A Revolution in American University Libraries
米国の大学図書館革新

Everett T. Moore
エヴェレット・ティー・ムーア

要　旨

1950年代の米国における大学図書館の学生に対するサービスの変化は，まさに革命的といっても過言ではない。この革新は勿論突如として始まったものではなく，その萌芽は，増加の一途を辿る学生に対するサービスの問題をとりあげた第二次大戦前の大学図書館に関する多くの研究の中に見出される。

大きな州立大学，主として米国中西部，西部の大学で事態は最も深刻であった。州立大学のみならず大きな私立大学においても同様，大量の学部学生に対して，いかにして効率のよい図書館サービスを行なうかが問題の焦点となった。即ち，学生数の多い大学の図書館がその中央館を通じて，質も量も異なる教授陣，研究者，大学院学生，学部学生のすべての要求を満たそうとするところに困難があった。古い大きな大学図書館では，大きな積層式の書庫に数十万，時には数百万の図書を蔵し，教員と大学院学生のみが入庫を許され，学部学生は，貸出係を通じて所要の図書を請求し，時には借り出すまでに長時間待たねばならなかった。1930年頃に建てられた大学図書館建築は，書誌的研究の象徴として設計されたものであって，現代の要求に合致しない点が多かった。戦後学生が大勢になり，しかもすぐれた学生達が益々増加し，従って図書館に対する要求も量が増加しただけでなく，程度も高くなって来た。戦後間もなく多くの大学図書館では，学部学生に対しても大学院学生に対しても，適切なサービスを提供することはできなくなってきたので，総てのレベルの利用者に対して，より良いサービスを提供するために，何かすばらしい手段を考え出すことが必要となってきた。

ハーバード大学では，1948年学部学生のために新たにラモント図書館を建設し，他の多くの大学に対して将来の行く道を示した。これは学部学生に対して，より適切なサービスを行なうことと，ワイドナー本館に対する過重な負担を軽減するという，二つの目的を持っていた。この方法を学部学生の多い大きな州立大学に適用するには幾多の困難があったが，州立大学の中では，ミシガン大学が本館を改装し，また貯蔵図書館を新設すると同時に，学部学生図書館を別館として新設する計画を1952年に採択した。現在このミシガン大学の学部学生図書館と同規模のものを建築する計画を持っているものに，バークレ

Everett T. Moore, Assistant University Librarian, University of California, Los Angeles. 1952-53 Visiting Professor, Japan Library School. エヴェレット・ティー・ムーア：カリフォルニア大学（ロスアンゼルス）図書館副館長；1952-53 年度図書館学科訪問教授.

ーのカリフォルニア大学，イリノイ大学，スタンフォード大学がある。またテキサス大学の新しい学部学生図書館は最近完成した。

このようなやり方と反対の行き方もあることを示そうとするかのように，若干の大学では総合研究図書館を新築し，その後旧来の総合図書館を学部学生図書館に改装するという方法を採用した。この方法を最初に実行したのはコーネル大学である。ロスアンゼルスのカリフォルニア大学は10年間も建築プログラムを検討した暁に，新しい研究図書館を1964，1968，1972年と3期に分けて建築し，また主として学部学生のための図書館として旧本館を改装する予定で，その改装もまた3期に分けて施行されることになっている。

この学部学生図書館を分離するという方式がすべての人々に容認されたというわけでは決してない。新しい図書館を建てようにも建てられない大学も沢山あるし，また学部学生と大学院学生を一緒にした方がよいと考える人達もいる。このような方式のすぐれた総合図書館新築の例は，セントルイスのワシントン大学，ジョンズ・ホプキンズ大学，ノートルダム大学，ペンシルヴァニア大学に見られる。大学図書館の設計様式が決して単一なものでないということは，各大学が健全な自主性に基づいて設計し，組織しているからで，まことに意義がある。過去の図書館が記念碑的建築物として一様な建築様式であったのに比べて，独自の要求が考慮されている証である。

米国で現在建てられつつある大学図書館の建築は，教授，大学院学生，学部学生，その他の利用者の要求にマッチしたサービスに対する考慮を反映していることは，非常に意義のあることである。図書，雑誌，その他の資料が容易に入手でき，それらの資料を利用するのに便利で快的な施設があり，資料の探索利用を援助できる有能な館員がいるならば，他のことは余り重要ではない。

