

Jun 9th, 12:00 AM

Periodicals Collections in Academic Libraries of the Federal Republic of Germany: Development and Managerial Aspects

Richard Landwehrmeyer
University of Tübingen

Richard Landwehrmeyer, "Periodicals Collections in Academic Libraries of the Federal Republic of Germany: Development and Managerial Aspects." *Proceedings of the IATUL Conferences*. Paper 5. <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/iatul/1983/papers/5>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

PERIODICALS COLLECTIONS IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES OF THE
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Development and Managerial Aspects

Richard Landwehrmeyer

Director of University Library, Tübingen, Germany

1. Collection management is a recurrent and everlasting topic of librarianship. Because without their collections, our libraries would have no raison d'être. Without collection building, other professional activities would be - in the plain literal meaning of the word - unsubstantial and superfluous. I am well aware that in saying this I am putting forward a tremendous commonplace. The corresponding commonplace is that our collections serve no purpose if not properly put to use. Both collections and services are obviously of equal importance - but, although there is a world-wide shift of emphasis from the collecting attitude to service activities, collections come first. Nothing can be done with nothing.
2. Though quantity is not quality in itself, quality in a library will not materialize without certain quantities: large collections seem to be better than small ones and, though the value of a library is no longer seen in its mere number of volumes, I have never met any librarian who boasted of having a very small collection.

Serials collection development has become one of the most difficult and widely debated questions facing libraries today: because we have at the same time both fundamental growth and deficiency problems. We have got painfully aware of the fact that continuous growth seems to be as inevitable as it is impossible. No wonder we are divided into two kinds of librarians (sometimes in one and the same person) - the collecting animal and the managing beast, neither of which is harmless, for the first has a tendency to set value exclusively on more and more volumes regardless of price, while the other, knowing the price of everything, ends in ignoring their value.

The present situation seems to be characterized by a violent clash of growth

problems on the one side and sudden limitations on the other. While the so-called information explosion seems to continue and, accordingly, an ever-increasing demand, libraries as mediators between both ends grow more and more aware of the intrinsic problem of growth (e.g. the size/effect relation) as they are confronted with hard limitations coming from the outside: limitations of building space and storage capacity, limitations of staff and budget. If growth is confronted with limitations, the best solution seems to be cooperation. At the same time fundamental changes in the publishing world and in information transmission seem to be occurring. So libraries have to face a number of new challenges at the same time. We are all operating on a rapidly shifting ground: what was the best thing to do in a past period may become entirely unreasonable in the near future. And "periods", I feel, are growing shorter and shorter.

Stating this in a general way is not very rewarding. Problems are of different kinds and natures in different countries, different libraries and different individual collections with regard to their particular degree of development, their specific purpose or their user community.

With regard to collection management, in my view those libraries are happiest whose purpose is limited, whose clientele is well defined and strongly focussed upon a narrow field of interest; whereas those libraries are most difficult to manage which, in a universal context of subjects, are confronted with users of a very mixed character and vast, diffuse interests. This is the case with most academic libraries, most of all with university libraries. The organizers of this meeting thought that it might be of interest to you to hear something about German university libraries. Though university libraries are similar, they are not uniform; you must therefore allow for some generalization and simplification.

3. Development of Periodical Collections

At the end of the last war, most of our university libraries were not only damaged and suffered big losses to their collections, but they all had to recover entire fields of knowledge that had lain barren through the thirties and through the war period. Collections of foreign periodicals were rather poor. One of the most urgent things to do was to get hold of foreign periodicals in order to enable German scholars to get into contact with international standards of science and learning. In 1949 there were 22 university libraries (among these 7 libraries of Technische Hochschulen) more or less fully functioning with a total of 20,800 current periodicals (German as well as foreign). This was an average of about 1,200 in the full universities and of 390 in the libraries of the Technische Hoch-

schulen. In the following three decades the traditional university libraries were able to raise their local standards, the former Technische Hochschulen (such as Aachen, Braunschweig, Hanover, Karlsruhe, Stuttgart) grew into full universities by adding the fields of the humanities or social sciences, and a number of new university libraries (26) concentrated on building up adequate serials collections of their own. Some figures may help you to grasp the extent of this development.

In 1979 libraries of the former Technische Hochschulen had expanded their current programmes to an average number of 5,000 each (4,893). At the same time, the traditional university libraries had been able to extend their current programmes to an average of 7,700 current items. (Highest figure is given by Göttingen with 13,700, lowest by Munich University Library with 3,300). So periodical programmes in the former technological universities expanded by a factor of 12, and in the full universities, starting from a higher level, by a factor of 6 within three decades.

