



# Spatial growth in university libraries: The future

## Citation

Metcalf, Keyes D. 1948. Spatial growth in university libraries: The future. Harvard Library Bulletin II (2), Spring 1948: 164-178.

## Permanent link

<https://nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HUL.INSTREPOS:37363404>

## Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

## Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.  
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

# Spatial Growth in University Libraries: The Future

**T**HE article in the Spring 1947 issue of the *BULLETIN* entitled 'Spatial Growth in University Libraries' discussed in some detail the ever increasing demands for space for book storage, for readers and staff, for corridors, communications, and utilities, and for monumental purposes. It brought out the fact that, in spite of the general belief that the greatest use of space in a large university library is for book storage, actually space assigned to readers exceeds that for books in almost all institutions. It then discussed the different types of material that occupy book storage space, and considered the prospective future rate of growth for newspapers, periodicals and serials, public documents, trade books, pamphlets and ephemeral material, and reached the conclusion that at present book collections are not growing as rapidly proportionately as in the past, and that there seems to be a good prospect that in the future the percentage rate of growth in space needs for books in great research libraries may diminish even further. It admitted, however, that in spite of the decreasing pace in the growth of book collections and in spite of the fact that readers have occupied more space in libraries than books in the past, the accumulation of books in a university library is already a serious problem, and will gradually become the major factor in increased requirements; every effort must therefore be made to face it in a way that will at least minimize the complications that arise from it.

In the Winter 1948 number of the *BULLETIN*, a second article in the Spatial Growth series discussed the question as it applied to the Harvard Library 1638-1947. This article dealt with the problem in a more concrete manner than the previous one. It showed that the growth of the Harvard University Library had begun to slow up, if not in the actual number of volumes added year by year, at least on a percentage basis. It told in some detail of the tremendous growth in space allotted to the Library in the past generation through the building of the Widener Memorial Library, as well as in the new accommodations provided for the departmental and special libraries. It stated that, when the Lamont Library for undergraduates is completed, the total space available to

the University Library will be over 11,000,000 cubic feet, and showed that a very large percentage of that space had been constructed or assigned in the years since Gore Hall was torn down in 1912. It described the program adopted in 1939 for the physical growth of the Library, and finally, by means of illustration from the Harvard Library, posed the question of the future of university libraries in general, saying that if the collections of the Harvard University Library increased in the next thirty years at the same rate as during the past thirty years, and if the student body increased by one hundred each year, at the end of thirty years the Library, instead of the present 5,000,000 volumes, would have 13,500,000; that new non-monumental construction to the extent of at least 6,000,000 cubic feet would be required; and that the cost of this new construction at present rates, plus endowment for its current upkeep, would amount to an average of \$650,000 a year throughout the thirty-year period. It made it clear, however, that Harvard was instanced merely as a hypothetical case, since there were in reality alleviating factors, and it indicated that there might be a brighter side to the picture generally. A third article, it was proposed, would treat in more detail possible solutions of the question of what university libraries might do to keep their growth in space requirements within reasonable size and within the compass of probable support. This article — the third and last of the *Spatial Growth* series — will discuss the problem for university libraries in general and Harvard University in particular from that point of view.

No attempt will be made to foretell the future, but there will be an effort to point out the situations that may arise and to suggest factors that should be studied. The writer is not wise enough to prophesy even under the most auspicious conditions, and with the uncertain financial situation — which may well be the most important single factor in the years immediately ahead — prophecy has added complications. There is always the question of the number of new publications printed, something that depends at least partially on the relation of printing costs to other costs. There is also the question of the disintegration of material already published. There is the problem of the saving in space that may be obtained by microfilm or by microprint or by microcard, and there are many other factors, financial and otherwise, which may fluctuate.

This is not an article on costs, in spite of the fact that they do have so great an effect on spatial requirements. An article discussing cost

problems in university libraries is planned for a later number of the BULLETIN. It seems worth while here, however, since costs are such an important factor in space requirements, to state rather definitely some of the things that are affected by them and which in turn affect, at least indirectly, spatial requirements, since money spent on one phase of library work thereby becomes unavailable for others. They include the following:

1. The cost of new construction, which includes space for readers and staff, for book storage, for communications and utilities, and for monumental and memorial purposes.
2. The cost of building upkeep, cleaning, light, heat, repairs, etc.
3. The cost of overhead, such as general supervision, supplies and other operating expenditures.
4. The cost of selecting additions to the collections and going through the processes of ordering, receiving, and paying for them.
5. The purchase cost of the acquisitions.
6. The cost of cataloguing the acquisitions.
7. The cost of service.