将来，高能率の図書館では，貸出業務管理は機械化され，データ処理に電子計算機が利用されることがかならず必要になるであろうから，近代的な大学図書館を組織するには最高の経営の才能とビジネスセンスが要求される。

米国の図書館人の中には，このような量的かつ複雑な大学の成長に対して懸念を抱く向きもあるが，問題なのは学生の量そのものではなく，その成長率であり，もし受入態勢を上廻る増加により，バランスが壊れた時こそ危険なのである。今や米国の大学図書館革新は進行中であり，この影響を受けなかった図書館は一つもない。このような変りゆく事態の中で，いつも変らないものは，アメリカの図書館人の合言葉〝サービスの精神〟であろう。 (T. S.)

The second half of the twentieth century has seen in its initial years nothing less than a revolution in library services to university students in the United States. By now we have reached a point where we can usefully look at the road we have traveled and study the general direction we are going.

As with all revolutions, this one did not begin at a precise moment in history. Its roots extend back well before the mid-century point, for they can be seen in many studies of college and university libraries in the pre-World War II years concerning the increasingly difficult problems of serving the constantly growing numbers of undergraduate and graduate students in a variety of institutions of higher learning. Librarians, faculties, and students were all frustrated by the large enrollments (particularly in the state universities) and of having to use library buildings which were ill-suited to the organization of efficient and agreeable service. The very basis of large-scale library service to undergraduates in the largest universities was under scrutiny and much doubt was cast on the ability of even the largest libraries to cope with the situation.

Conditions were most seriously aggravated in the great state universities, mainly in the Middle West and the West, those remarkable public institutions whose vital task has been thought of for more than a century in the United States as "the fortification and enrichment of democracy."[1] These institutions, aided and inspired by the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862 (signed by Abraham Lincoln) had become more and more numerous, and by the early years of the twentieth century several of them were well established as the most important in the nation. By this time, also, they were growing rapidly. Some of them, such as California, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Washington, and Wisconsin, already had between ten and twenty thousand students in the pre-war years.

The problems of size pertained to entire universities, of course, not alone to their libraries. Allan Nevins has said that "Coping with numbers, the state and land-grant universities have an ever more difficult responsibility for promoting freedom in inquiry, freedom in discussion of ideas, and freedom in the dissemination of truth, however unpopular. They must deal with cross sections of the whole population, and the worst tyranny is often mass tyranny. Numbers unquestionably complicate the task of keeping our nation an open and mobile society. Higher education has a prime function in contribution to equality of opportunity by giving every ambitious person, young or old, rich or poor, well trained or ill trained, a chance adapted to his or her gifts. But the avenues of opportunity may become choked, and in training millions of students—perhaps soon ten millions —it will not be as easy as it was to foster a healthy diversity in intellectual and social life, to encourage social experimentation, and to nature tolerance and liberalism."[2]

The numbers of students needing to be served in these expanding universities posed some giganitic problems for university librarians. Not only in the public universities but in the larger private universities as well, questions of how to provide efficient, let alone meaningful, library service to the masses of undergraduate students were among the most vexing of all. The situation faced by American university librarians was sympathetically described in 1939 by that perceptive observer, Wilhelm Munthe, whose book, *American Librarianship from a European Angle*,[3] still makes important reading.

"This peculiar combination of an English-American liberal arts college and a continental university," Munthe wrote, "is what makes it so difficult for European visitors to appreciate the problems that American universities, both state and endowed, are facing today. A glance at one of these peculiarly American institutions shows us an enormous undergraduate college, a superstructure of a graduate college with much smaller enrollment, and a row of annexes in the form of professional schools for the study of law, medicine, etc. However, it is only the last two groups, and only they, that make up the university in the European sense. The relative size of the undergraduate and graduate divisions is best shown by the enrollment figures, which total over half a million for all American four-year liberal arts colleges, but only about 77,000 for the graduate departments, not quite 13 per cent. This does not, however, include the students in other graduate professional schools. But it is the undergraduates with their superiority in number that determine the character of campus life, crowd the residence halls, gymnasiums and stadiums, fraternity houses, etc., and hence provide the university with its social problems. If we could cut off the undergraduate college, we would be left with a university in the strict sense, which in only a few instances would have more than 1,000 or 2,000 students, as against the 10,000 to 15,000 that many now have. But we would also have left the great scientific laboratories, museums, hospitals, and—a true university library."[4]