The new universities founded after 1949 (and for the most part after 1965), held in all about 145,000 current periodicals in 1979, an average of 5,600 each. (The highest figure is given by Bremen with 13,600, the lowest by Passau - the most recent foundation - with 1,910). Compared to European standards, this seems to be slightly above the average.¹ (Figures given by the traditional university libraries do not include current periodicals of faculty and institute libraries).

This development within university libraries was backed of course by the Deutsche Bibliothek as an archive of the national book production including periodicals of every kind, by the very substantial collection of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (c. 45,000) and by one particular library which specialized in collecting periodicals on a very large scale with emphasis on foreign periodicals. This was the Western part of the former Staatsbibliothek (Berlin), now the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz. This library achieved, with some 30,000 current items (1979), the largest collection of periodicals in any library of the Federal Republic and is now one of the main sources of the provision of journal articles through photocopy or lending.

4. Standards and Cooperation

In the post-war period the salient question was how to achieve a sufficient degree of coverage when each individual library had only limited resources and prospects. In principle, there were two alternatives: to build up a central collection, i.e. a new National Library going beyond the scope of an archive of the

national book production; or to achieve a cooperative scheme of acquisition and resource sharing. For various reasons a National Library was not realized, so the cooperative system was the only solution left. This was firmly supported (from 1949 onwards) by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and resulted in what is now known as our decentralized system of literature provision and document supply. (It includes of course not only periodicals but monographs and other material as well.)

With regard to periodicals, it was felt from the start that sufficient provision had to be achieved in two ways: raising local collections to reasonable standards as basic to the whole framework while achieving at the same time decentralized special collections with comprehensive coverage in their respective fields. Both principles were regarded as interdependent and therefore treated as one and the same thing. Immense pains were taken in those days by special committees to examine all kinds and numbers of foreign scholarly and research journals, putting them into two categories:

- an A-level as standard collection to every university library
- a B-level: journals for special collections in the "Sondersammelgebiete".

Accordingly, lists of periodicals were published not only as recommendations to be followed, but financial support was given by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft in order to ensure actual subscriptions. Libraries were expected to take the A-level journals as soon as possible, together with comprehensive acquisition of relevant German periodicals. The special collections are still supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft to the extent of 75% to 80% of total expenditure on foreign periodicals. Selection and coordination of this kind was greatly favoured, it is true, by the fact that at that time world production of periodicals was comparatively limited. Those lists, long since abandoned of course, laid the foundations of our periodical collections. They were of much value even in the late sixties when new universities were founded and their libraries had to start serial collections from scratch. As you see, initially planning was promoted by necessity, coordination by the pressure of circumstances. What was achieved was in a way (long before the invention of the term) collection management on a national scale, tempered by federalism.

5. Further Planning Activities and Standards

The initial standard lists of periodical collections in academic libraries were followed by a number of attempts to develop quantitatively defined standards (Bibliothekspläne). These were of great help in many respects but have, on the

whole, not lived up to their expectations. Development plans of this order suffer from aiming at two goals at the same time. As political programmes they try to influence public policy: as guidelines for libraries they try to serve librarians as management tools. If they do not achieve the first aim, they are of only limited value for the second. Moreover, the trouble with standards is that, if defined in financial terms, they grow rapidly obsolete; if stated in numbers of periodical subscriptions they seldom fit into the realities of a given situation; if they try to be qualitative, using terms like "sufficient", "consistent", "systematically developed", they are too vague to be of real value.

6. Local Collection Management

Within local library systems a growing need of coordination was felt through the sixties and seventies. Ensuing practice was in most Bundesländer enforced by university laws, imposing close cooperation between faculties and central library.

With emphasis on periodicals, three requirements had to be achieved:

- coordinated collection development by close cooperation in selection and de-acquisition of current journals in order to avoid unnecessary duplication and strengthen the existing collections
- user-oriented location of periodicals with open access and photocopy facilities
- creation of comprehensive local union lists as location tools.

With the new universities, these basic requirements imposed themselves. Within the traditional universities they have been achieved only to a degree. Besides close cooperation in acquisition decision and location, in most libraries every inter-library loan request is carefully analysed by the subject librarians: in cases of frequent demand by a number of users purchase is proposed, if regional resources are not sufficient. Only few libraries, I suppose, have written guidelines to their acquisition policy.