This final cost — that of service — is one which is perhaps easier to face than any of the others, as an institution that has gone to the expense of caring for the first six categories of expenditures should be, and generally is, ready to pay for the seventh, to which all the others are subordinate. This does not mean, however, that expenditures for circulation and reference work do not need to be watched and held within reasonable bounds. There might be added to the seven types of expenditures already mentioned the cost of decentralization, which in many universities increases the library budget considerably, or the cost of caring for special collections of various kinds under the central roof. Each of the types of expenditures should be kept in mind, and it is better to be realistic about them than to go ahead blindly and hope that everything will come out all right. It is wiser to face facts than to be surprised by them when it is too late to make satisfactory adjustments.

But this article is about spatial growth, not library finances. As has been indicated, space is provided in libraries for readers and staff, for communications and utilities, and in too many cases for monumental and memorial purposes, as well as for books. Space for readers falls into the same general category as service costs. It must be provided. Why should a university library spend half a million dollars for construction, for acquisitions, for cataloguing, if it is not going to provide

space in which the books acquired and processed and stored can be used? As was stated in the first article, more library space in research libraries is now given up to readers than to any other one purpose. In the great libraries, this will probably gradually cease to be true because it is evident that collections tend to grow proportionately, under normal conditions, more rapidly than the number of readers in a research library. But while space for readers is necessary, and while, on the other hand, it may become less important proportionately in the future, it will always be a large factor, and it is an aspect of the library on which in the past a tremendous and inexcusably large amount of space has been wasted because of monumental reading rooms and poor planning. It should be understood that, as far as cubage is concerned, a small stall in a stack seven and a half to eight feet high is the most economical method in terms of space to care for a reader, and that, with present-day ventilation and air-conditioning, there is little excuse for a reading room of more than two stack floors in height. In that connection note may be made that the most valuable space in a reading room — that on the periphery — is ordinarily used for books; that it can rarely be so used without disturbing the occupants of the room; and that it can be used to great advantage for small stalls with individual tables. It has been found possible, by planning the Lamont Library at Harvard in this way, to have a room of 3,870 square feet seating 170 readers, all of them at greater than standard distances from each other, and still with over sixty per cent seated one to a table or in 'semi-lounge' chairs.

Without further comment on the space used for monumental or memorial purposes in reading rooms or in hallways and grand entrances, the situation may be summed up by suggesting that it is simply a question of knowing what monumental space costs and being willing to face that cost realistically. If a great library has 1,000,000 cubic feet of space that is of value only as a monument, and this space costs, as it does today, not much under two dollars a cubic foot, is it worth it? This is a question for the university authorities, and those who provide the funds to answer, and the answer at least in times of financial stress will seem obvious in most cases.

When one turns to the space for book storage, the problem is more complex. The efficient use of space should not be forgotten, of course, but that is only part of the story. An even more important question is what is put in it, as the total cost of the space, although great, is less than the cost of the material that occupies it, particularly if the process-

ing cost is included. Book storage may present difficulties even in a small library, but when a library contains a million volumes or more and grows at the rate of four per cent annually, the figure that has been considered a normal rate for a research institution, it becomes a formidable problem indeed, even if the cost of acquiring, cataloguing, and serving the books is forgotten. There are now four research libraries in the United States with over 3,000,000 volumes and pamphlets in their collections: the Library of Congress, the libraries of Harvard University and Yale University, and the Reference Department of the New York Public Library. If the smallest one of these should increase at the standard rate of four per cent a year in size, it would add over 125,000 volumes annually, and at one dollar per volume in a standard stack, which is the lowest cost that should now be figured for stack construction, the charge amounts to \$125,000 a year. If to that is added the upkeep costs for this space, which may well take the income at four per cent of \$50,000 more, it would require a total investment of \$175,000 a year for new book storage space and its care. Then it should be remembered that, in what has in the past been called the normal course of events, this figure of \$175,000 would increase four per cent a year, since growth seems to be geometric, and in less than eighteen years the \$175,000 a year would increase to \$350,000. For Harvard with its 5,000,000 volumes, the figure would be \$280,000 a year to start with, and it would go up to \$560,000 a year in eighteen years; \$1,120,000 in thirty-six years; \$2,240,000 in fifty-four years; \$4,480,000 in seventy-two years; and \$8,960,000 in ninety years. This is for storage space for books alone, and has nothing to do with the rest of the building requirements, which would undoubtedly increase largely, although not proportionately.