This was the crux of the problem: that the large university libraries were attempting to serve through the same central facilities a great variety and quantity of needs of faculties, researchers, graduate students, and undergraduates. Large multi-tiered book stacks with low ceilings

and narrow aisles, designed to hold hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of books, were characteristic features of the largest libraries. The stacks were generally open only to graduate students and faculty members. Undergraduates, too numerous to be permitted in the crowded stacks, had to present their requests at a loan desk and wait, sometimes for a long time, for their books to be delivered. A requested book might be out on loan to someone else, or it might turn out to be not as useful as the student had hoped from reading the catalogue card. A student might try several times to find what he needed, only to be frustrated at every attempt. The undergraduate's competition with graduates and faculty was badly handicapped.

Or, the undergraduate might need to use the books placed on reserve for his courses. The reserve system, established in American university libraries many years ago as a means for serving the mass demands of undergraduates who were assigned speciffic readings in books —sometimes entire books—has done much to provide the necessary copies of books in heaviest demand, and to bring them together for more efficient and convenient circulation. But since it was often a closed-shelf system, and because even the scores of copies of some books had to be competed for by hundreds of students, the loan periods were often brief—as little as an hour or two—or there were insufficient copies, and again, the undergraduate was the victim of a machine-like system which frequently operated with less than streamlined efficiency.

The university library building, as Frederick H. Wagman has graphically put it, "was designed well into the 1930's (and in some instances into the 40's) as both inspiring symbol and center of bibliographical research activity. It offered storage for great numbers of books, study cubicles for the faculty, and carrells and seminar rooms for the graduate students. It impressed visiters with an imposing lobby and appropriately sententious Latin inscriptions on the walls. Invariably it also contained a cathedral-like, dimly lit main reading room which housed a collection of reference works and was furnished with long tables and chairs in an arrangement favored by dormitory dining halls to achieve maximum utilization of seating space for brief periods of time. The use of the reference collection bore no relationship to the abundant space in which it was housed, consequently this room usualy served as the main 'study hall' of the library where the undergraduates might read books brought to them from the stacks, or more often, study their own textbooks and lecture notes. The reference department was often housed in this room and it was mistakenly assumed that the reference staff would be able, because of proximity, to . . . assist the undergraduates adequately with their minor bibliographical preblems. The stacks were closed to undergraduates because the scholarly volumes had to be protected and also because no library could afford the shelf-reading entailed in granting thousands of inexperienced students free access to all the books. . . .

". . . Despite their huge undergraduate enrollments the libraries of many of these very large universities could not have been better conceived or designed to discourage use by young students. Their book collections are relatively inaccessible. Too few copies of the best and most needed books can be made available. The staff of reference librarians is too limited and harassed to be very helpful. The rooms assigned to undergraduate students are frequently depressing. The catalog is too large and complicated. In few of these institutions is there a carefully planned program in force that will help the student acquire facility in working with the bibliographical tools essetial for the intelligent use of the human record."[5]

Underscoring the fact that this situation typified the large privately-endowed universities as well as the state universities, Philip J. McNiff described the Harvard University Library's problems in similar fashion. He told of the many drawbacks there were to undergraduate service in the Widener Library in the pre-Lamont Library days:

"It was too large and impersonal; the college students has direct access only to the reserved

reading books and a small browsing collection. The large reading room on the second floor proved to be unsatisfactory as a reserved book center and collections serving the survey courses were established in two other buildings. The increased demands of faculty members, graduate students and visiting scholars pushed the undergraduates further into the background. The result was that Harvard students were not receiving the quality of library service enjoyed by students in the better four year liberal arts colleges."[6]

This was generally the situation among American universities at the beginning of World War II. All efforts to improve matters had to be put off until the close of the war, and within a few years after that matters had become worse than ever before. Enrollments in all universities were swollen to unprecedented numbers as the war veterans came to college and graduate school under the encouragement of the federal government through its "G.I. Bill."

Wilhelm Munthe had remaked wistfully that "if we could cut off the undergraduate college, we would be left with a university in the strict sense." But the post-war situation was to be rather an intensification of that before the war. Instead of the total of less than a million students in American colleges and universities in the 1930's, the total was to rise to four million in the early 1960's. Existing institutions have expanded beyond all previous expectations, and hundreds of new universities and colleges have been established. The bounds of knowledge and learning have, as we know, been immeasurably extended. The difficulties of providing good university library service have been enormously multiplied, but so have the opportunities for making revolutionary changes in methods and means. The old ways were so patently inadequate that drastic measures were essential.