7. Location Tools

Local union lists (ensuring full use of local resources and inhibiting unnecessary demand on the regional or the supra-regional lending system) have been, at a second stage, achieved by regional cooperative cataloguing in most regions; in some cases by direct cooperation with the Berlin Periodicals Data Base. With the help of this, which actually lists some 300,000 periodicals, a great number and indeed an already very high percentage of total journals holdings (current and others) can be traced with precision. Every important library, partner in the lending system, is provided with a COM-file of these dates; these will soon be accessible

through on-line searching via EURONET. Local decisions about new subscriptions can be checked against this list as they are taken, of course, in the light of the existing special collections of the Sondersammelgebiete.

8. Periodicals Within the SSGG-Plan

Within the supra-regional system of literature provision, coordinated and subsidized by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, location of special collections was at first (in the post-war period) excessively scattered. In the course of three decades, considerable concentration was achieved. The decisive step in this direction was the foundation of four Zentrale Fachbibliotheken (of Economics, Medicine, Technology and Agriculture), covering those fields in which periodicals are most in demand.

In the late seventies, a group of German librarians felt that decentralization, which had been the best thing in the fifties and had been adequate in the sixties, had proved problematic through the seventies and would become inadequate in the eighties. They advocated a national periodicals centre, or at least a central lending collection of periodicals in the humanities and the social sciences in addition to the existing four Zentrale Fachbibliotheken. This idea, which certainly has something to be said for it, had, in the given conditions of the Federal Republic, no chance for realisation.

At present, special collections of periodicals within the Sondersammelgebiet-libraries and the Zentrale Fachbibliotheken comprise about 84,000*) current journals, located in 21 different libraries. The ratio of German to foreign periodicals is 2:8. The most important periodical collections within this structure are those of the Zentrale Fachbibliotheken, whose share is 56% of the total programme. If to these are added the five most important SSG-libraries (Göttingen, Cologne, etc.), 74% of the current programme is concentrated on 9 libraries. Decentralization must not be evaluated exclusively by the number of participating libraries but by the scale of their collections and by the share of interlending they handle.

Periodical collections of the Zentrale Fachbibliotheken and Sondersammelgebiet-libraries together with those of the two Staatsbibliotheken in Berlin (30,000) and Munich (27,000), form the backbone of research collections in academic libraries of the Federal Republic which, taken together, comprise about 450,000 current periodicals.

*) The 16th edition of Ulrich's International Periodicals Dictionary identified c. 85,000 current titles.

9. Evaluation

An evaluation of these facts is rather difficult. If you accept the satisfaction rate of inter-library loan requests as one test of the quality of local collections you may perhaps be prepared to accept the following deductions:

- In universities the average ratio of local request/loans to inter-library loan requests is 94:6. (This average figure of 1980/81 refers to the university libraries only and is not specific to periodicals.) So local library systems satisfy up to 94% of the known requests, and only 6% of total requests originating from universities seem to be dependent on other than local resources. The average number of inter-library loan requests produced by university libraries within a year is about 20,000 each, the total number of requests being 1.15 millions a year. (There are of course enormous differences: the highest figure is that of Munster with 41,700, the lowest Passau with 3,300: this does not necessarily mean that local resources in Munster are worst and those in Passau best.)
- Satisfaction rate in inter-library requests originating from university libraries is c. 84% (1980).
- The share of requests relative to journal articles is probably about 60%, because 63% are satisfied through photocopy, and photocopy is rarely used as a substitute for book lending. If the satisfaction rate of requests for journal articles corresponds to the general rate of 84% - it is probably much better -, some 11,000 requests of this kind remain unsatisfied, an average of 2,000 to 2,500 at each university. If you eliminate that unknown but rather considerable portion of requests referring to older material, satisfaction of requests referring to current material may be about 90%.

The question is, whether this may be regarded as satisfactory. We are fairly sure about only one point: to satisfy the rest would cause quite disproportionate efforts and costs. A librarian may look at the result in two ways:

- He may follow the ordinary assumption that a comparatively low rate of inter-library loan requests (or photocopy) is a sure mark of the quality of his collection (though you remain uncertain about the quality of the user community)
- he may with much justification think a higher rate of loan requests a good mark for his collection management, especially where loan fees are low and prices for publications are high.

Our objective must be to find the best compromise between these two aspects

of expenditure and user satisfaction.