But it is not just the four libraries named above that are involved in this fantastic situation — the libraries of Columbia University and of the Universities of Illinois, California, and Minnesota now have, or will soon have, 1,500,000 volumes; they must figure on something like \$100,000 a year for increased storage space for books even at present if they grow at what is called the standard rate (and they are only some eighteen years behind the libraries in the first group). In addition, four other libraries, Michigan, Cornell, Princeton, and Pennsylvania, have 1,000,000 volumes or more, and in thirty years they will be, if the standard rate of growth continues, in a situation similar to that now faced by the New York Public Library and Yale. It seems

evident that growth must be reduced, if not for all the libraries immediately, for all of them in due course. The question is how much will it, should it, be reduced? As has been indicated in the earlier articles, if the growth in the budget and the building needs in a library is no greater than in the rest of the university, this growth should not be considered a serious matter, and it is probably safe to say that in the normal course of events most universities will increase their budgets at least one per cent a year, if we are figuring on a stable price level. This increase, compounded, means doubling in seventy years, and is a very different matter from an increase of four per cent a year, with doubling in eighteen years.

This brings us to the crux of the problem for Harvard and other universities. How can the growth of libraries be slowed? The various methods that may be considered fall into the six following groups:

1. Financial pressure. This pressure is being felt in many of the larger institutions today. It will not be discussed in detail at this time. Its effect may be postponed by eloquent appeals for help on the part of the library officials. The governing boards of an institution may be persuaded, for instance, that the library should use ten per cent of the institution's total income instead of the five that is now used. But increases of this kind cannot go on indefinitely. It seems to the writer that a reduction of growth forced by financial exigencies and nothing else is like fighting a rear-guard action, and should be avoided, if possible.

2. Lack of material to acquire. This factor is bound to come into the picture sooner or later unless the number of new publications continues to increase as rapidly as libraries have grown in the past. Libraries cannot indefinitely go on growing at the rate of four per cent a year unless the number of new books published increases by a nearly equal rate. Otherwise, sooner or later a library will acquire all the books there are. To most libraries the possibility of a shortage in new titles available for acquisition seems far distant, but when a library holds 9,000,000 volumes and pamphlets, as the Library of Congress does today, that time may not be so remote, and it can be said with little fear of contradiction that the Library of Congress cannot continue to grow at the present rate of well over four per cent a year for any considerable period without finding it difficult to locate enough new publications on the market to maintain this rate, while in due course the supply of older books still wanted will give out.

3. Disintegration of material. It is extremely probable that before the end of this century disintegration of books already in libraries will become so great that net growth will be greatly reduced. Since the beginning of the use of wood pulp in books and newspapers seventy-five years ago, disintegration has become a greater and greater factor. It has already doomed the great newspaper collections. Any woodpulp newspaper that is fifty years old, even if it has been kept under the best of conditions and has been little used, has little life left in it. Many of the books that were published on poor paper during the first World War, to say nothing of many books and pamphlets published both earlier or later, have reached the stage where one more use will be the last. The disintegration of printed matter may well become the greatest problem to be faced by research libraries within another generation.