"This new exciting climate of opportunity," says Wyman W. Parker, of Wesleyan University, "seems in large part due to the enormous breakthrough in science—knowledge of recognizable frontiers—in space, in the body, in the mind—which might be conquered.... There is now a curiosity about the physical world akin to that of Elizabethan England which will bring in great understanding of the world and the body—the macrocosm and the microcosm...."

"The fact is that we all have more *and better* students than ever before. They are bursting with energy and enthusiasm—and, alack, their horizons are boundless. This, of course, is good as far as their ideas go but it forces the librarians to attempt to satisfy limitless interests. There is now more advanced work in the colleges than ever before. Our faculty members demand more effort and expect a higher standard of performance than previously. Honors work or the individual project is in evidence on every campus and is increasing constantly. In truth, the undergraduate curriculum has become so accelerated that in many instances a fine student goes to graduate school from college knowing well the tools of research while the superior scholar may even gain an A.B. having had the equivalent of a first year of graduate study."[7]

A fact about post-war enrollments that would have surprised Munthe and perhaps alarmed him is that we now have not only vastly greater numbers of undergraduates in our colleges and universities today than in the 1930's but a larger percentage of graduate students as well. Precise figures are not available, but reports from a number of major universities show that by the 1960's, the proportion of graduate students to undergraduates had risen significantly above the thirteen per cent cited by Munthe as an overall percentage. Of the great state universities mentioned above as having the largest enrollments before the war, statistics published by the United States Office of Education[8] showed them to be in the following percentage ranges in 1961:

50–74 per cent graduate students:	California (Berkeley)
25–49 per cent graduate students:	Michigan
10–24 per cent graduate students:	Illinois
	Indiana
	Minnesota
	Washington
	Wisconsin

Other state universities now of major size show comparable percentages: UCLA, in the 25-49 per cent range, and Iowa, Louisiana State, Ohio State, and Oregon, in the 10-24 per cent range.

Among the larger private universities, Chicago and Harvard are in the 50-74 per cent range and Columbia, Johns Hopkings, Stanford, and Yale are in the 25-49 per cent range.

By soon after the war, therefore, most university libraries were serving neither undergraduates nor graduate students adequately with their pre-war resources and facilities, and drastic measures were needed which would provide better for the students on all levels.

Harvard pointed the way for a number of universities by establishing in 1948 the Lamont Library, an entirely new facility for undergraduates. The move had a dual purpose: to provide more adequately and suitably for the undergraduates and to relieve the severe pressure on the main library, Widener. "It is a tribute to Harvard," Frederick Wagman writes, "that it was the first among the great universities to attack this situation and that it did so, not under the pressure of increased enrollment, not because circumstances forced it, but because it wished to improve library service to undergraduates despite the increasing demands of scholarship. It should be remembered that at Harvard the graduate students outnumber the undergraduates and that the Widener Library and the many branch libraries offer far more by way of library facilities than is available at most universities to serve much larger student bodies. Additionally, Harvard had already developed a system of house libraries for the benefit of its undergraduates. Nevertheless, in his address at the conference referred to above, Keyes Metcalf stated as the first premise on which the Lamont Library was planned: 'The undergraduates will make more and better use of a library designed expressly for them.' Mr. Metcalf did not leave this statement exposed and unsupported by practical considerations. He went on to list as additional premises: 'That this was the best way to relieve the pressure in the Widener building and make unnecessary a new centeral building; and that if the pressure were relieved, the Widener Library building would become a more satisfactory research center than it has been in the past.'[9] All three of his premises were correct. It is to his credit that he listed them in their proper order of importance."[10]

The Harvard achivement, while eminently suitable and successful for that university, did not provide an immediate and simple answer to the problems of the state universities with their much larger enrollments and much higher percentages of undergraduates. But the plan was studied and carefully weighed for its applicability in some form. To provide similar separate facilities large sums of money would be required for additional capital outlay and for additional staff and books. The ideas would have to be *sold* to the state authorities as essential to the successful development of higher education programs already being expanded and intensified in many universities.