With some caution you may say that in the Federal Republic the development of periodical collections within a planned system of resource sharing has achieved reasonable results, at least so far as universities are concerned. I am tactfully silent upon delivery speed and I cannot tell you whether this result would get good marks in a comprehensive cost/benefit study.

10. Actual Situation and Prospects

After a period of prosperity and expansion, increasing journal prices in the late seventies (combined with the devaluation of the D-Mark versus US-Dollar) gradually changed attitudes of libraries to their serial collections. Slow growth or even decline of budgets and increasing allocations for serials reduced the proportion available for book purchases while at the same time books grew more and more expensive.

First reaction was an increasing reluctance to take out new subscriptions, despite the fact that there seemed to be no decrease in the publishing of new serials.

This caused uneasy feelings because in principle there is no reason to prefer new books to new periodicals. Perhaps new serials are of even greater importance.

This of course depends upon the subject field concerned. The only argument against new subscriptions is a budgetary one besides the essential uncertainty of the bargain: you are never sure in continuing a subscription of getting your money's worth.

In 1981, and dramatically in 1982, severe cuts in public expenditure forced libraries to make drastic decisions. In several cases, book purchases had to be stopped altogether because the remaining portion of the budget was barely sufficient to cover subscription obligations. As a change for the better was unlikely, immediate measures had to be taken. In 1980, expenditure on serials accounted on average for 55% of the acquisitions budget; in 1982, this had risen to 63%. In this situation, a shift from the periodicals portion of the budget to the book portion was imperative; this meant a good deal of cancellation of journal subscriptions.

An enquiry into the state of affairs which I undertook in April 1983 produced evidence that 48 academic libraries together had cancelled in 1981 and 1982 about 25,000 subscriptions, an average of 520 each. Expenditures on serials had been reduced by 6% - 15%; in extreme cases up to 36% of current subscriptions were cut.

When in 1982 we reported upon the situation to which libraries were reduced,

an unexpectedly lively public discussion took place. The existing interactions between publishing, library activities and research conditions were discussed and to some degree clarified, with the result that, on the whole, disproportionate damage was in the end avoided, and in most academic libraries purchasing power was restored to an acceptable level. This was done mainly through extra grants which means, I need not tell you, that something could be done for book purchase, but that libraries had to remain cautious about their budgetary allocations to serials.

The main reactions to the new challenges were, of course, the classic procedures: dropping duplicate subscriptions, infrequently used or marginal material, items in foreign and unfamiliar languages (which means, I am sorry to say, all languages except English) and, last but not least, very expensive periodicals, because only by dropping these, immediate and effective savings can be expected.

Compared with the given standards of serials collections in our university libraries, the shrinking process may on the whole, with the exception of individual cases, not be regarded as disastrous. So far, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft has been able to allocate grants for literature provision roughly in line with inflation, so that the participating libraries were able to continue, even to expand, their acquisition programmes. The existing system of decentralized acquisition and resource sharing mitigates the negative effect of local cuts. But this strength has its weaknesses too. The impact upon inter-library lending will be considerable. One of the results of my enquiry was that, from 1980 to 1982, local requests increased by 8% while inter-library loan requests received by these libraries rose about 24%. With reduced staff and many other problems of personnel management, an increasing number of loan requests will certainly not increase efficiency and speed.

Another question is whether the Sondersammelgebiet-libraries are able to stand distortions caused by lower funds for local activities and rising demands upon their special tasks within the decentralized system. As they are obliged to allocate 20% to 25% of the total expenditure for foreign literature in their Sondersammelgebiete out of their own funds, a reduced budget may eventually prevent them from meeting their obligations within the supra-regional system. The proper balance between their local and their national functions may be upset, at least in some libraries, especially medium-sized university libraries with a relative large share in the Sondersammelgebiet-system.

11. Future Prospects

Prediction of future development is a dangerous business. I should feel much

easier sitting on your side hearing about it than speaking to you about probable issues.

12. Probable Reactions in the Immediate Future

As funding of libraries will not keep up with inflation but rather go down, and real prices of periodicals will rise rather than fall, pressure upon allocations for serials will continue.

Alternative purchase strategies on the book market, reduced binding standards - usually paid for later by disproportionate cost of repair - are all poor remedies and are of only marginal importance and percentage. Savings through exchange or gift are highly improbable. So further cancellation of subscriptions will be inevitable. The trouble with subscription cancellation in larger academic libraries is that there are only two ways of obtaining the desired financial effect: either you cancel a very great number of rather inexpensive journals (then the loss in substance is disproportionate to the money saved) or you cancel the very expensive periodicals, exactly those to which only libraries can afford to subscribe.