4. Photographic reproduction. Another way to reduce spatial requirements is to reproduce by microphotography all or parts of library collections. This has already been done on a large scale with newspapers because there disintegration has progressed farther than with other types of printed material, and because the space saved is proportionately greater. Many who have been interested in the problem of space have felt that this was the solution of the space problem, but they have failed to comprehend the cost of the photographic work. Photographic reproductions may be any one of the following: microfilms, microcards made directly from film or by offset, other offset printing at full or reduced size, and photostat. Photostating is too expensive for consideration on a large scale, and does little to reduce space requirements. Microfilm is the cheapest process for a single copy, but the cost of microfilming printed material that is in book form and cannot be fed into the camera automatically is and will continue to be greater than the cost of the space saved, not because of material costs but because of labor charges. It seems evident then that in general microfilm will be used as a space saver only when the progressive disintegration of the original makes another reason for turning to it. It may be used for a new acquisition if the purchase price of the volume is too great to make it obtainable in the original form. But if a book is already in the library, it is cheaper to keep it and care for it as long as it will hold together than to microfilm it. If photostat and microfilm are not going to solve the problem, what about microcards, microprints, and the various offset methods? These are 'edition' methods of reproduc-



tion, and can be used only when enough copies can be sold to pay for the high cost of the original master copy. If fifty or more copies can be sold, the price may come within reach. However, up to the present it has not been found possible to sell fifty copies of any considerable amount of material, and while there is no question that these photographic methods will be used as the years go by, there seems to be little prospect of their being used on a sufficiently large scale to be a major factor in solving the space problem in the great research libraries.

5. Discard, or by transfer of material already acquired. The discarding of little-used material if it is readily available elsewhere, whether the discarding results in 'pulsing' or sale, cannot always be frowned upon, but transfer to another institution that has need of the material should generally be considered first. Transfer is probably more important with the less used but more unusual material than with standard books because the latter are generally more readily available elsewhere. It is to be hoped that as time goes on little-used collections in small institutions will be transferred by gift or by sale at a reasonable price to other institutions where the use will be greater. This is particularly desirable when the material fits into a collection already in the second library and supplements it. A large proportion of the material so transferred may prove to be duplicate and unneeded in the institution receiving it, and then can be sold or pulped, or possibly a third institution may be found that can make use of it. It must be admitted that a series of transfers of this kind is expensive. An alternative type of transfer, that to a cooperative regional deposit library, may well be considered in the future. The New England Deposit Library in Boston is the only library of this kind now in existence. It was opened in the winter of 1942, and has led a successful life during the past six years. It will not be described here, however, but will be discussed in a later number of this BULLETIN. It is merely proposed here that the organization of great regional libraries on the same general plan as the New England Deposit Library, but covering a larger area, is desirable, with the location of one somewhere in the northeast section of the United States to care for the Middle States and New England; a second in the Middle West, probably somewhere close to Chicago, to help solve the storage problem for the district between the Alleghenies and the Rockies; a third on the West Coast; and the possibility of a fourth at a later time in the Southern States. It should be easier to find financial support for libraries of this kind if they are on a large scale.

In addition, more space would be saved through the discarding or sale of duplicate material sent to a deposit library if it served several institutions of the same general character. The three libraries which rent over eighty per cent of the space in the New England Deposit Library — the Boston Public, the Massachusetts State, and the Harvard University Libraries — are three very different types of institutions, with collections that overlap comparatively little, and as a result there has been and will be little duplication, except for newspapers, in the material placed therein. A deposit library taking over little-used material from the great midwestern state university libraries should find a much larger percentage of duplication in the material sent to it. This proposal for a series of great regional libraries will also be discussed in a later number of the BULLETIN.

6. This brings us to the sixth method of saving space in a library: more careful selection of acquisitions. Again the question of cost must be considered. Libraries in the past have added great collections of material in the expectation that these collections might sometime prove useful, or because they were rare or unusual, or because they were gifts and it seemed unwise to 'look a gift horse in the mouth.' There has been too little thought as to whether it was worth while to pay for each book a dollar and a half for storage and two dollars and a half for acquisition and processing costs, plus the cost of the volume itself. In the future, this will undoubtedly be kept in mind more often. Libraries will be less inclined to add a book because it is thought that it may be needed at some future date. There will be, it is to be hoped, full realization of the costs involved.