The first of the state university libraries to undertake a major program was at the University of Michigan, under Frederick Wagman's direction. As Mr. Wagman has recounted, the University had previously planned to enlarge its general library building. Remodeling and expansion of that building, at very high cost, would have improved it greately, he says, for use by the graduate students and faculty, but would not have provided for undergraduate needs to any significant extent. In 1952 this plan, long in the development stage, was set aside, and the University proceeded with a subsititute plan calling for some remodeling of the general library, for construction of a storage building and bindery, and for a separate undergraduate library building.[11]

The program for the Michigan undergraduate library stated that "everything possible should be done in the architectural planning and in the selection of books and staff to make the library inviting and easy to use; to give the students the impression that the librarians were employed to assist rather than supervise or monitor them; and to help the undergraduates develop a proprietary interest in their

library."[12]

"It was decided early in the planning," Mr. Wagman says, "that the entire book collection would be placed on open shelves. To facilitate the finding of books, the floor plan was simplified to the ultimate degree and no sacrfice of this simplicity was subsequently permitted for the sake of architectural effect. Critical examination of the reasons usually advanced for keeping reserve books behind a barrier led to the conclusion that it would be feasible, although more costly, to place the reserves where they belong in the classification system, on the open shelves, provided one marked them with a distinctive symbol and controlled the exits from the building. Exception to this rule has been made only for occasional items such as reprints of journal articles lent to the library by the faculty for class use. The planning committee decided also that the only argument against allowing the students to smoke anywhere in the air-conditioned building was the janitorial cost of emptying ash trays at night and that this argument was not compelling. Similarly, it seemed foolish to make students who were spending long hours in the library leave the building in order to get a cup of coffee, so a coffee shop was provided even though this meant extra floor washing in one room.

"Since the ideal of complete privacy, a separate room for every reader, is unattainable, a compromise was effected. The large reading area on every floor is broken by a row of group study rooms along one wall, each of which can accommodate eight students, by the ranges of book shelving and by placement of colorful 'space-breakers' or screens. As a result one is not given the sensation of sitting in a very large room in any reading area. One-third of the seating provided is at individual tables attached to the screens or along the walls. The rest of the seating is at tables designed for four students, except that the arrangement of tables is interrupted by occasional groupings of lounge furniture. Despite the disproportionate ratio of seating to book space, the reader is conscious of the proximity of the books in all parts of the reading areas."[13]

This is perhaps the definitive statement for the idea of a new undergraduate library in the university. Several other universities now have plans under way for new undergradute libraries of comparable size and scope—among them, California at Berkeley, Illinois at Urbana, and Stanford. A new undergraduate library at the University of Texas, recently completed, is called the Academic Center. A few years ago, in stating the reasons for building the new library, the Chancellor at Texas, H.H. Ransom, spoke acidly of some of the now generally discredited practices of library planning of a generation ago:

"The undergurate area of the present twenty-seven story architectural curiosity was inadequate for undergraduates the day it left the drawing boards. Designed as a mixed library and administration building, its effect has been to assist—or test—scholarly pertinacity, depth of bibliographical penetration, breadth of comparative studies, and sophistication of intellectual judgment. In other words, it is unusable by freshmen and sophomores. Even if it were not, the University has barred these younger students from all parts of the building except four large rooms and the cathedral-like entrances where the card catalogues are housed. There are all kinds of excuses for this quarter-century of denial: the tremendous growth of graduate programs, the equally great problems of library security in a building with a more complicated design than a prairie-dog village, the faculty's quiet surrender to textbook selections and cheap reprints. But although everybody has understood the situation, nobody has defended it. . . ."[14]

As if to show that the scheme can be reversed with similar effect, several universities have chosen to build new general, or research libraries and then to remodel their old general library buildings for more appropriate use by undergraduates. First to undertake this plan was Cornell, where, after completion of its beautiful and excellently planned Olin Library, for faculty and graduate students, its former main library was thoroughly remodeled to become

a handsome and functional Uris Library for undergraduates. In many respects these are models of their kind, for they have set impressive standards of taste and practicability which have strongly influenced building planning at other universities. At UCLA (the Los Angeles campus of the University of California) a ten-year building program embraces the building of a new Research Library, the first unit of which was occupied in 1964, with two successive units to follow in 1968 and 1972, and remodeling of the former main library building for use largely as a College Library. Again, the work on this building will be carried through three stages, the first to be completed in the fall of 1965.