These obvious absurdities are emphasized by the effect upon location instruments and the consequent confusion in the lending system: printed union lists grow suddenly obsolete. This disadvantage is minimized when computer-based lists are used and inexpensive COM-reissues or on-line searching ensure that location indications are up to date.

Presumably the main reaction to the situation will follow the traditional pattern: intensified cooperation and long-range regional acquisition policies will be recommended:

- more cooperation in order to reduce duplicates in the local and regional systems, and to some extent even in the national lending system
- remote storage of infrequently used back sets of journals in regional centres reduced to one item per lending region (in order to save storage space in the local systems)
- improvement of bibliographic access to journal holdings through networks and delivery systems using photocopy, facsimile transmission and other devices.

As decentralized acquisition and resource sharing in the national frame of the Sondersammelgebiete has proved useful and has been practised more or less successfully within the local systems of universities, it will be thought a suitable thing to repeat this within the regional lending and network systems. In Nordrhein-Westfalen this has already been attempted (and in part achieved) including in this case not only academic libraries but larger public libraries as well.

I think that resource sharing practised on three different levels - local, regional and national - may turn out to be, not so much the most reasonable, as the most confusing thing to do. It may prove far too complicated even with the help of perfect library networks, which at the moment are far from being fully developed, let alone perfect.

There seems to be good sense in a scheme like the following one:

- heavily or at least frequently used material - I am speaking of periodicals - is placed in the decentralized departmental or institute libraries (so far as the traditional universities are concerned) and is for local use only;
- less used material is placed in the main collection of the central library for local as well as for regional and supra-regional use;
- infrequently used special material is exclusively held in one library of a region if not in one of the Sondersammelgebiet-libraries, and is primarily intended for inter-library lending.

Unfortunately individual journals have a bad habit of not falling clearly into any one of these categories. In the given circumstances, even under great pressure, duplication can be reduced only to a limited extent; cooperative de-acquisition is not only difficult to manage but very expensive to realize; inconvenience for the user community will be intolerable; the impact on inter-library lending will be heavy, and there are already reasons for not being too happy about the present state of affairs. Excessive resource sharing is in direct contradiction to user-oriented collection management that has been one of the main aims of German university libraries in the last decades. To the majority of readers regional resource sharing is equivalent to remote storage - the user will be deprived of what has only recently been granted: open access to large collections. Open access has been the great motto of every new university library; and most of the traditional ones, if given the opportunity with enlarged or new buildings, have tried to ensure open access to large areas of their collections, especially to their periodical collection. Regional resource sharing is directly opposite to this beneficial tendency. It is worse than local storage in closed stacks, which has been the usual thing in most traditional university libraries (a fact in part responsible for the undesirable development of our institute libraries). Of course, it all depends upon the value you put on easy physical access and browsing opportunities.

The German experience with decentralized resources is against excessive resource sharing. It is not in the interest of the user. It is expensive, and moreover it causes an undesirable estrangement between the library and its user community within a university. Collections, no doubt, need management; they cannot be replaced by management. Lending systems are no substitutes for actual libraries.

13. Impact on Publication

There is another aspect of excessive resource sharing: its impact on publishing. Resource sharing seems to be reasonable if looked at from inside a library system. If it is extended to an entire region, if it is strictly practised within a national frame, if country after country takes part in this kind of sharing (eventually even the Japanese libraries), will there be in the end any resources to share? Will scholarly and research journals not simply have ceased to appear?

On the question of resource sharing, we should do this with carefully regard to the publisher/library relationship in journal publication. I have no information on the effect of restrictions in US and British libraries in the seventies on the publishing of scholarly and research journals; I have a suspicion that it has in fact contributed to the raising of prices. The ordinary librarian's economic awareness seems to be limited to an idea that books (not to speak of journals) are expensive: his reaction to budget limitations is, after some hesitation, as we have seen, to reduce his library's subscriptions to journals. He innocently contributes to what is described as "a disastrous downward spiral of lowered subscriptions leading to higher prices, leading in turn to lower subscriptions, ad infinitum".² I have an impression that the closed economic system of library purchase and journal publishing, already distorted by various kinds of subsidizing, and perverted by page fees and other devices, will eventually become unbalanced.

Relations between publishing and libraries have already been ambivalent: the existence and the buying capacity of libraries are basic to publishing; at the same time, libraries reduce the distribution range of journals by circulating them within their own closed systems. The efficiency of resource sharing, so far as journals are concerned, depends on photocopying; an abuse of photocopying is impairing publishing conditions. No wonder a third way is sought out of this perplexing situation.