A cooperative purchasing plan, known among librarians as the 'Farmington Plan,' is now being worked out. By it each of over fifty of the larger research libraries of the country is to take responsibility for the inclusive acquisition and recording of research material in certain limited fields. It is hoped that among the fifty all fields of knowledge can be covered and that in the not distant future librarians can be assured that one copy of practically every new book 'conceivably of research importance' can be found in some library in the country. It will then no longer be necessary to acquire a new book simply because the librarian feels that someone sometime may need to use it, and decision can be made by answering the question: Is it worth while for the library to spend four dollars, plus the cost of the book, in order to have the volume on its own shelves? The study made by Miss Flora Belle Luding-

ton of the Mt Holyoke College Library some years ago is worth considering here. College library acquisitions in general are much more carefully selected than those for university libraries, and the books in the Mt Holyoke Library were at least reasonably well selected. Miss Ludington found, however, that some thirty per cent of the volumes in the collection had apparently never been used, and this was a collection, not of a million volumes, but of 150,000 carefully selected pieces chosen because it was believed that they would be used currently. In a great university library the proportion is probably considerably greater. Indeed, it would not be rash to state that half of the books in most of our great university libraries not only never have been used, but never will be used; in the case of the larger libraries, this figure may well be increased from one half to two thirds. It is of course easy to say that any single volume of the two thirds that might never be used may be called for at any time. That may well be, but how many million volumes can a library afford to have on its shelves — volumes that cost four dollars for storage space and cataloguing in addition to the purchase price — just because it is believed that some of them will be used, if it is known that another copy of each of them is in some library in the country and is readily available by inter-library loan or on microfilm? Is there any real reason why books should not be much more carefully selected under such conditions? Book selection is not an exact science. There will always be mistakes, but should it not be possible for universities to do a better and more selective job of book selection than is now done, particularly if the 'Farmington Plan' turns out to be reasonably successful? It is admitted that almost any book may be called for sometime, and if costs did not need to be considered selection could, and perhaps should, go on as at present, but costs and storage space do have to be considered and undoubtedly will have to be considered more in the future than in the past.

So much for the general picture. It seems evident that university libraries must inevitably slow up in their growth. Financial pressure, if nothing else, will ultimately make this necessary. Lack of new publications will at least reduce growth in the largest of libraries. Disintegration will become an increasingly greater factor. Photographic reproduction will solve the newspaper storage problem and somewhat mitigate the situation in other fields. But above everything better selection, supplemented by transfer or discarding, should be emphasized at this time. With the above as background, Harvard's situation will now

be considered in a more concrete fashion than has been possible in this theoretical discussion dealing with university libraries in general.

What can be said about the future of the growth of the Harvard Library? The University is fortunately in a better position at present as far as storage space for its main collection is concerned than it has been since the Widener building began to fill up in the middle twenties. Enough new shelving for 75,000 volumes has been erected in Widener in the past ten years — the limit in this direction has now been reached. The Widener stack at present, partly because of this new shelving, but primarily because of the construction of the Houghton, Littauer, and New England Deposit Libraries, with extensive transfers to each of these buildings, has had during the past five years more vacant shelves than at any time since the early thirties. On 30 June 1947 the Widener shelves contained 1,863,824 volumes and pamphlets, of which less than 3,000 were newspapers. Just fifteen years earlier the record showed 1,596,000 volumes, but among them were newspapers occupying space which now shelves nearly 200,000 regular volumes. It should be possible to care for 150,000 new volumes and pamphlets, or five years' net growth at the present rate, of the main collection in Widener before the pressure becomes unbearable. It should always be remembered in this connection that, while new stack construction costs are large, inadequate storage is also expensive, because of charges for continual shifting and for repairs of books damaged by the shifting and by overcrowding. When these costs from overcrowding become equal to the interest on the cost of new construction, plus the endowment required for upkeep, it is certainly desirable, and in the long run cheaper as well, to arrange for additional shelving. Translated into present-day Harvard terms, it amounts to something like this. Harvard now expects to add an average of 50,000 volumes a year to the main Harvard College Library collection; 30,000 go to the Widener building, 15,000 go to the New England Deposit Library, and 5,000 go to the collections in the Houghton Library. The cost of new construction and its upkeep for 30,000 volumes comes to about \$40,000. Annual interest on this amount at four per cent is \$1,600. If the cost of constant shifting because of crowded conditions, plus the cost of repairing damage due to these conditions, come to \$1,600, new construction should be considered. However, the building of small new units is uneconomical, and new construction should probably provide for not less than five years' growth. That might be interpreted to mean that new shelving should be built when the cost of the lack of it comes to \$8,000 annually. This is the

interest on \$200,000, by means of which the construction and its upkeep for 150,000 volumes could be provided. Further study is required of the question as to the exact point in overcrowding when it is economical to provide new book storage space, and it is hoped that someone can suggest a reasonably satisfactory formula. As far as the present situation in Widener is concerned, there is still room for five years' growth before pressure for book storage space becomes serious; and there is additional available shelf space elsewhere.

