibliothekare. Wiesbaden, O. Harrassowitz, 1961, Vol. 39, pp. 453-456.

10. *Aus der Arbeit der wissenschaftlichen Bibliotheken in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, Herausgegeben von der Bibliothekskommission für Ausbildungsfragen beim Staatssekretariat für Hochschulwesen. Leipzig, O. Harrassowitz, 1955, pp. 6, 225-226. See also *Mitteilungsblatt der bibliothekarischen Fachkommissionen und Arbeitskreise*. Berlin, 1960, No. 1 ff.

11. Von Busse, Gisela. *West German Library Developments since 1945*. Washington, Library of Congress, 1962, pp. 9, 53-54, 76-77.

12. Göber, Willy. "Das Bibliothekswesen einer Universität als Einheit." In: *Bibliothek, Bibliothekar, Bibliothekswissenschaft. Festschrift Joris Vorstius*. Leipzig, O. Harrassowitz, 1954, pp. 154-171. See also Selbmann, Erhard. "Aus der Arbeit der Bibliothekskommission für Bibliothekspraxis." In: *Aus der Arbeit der wissenschaftlichen Bibliotheken in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, pp. 85-86.

13. Krüss, Hugo Andres. "Fünfundzwanzig Jahre Preussischer Beirat für Bibliotheksangelegenheiten," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 50:18-21, Jan.-Feb. 1933.

## European University Libraries: Germany

14. Detailed information for all German research libraries on the destruction in the Second World War is to be found in: *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Bibliotheken*, Vol. 34, Leipzig, O. Harrassowitz, 1950. See also Leyh, Georg. "Katastrophe." In: *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft*. Wiesbaden, O. Harrassowitz, 1957. Vol. 3, 2, pp. 473-478.

15. "Die Staatsbibliothek in Berlin." In: *Jahrbuch der Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz*, 1962. Köln, G. Grote, 1963, pp. 59-75. See also Witte, Wilhelm. "Die Staatsbibliothek." In: *Jahrbuch der Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz*, *op. cit.* pp. 264-293. See also *Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, 1661-1961*. Leipzig, VEB Verlag für Buch- und Bibliothekswesen, 1961, Vol. 2: Bibliographie.

16. "Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Deutschen Bücherei." In: *Deutsche Bücherei, 1912-1962. Festschrift zum fünfzigjährigen Bestehen der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek*. Leipzig, Deutsche Bücherei, 1962, pp. 287-379.

17. Leyh, Georg. "Durchbildung der wissenschaftlichen Gebrauchsbibliothek (von 1870 bis zur gegenwart)." In: *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft*, Vol. 3, 2, pp. 307-491, especially p. 321 (Althoff) and pp. 400-412 (Reform der preussischen Universitätsbibliotheken).

18. Danton, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

19. In 1963 there were at the University of Heidelberg 11,525 students and 553 academic teachers (119 of them professors *ordinarius*). The University Library (without the institute libraries) had at the same time 51 employees (including 12 academic librarians and 20 certified librarians).

20. *Das Akademische Deutschland*, Herausgegeben von Michael Doeberl. Berlin, C. A. Weller, 1930, Vol. 3, pp. 285-296.

21. Stromeier, Rainald. *Europäische Bibliotheksbauten seit 1930*. (Beiträge zum Buch- und Bibliothekswesen, Vol. 9). Wiesbaden, O. Harrassowitz, 1962. See also Mehl, Ernst, und Hannemann, Kurt. "Deutsche Bibliotheksgeschichte." In: *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss*, Herausgegeben von Wolfgang Stammler. 2d ed. Berlin, E. Schmidt, 1957, Vol. 1, col. 553-556.

22. *Verzeichnis ausgewählter wissenschaftlicher Zeitschriften des Auslandes*. VAZ, Bearbeitet von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft. Wiesbaden, F. Steiner, 1957. New addition in preparation.

23. von Busse, Gisela, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-74. In 1956 a program of special fields of collection development was also established for the research libraries of East Germany. See Kunze, Horst. *Bibliotheksverwaltungslehre*. 2d ed. Leipzig, VEB O. Harrassowitz, 1958, pp. 72-73.

24. The only available information reports the increase of volumes for the several libraries and their subject fields. See "Statistik der wissenschaftlichen Bibliotheken, 1961." In: *Jahrbuch der Bibliotheken, Archive und Dokumentationsstellen der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*. Vol. 2:1960-61. Berlin, 1962, pp. 303-307.

25. Brückmann, Kurt. "Einige Bemerkungen zu Entwicklungstendenzen des wissenschaftlichen Bibliothekswesens der DDR seit 1959," *Börsenblatt für den deutschen Buchhandel* [Leipzig edition], 129:343-346, 1962. As section leader (Sektorleiter) of the Secretary of State for universities and other schools of higher learning, Brückmann has been responsible for the research libraries of East Germany since 1959.

26. These figures are based on inquiries made by the Scientific Advisory Council (Wissenschaftsrat). Since completion of the body of this article, the Scientific Advisory Council has published its *Empfehlungen des Wissenschaftsrates zum Ausbau der wissenschaftlichen Einrichtungen*. Bonn, Bundesdruckerei, 1964, Vol. 2, Wissenschaftliche Bibliotheken. The statistical data (pp. 249-290) cover eighty-two research libraries of the Federal Republic of Germany: Thirty-seven provincial and municipal libraries, thirty-two libraries of universities and other institutions of higher education, and thirteen special research libraries. At the end of 1962, they held 31,398,000 volumes and 5,847,000 dissertations. In 1961 they expended 17,925,000 Dm. for purchase of books and binding.

27. "In all the political and ideological activities of research libraries, in both research and practical terms, there has been noticeable a decisive process of change during the last few years. In the struggle against old and outgrown concepts, expressed in conservatism, neutralism and objectivism, the demands for socialist partisanship, for the principles of socialist solidarity, and for an orientation towards the political, economic and cultural strengthening of the German workers and peasant state, are gaining steadily in strength." Brückmann, *op. cit.*, p. 346. See also Kunze, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 28. See also Bunke, Horst. "Die Entwicklung der wissenschaftlichen Bibliotheken seit 1959 und ihre Aufgaben in der Periode des umfassenden Aufbaus des Sozialismus in der DDR," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 77:529-542, 1963.

28. Rasmussen, von Detlef. "Wissenschaft und Verwaltung im Beruf des Bibliothekars," *Libri*, 13:93-106, 1963.

29. "Erlass, betreffend die Bibliotheken der Universitäts-Anstalten und deren Beziehungen zu den Universitäts-Bibliotheken (im Königreich Preussen)," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 8:550-551, 1891.

30. Hartmann, Karl Julius. "Das Problem der Institutsbibliotheken," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 56:17-37, Jan.-Feb. 1939. See also *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft*. Vol. 2 (1961), pp. 594-597 (Norbert Fischer) and 982-989 (Georg Leyh). See also von Busse, Gisela. "The Problem of Intra-Campus Library Relations." In: *West German Library Developments since 1945*, Library of Congress, Washington, pp. 31-34.

31. Hauschka, Ernst Reinhold. "Gedanken über neue Universitätsbibliotheken." In: *Colloquium. Eine deutsche Studentenzeitung*, 17:12-14, 1963.

32. Hartmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-37.