The separate undergraduate library pattern has by no means received universal acceptance. Many universities are not in a position to establish new libraries. Others believe it wiser to maintain integrated services for graduates and undergraduates. Some examples of notable new general library buildings are those at Washington University in St. Louis, Johns Hopkins, Notre Dame, and the University of Pennsylvannia.

The lack of a single or consistent pattern in the planning and organization of university libraries is of significance only in so far as it demonstrates a healthy independence in planning, so that local and immediate requirements are given greater attention than in the days of planning the noble monuments which so often were monstrously unusable as libraries for either graduate students or undergraduates.

Of larger significance is the fact that the university library buildings now being built in the United States reflect the heightened concern for the kind of service needed by all of their users: factulty, graduate students, undergraduates, and all the others who may use their resources. It does not matter so much how these services may be organized within the building or buildings provided, so long as all concerned may have ready access to books and periodicals and other materials, convenient and comfortable facilities for using those materials, and skilled staff to assist in fiding and using the library's resources. The varied talents and skills of librarians and architects will be taxed to provide appropriate, pleasing, and functional facilities which will fulfill these needs.

To organize such agreeable facilities and services in the modern university library requires the best of administrative talent and business sense as well, for the utilization of mechanized systems for circulation control and of computer facilities for control of data will surely be required in tomorrow's efficient library. The tens of thousands of students and the thousands of faculty members to be served and the millions of books to be organized for efficient use demand the finest systems available if the library's older ideals of good service are to be afforded.

American librarians often express concern over the growth of universities to such size and complexity. But Allan Nevins remarks that "Observers who find the gargantuan statistics of present and prospective enrollment disconcerting will nevertheless commit a flagrant error if they supporse that great size is in itself reprehensible. The error has a simply psychological root. A total of 30,000 students seems alarming to the man who relates it to the kind of university he attended with 6,000 students. Of course attendances of 30,000 are not related to that kind of institution at all. The crucial question, as President Henry of Illinois says, is not size but rate of increase. . . .

"Size and rate of growth hoist their danger signal only when they become disproportionate to existing facilities and faculty, to financial resources, and above all, to administrative capacity. . . ."[15]

The library revolution in American universities is now in full swing. No library has been unaffected. Some libraries have undergone thoroughgoing change and are now able to see fairly clearly how they may serve more adequately than did the libraries of a generation ago all who depend on them—even those vastly greater numbers who now make up our universities. One value remains constant through the changing conditions. Wilhelm Munthe referred to it when he discussed the speed and

service characteristic of American libraries. The whole difference between European and American libraries, he said, is accounted for "by that American ideal which is covered by the word 'service', the watchword of American librarianship."[16]

1) Allan Nevins, *The State Universities and Democracy* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1962), p. 111.
2) *Ibid.*, pp. 111–112.
3) Wilhelm Munthe, *American Librarianship from a European Angle* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1939). (1961 reprint cited.)
4) *Ibid.*, pp. 114–115.
5) Frederick H. Wagman, "The Undergraduate Library of the University of Michigan," *College and Research Libraries*, XX (May 1959), pp. 179–180.
6) Philip J. McNiff, "Lamont Library, Harvard College," *College and Research Libraries*, XIV (July 1953), p. 269.
7) Wyman W. Parker, "The College Library: New Demands and New Approaches," *College and Research Libraries*, XXIV (November 1963), p. 460.
8) U.S. Office of Education, *Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1962–63. Institutional Data* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964).
9) *The Place of the Library in the University, A Conference Held at Harvard University 30–31 March, 1949.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Library, 1950), p. 42.
10) Frederick H. Wagman, "The Undergraduate Library of the University of Michigan," *College and Research Libraries*, XX (May 1959), p. 181.
11) *Ibid.*, pp. 183–184.
12) *Ibid.*, p. 184.
13) *Ibid.*, p. 184.
14) H.H. Ransom, "The Academic Center: A Plan for An Undergraduate Library," *The Library Chronicle of the University of Texas*, VI (Winter 1960), pp. 48–49.
15) Allan Nevins, *The State University and Democracy* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1962), pp. 117–118.
16) Wilhelm Munthe, *American Librarianship from a European Angle* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1939), p. 129. (1961 reprint cited.)