The Houghton building now has a two-year margin in terms of a growth of 5,000 volumes a year, plus the normal acquisition of manuscript material. The New England Deposit Library is nearly full, both Harvard's share of it and that for other institutions. The space is practically all rented, but new construction there is apparently one third the cost of that in a regular library building, and new units can be financed when needed by the rent that will be received for space. Under present plans, 15,000 volumes and pamphlets are sent from the main collection to the Deposit Library annually, and new units should be provided there to make this possible in the future.

The Lamont Library should be completed not later than the winter of 1948-49. Under that building are two complete floors of stack. One of these will house the overflow from Widener of material that the Library hesitates to send as far as the Deposit Library. This floor has shelving for the remaining bound volumes of newspapers in Widener, which now occupy space for 60,000 volumes or two years' growth, and 1,700 sections for books, which should care for some 210,000 volumes,<sup>1</sup> or enough space for seven years at the present rate of growth of the Widener collection. The second floor is primarily for the overflow from the Houghton Library, which should be taken care of in this way for an estimated sixteen years at the present rate of growth, but this floor will also house the Theatre, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and Lincoln collections, which now occupy space in Widener sufficient for two years' growth.

This all adds up as follows: the Houghton growth, figured at the present rate, is provided for for eighteen years, two years in the present building and sixteen in Lamont; Widener for seventeen years, five from its present vacant shelves, four from space now occupied by the Theatre, American Board, Lincoln, and newspaper collections, and seven from new space in the stacks under Lamont, plus one from the undergrad-

<sup>1</sup> This shelving will not be installed until it is needed, but the uprights will be in place.

uate books that will be transferred to Lamont. This is all on the basis of growth at the present rate of 30,000 volumes a year for the part of the main collection that is kept in Widener, or later in the Widener storage stack in the Lamont building; 5,000 for Houghton and its overflow space in Lamont; and 15,000 volumes for the New England Deposit Library; or 50,000 in all. It must be realized, of course, that these are rough estimates only.

The vacant stack space in the Littauer Center is the only other large amount of shelving now in reserve. There, on the three floors used primarily for book storage, is room for 125,000 volumes. How rapidly this space will be filled will depend on the as yet undetermined acquisition policies for the Graduate School of Public Administration and for the Economics and Government Departments of the College, but there will be no crisis in the immediate future.

The rest of the University is not as well off. The Baker Library at the Graduate School of Business Administration can get along even in the immediate future in its present building only by sending the overflow to the Deposit Library or by extensive reconstruction or by an addition to its building. The Medical School, with the aid of the New England Deposit Library, can manage for an indefinite period as far as books are concerned, if the Boston Medical Library becomes the historical library in the medical field for the Boston area. At present it is cramped for space for both books and readers. If the two new University buildings that have been planned for the sciences come into being and provide adequate library facilities, they should care for the libraries in the physical and biological sciences for the next twenty years. The Divinity School will soon be in difficulty, but it has the Deposit Library to fall back on. The Chinese-Japanese Library of the Harvard-Yenching Institute is bursting its bounds badly, and the solution of its space problem cannot be postponed for more than a short period. The University Archives are growing at a tremendous rate and present what is still an unsolved problem. But the greatest immediate library problem for the University, if the smaller departmental and special libraries, where the pressure may already be great, but where the cost of providing relief will not be considerable, are omitted, lies in the Law School, which is growing at the rate of some 20,000 volumes a year, and has already practically reached the limit of its space in Langdell Hall.

The situation then for the University may be summed up somewhat as follows. If new units of the New England Deposit Library are con-

structed as needed, the main collection and the Houghton collection can be housed for nearly twenty years, on the basis of the present rate of growth. The science collections can be housed for an equal period if the two buildings now planned are constructed. The greatest need is for supplementary shelving for the Law School. The other points of pressure can be partially and temporarily relieved by transfers to new units of the Deposit Library, but growth in the Business, Medical, and Divinity Schools, the Chinese-Japanese Library, and the University Archives will present serious problems soon.