Symptomatic of the situation, it seems to me, are over-nervous reactions of German publishers to photocopy practices in libraries, and activities on their side aiming more or less at exclusion of libraries from the information business.

The more libraries reduce their purchasing, the more difficult it will be to publish: authors and users - at least an inner circle in the forefront of research, a closed community in itself - may be totally united in creating an information system of their own, independent of both publishers and libraries. We are already familiar with their habit of avoiding the inevitable delays of traditional publish-

ing and provision through libraries by producing papers and other material outside the book market (the so-called grey literature). Years ago, a mathematician explained to me that there are two kinds of scientists: well informed ones and uninformed ones, the latter being those who regularly read the current journals. You are all familiar with the trouble libraries have in getting hold of these productions that may not properly be called publications. This tendency, I think, will be intensified in scope and speed by all kinds of computer-based information transmission, whose main attraction in fact is the avoidance of paper, publishers and libraries.

One tendency seems to be obvious. A growing number of periodicals is already accessible not only in a paper edition but also through full-text storage in databases. The next step will probably be systems of document digitalization and teletransmission. So the tendency is to eliminate the journal in its traditional physical and bibliographic shape. Excessive resource sharing as a worldwide practice of library systems will contribute to the rapidity and the scale of this process.

What I am uneasy about is the question whether electronic publishing and publishing on demand may be called true publishing at all. With these devices we get an enormous acceleration in speed and efficiency of access; but will access be free, will accessibility be general and not monopolized by high-profit information producers and information brokers? Is there not an attack on one of the main social functions of the library, that is to ensure access to every kind of (published?) information for everyone able to make use of it?

In a way this development may be welcome, i.e. from an ecological point of view. We may say that journal publication has outgrown all reasonable dimensions, that much more is published than can be managed or "consumed". This may be so, but where is the remedy? In this respect we are deeply involved in a worldwide economic development: growth as an economic problem seems to be at a dead end everywhere. But I think libraries are not the right place to look for a cure to the disease. As long as there is an enormous amount of journal publishing on the one side and an enormous amount of demand on the other, libraries are there to control what is published and to ensure permanent use of periodicals. They do it in different ways: academic libraries have the right and the privilege to choose, but an essential condition of their usefulness is that provision is large, so long as production is large.

14. Conclusion

Out of these doubts, I am personally inclined to follow a rather conservative

line, insisting upon a broad view of literature provision within the local systems with reasonable relations to supra-regional resources, warning against expensive procedures which impoverish libraries by excessive resource sharing, waiting for technical changes and developments that might replace a good deal of our traditional devices and that should be part of the libraries' activities.

Meanwhile, we will have to continue, I think, aggressively to exert influence on public policy in favour of sufficient expenditure on literature provision. You will remember that academic libraries in the Federal Republic are exclusively funded by the State. We will have to explain to the authorities that sufficient information and free access to it through libraries is one of the conditions of the well being of a country. We shall warn against a narrow definition of benefit in cost/benefit studies. We will have to make clear that decision through quantitative measurement of use is in sharp contrast, if not in direct contradiction, to the usefulness of this kind of library.

Cutting back to what is actually used by the greater number is a reasonable standard for parts of a library's holdings, i.e. the undergraduate collection which we call Lehrbuchsammlung; but it is not acceptable for the main collection of a large academic library, least of all for its collection of scholarly and research journals. A collection deprived of a wide range of important but rather neglected material is deliberately excluding the very conditions of discovery, those regions of the unusual where new ideas tend to blossom. Though libraries should adopt user-oriented acquisition, they must not be reduced to what is thought useful by those who happen to be present at the time. One of the main tasks of academic libraries is to keep open the sources of intellectual life, and to do this in a broad, not in a narrow way.

- 1 British figures e.g. (excluding Oxford and Cambridge and all the London Colleges which greatly invalidates the comparison) give an average of c. 3,300 current periodicals for 49 university libraries (1978). Highest figures are given by Belfast, Birmingham, Glasgow, Leeds, Manchester with c. 8,000, lowest by Bath, East Anglia, York with c. 2,000 current periodicals. (Research libraries and collection in the U.K., 1978.
- 2 Bernard Fry et al. Economics and Interaction of the Publisher/Library Relationship in the Production and Use of Scholarly and Research Journals. Indiana University. 1975.