All this is on the basis of growth no greater than at present, or at least of no more than 125,000 to 150,000 volumes and pamphlets a year. Such a rate is two and a half to three per cent of the present collection, not the four per cent that has been considered standard, and in seven or eight years it would be two to two and a half per cent instead of two and a half to three, with a constantly decreasing ratio. This figure of 125,000 to 150,000 volumes will include growth of 50,000 volumes a year for the present main collection of the Harvard College Library, which now occupies all of Widener and Houghton and a large section of the New England Deposit Library, and will in another year occupy the Lamont building also. The figure provides in addition for a growth of 60,000 to 70,000 volumes a year for the present special and departmental libraries, and leaves a margin for new developments which past experience would indicate are bound to come into being as the years go by. New libraries such as those in the Littauer Center seminars are sure to grow rapidly, at least in their early stages. If the work now proposed in regional studies for the Far East and the Slavic areas is carried forward on the hoped-for scale, library developments in those fields will be great and will require space for books and for readers. It should be noted here that departmental libraries in special subjects should not be started unless funds are in sight to provide adequate support for them for at least ten years and preferably for considerably longer.

Two questions remain. How can the growth be kept down to this figure of 125,000 to 150,000 volumes and pamphlets a year (which would mean, as has been stated, a constantly decreasing ratio of growth), and what should be planned at the end of fifteen or twenty years when the space that is now in sight or can be made available at comparatively little expense has been filled? The earlier and theoretical part of this article indicated, among others, two important possibilities. The first was for more careful selection of acquisitions, made more

acceptable and easier to follow by a nation-wide cooperative acquisition plan that brings into the country, and makes available by inter-library loan or microfilm, at least one copy of all books conceivably of research importance as they are published; and the second was the transfer of large, little-used collections already in the University's possession to the New England Deposit Library, or better still to a great regional library for the whole northeast section of the United States. As previously stated, discussions of the Deposit Library and of a possible regional library will appear in later issues of the BULLETIN.

In conclusion, the points which must be kept in mind in all planning for the future spatial needs of the Harvard University Library are as follows:

1. Library space on a fairly large scale in the proposed science buildings will be a necessity.
2. New units of the New England Deposit Library must be constructed as needed, which, although they are the cheapest method of providing space, will mean an increase in the University Library budget of \$1,000 a year.
3. The future policy of the Law School Library must be determined and such space provided as may be required by the plans adopted.
4. The Graduate School of Business Administration has a problem similar to that of the Law School, but on a somewhat smaller scale.
5. The Medical School has a very expensive library space problem on its hands unless an agreement can be reached by the medical libraries of the Boston area by which the Boston Medical Library becomes the historical and research medical library center for the district.
6. Adequate quarters for the Chinese-Japanese Library should be provided.
7. New developments in the University, such as those proposed for regional studies in the Far East and in Slavic areas, will require new library facilities.
8. The University Archives problem has not yet been faced.
9. The special libraries should be kept in their present state of working libraries; or, if their character is changed, new space must be provided.
10. It is not too soon to plan for a great regional library.

KEYES D. METCALF



## List of Contributors

MERTON M. SEALTS, JR, Instructor, Department of English, Wellesley College

KEYES D. METCALF, Professor of Bibliography, Director of the Harvard University Library, and Librarian of Harvard College

HAMILTON VAUGHAN BAIL, Treasurer of the Franklin Institute, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

WILLIAM A. JACKSON, Professor of Bibliography and Assistant Librarian of the Harvard College Library in charge of the Houghton Library

ROBERT W. LOVETT, Assistant in the Harvard University Archives

G. W. COTTRELL, JR, Editor in the Harvard University Library

ADRIANA R. SALEM, Department of Printing and Graphic Arts, Harvard University

VINTON A. DEARING, Catalogue Department, Houghton Library, Harvard University

HERMAN TEERINK, Arnhem, Netherlands

FRED N. ROBINSON, Gurney Professor of English Literature, Emeritus, Harvard University

TAYLOR STARCK, Professor of German, Harvard University

RUTH A. SANBORN, Aviation Collection, Library of the Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University