

Multi-Campus Distribution of Purchased Libraries

Two large bloc collections—one in 1957 and the other in 1962—were purchased by the University of California for distribution among the libraries of its several campuses. The first was the seventy thousand volume Ogden collection which was housed at UCLA during processing; there was no special staffing nor budget to accommodate the project. These factors, plus lack of experience in distributing such collections, caused problems. The second collection—some fifty-two thousand volumes in the Isaac Foot library—was distributed from Santa Barbara. Because of the experience with the Ogden library, the handling of the Foot collection was better planned. Some problems nonetheless arose. These problems are described, and conclusions are drawn.

WITH THE EMERGENCE of state-wide systems of colleges and universities in the United States, a need has arisen for both those basic and those more specialized books which have been long unavailable in their libraries. As part of its program to meet these needs, the University of California in recent years has purchased two outstanding collections for distribution among the libraries of its special campuses. Both came to the University through Lawrence Clark Powell's connections with English bookmen. The first purchase, in 1957, was the library of C. K. Ogden, the inventor of Basic English and reviewer of the 13th *Britannica*; the second, in 1962, was that of Isaac Foot, M.P., founder of the Cromwell Society and a Methodist leader.

The problem of finding such desirable

Mr. Silver is a librarian with the Brooklyn Public Library.

collections and negotiating their purchase is not a concern of the present paper, nor is it to any extent the evaluation of the worth of such enterprises; that is left to older hands at that game. Rather, this paper shall describe and discuss the techniques by which these two collections were distributed among libraries which have an aggressive, competitive interest in improving their holdings. Perhaps this will be of value to library systems which will be engaged in similar projects.

The libraries of the university fall in three categories. First, there are the giants of Berkeley and UCLA (the latter including the William Andrews Clark memorial library), with their millions of volumes. The second comprises the three smaller campuses at Davis, Santa Barbara, and Riverside, whose libraries, measured in a few hundreds of thousands of books, are growing to support broad PhD programs. Third, there are the nas-

cent campuses at San Diego, Santa Cruz, and Irvine, for whose libraries-to-be a book-collecting program called the New Campuses Project was organized in 1959. The university's Library Council establishes such policy and practice as is needed for the entire system.

It was the Library Council which formally advised presidents Sproul and Kerr on the Ogden and Foot purchases and which set the guidelines for their distribution. Details, except for a few settlements of disputes, were left to the individual librarian in charge of each project. The Ogden distribution was the pioneering effort, with the mistakes naturally attendant upon such a project; the Foot profited mightily by those mistakes.¹

THE OGDEN COLLECTION

When Dr. Powell was on a book-buying trip in England in late 1957 he was offered the Ogden library. The bulk of it was in a London house, the balance in several other locations. Unknown at the time was the inclusion of the contents of a bookshop of Ogden's, with resulting heavy duplication of remaindered titles.

The bookseller's staff prepared a precis of the library, and Dr. Powell made an extensive inspection, difficult because the books were arranged "in the most higgledy-piggledy order." At a meeting of the Southern District of the California Library Association May 9, 1959, in a talk entitled "Something for Everyone," he described the results of later analysis: "Some of the subject collections . . . include 800 Bibles and Books of Common Prayer, 1500 books by and about Shake-

spere, 400 on physics and engineering . . . , 100 on color technology, 400 grammars, 1000 dictionaries, 4500 volumes of sets, yearbooks and journals"; actually, it was largely a valuable collection of miscellany.

The more than seventy thousand volumes were eventually purchased for \$100,000. As the several campus book budgets could stand no additional strain, the money came from a special appropriation.

The purpose of the purchase was to aid the libraries of the smaller campuses at Davis, Santa Barbara, and Riverside in filling gaps in standard materials. At the same time, longer established collections were to be assisted by a policy of building to strength. The collection was to be housed at UCLA during its processing. There was a newly built bookstack, with the shelving just being completed, that offered space. For reasons that will become clearer below, the needs of the expanding UCLA holdings were so to keep pressing into the Ogden that they would eventually force its processing into suspension.

Betty Rosenberg of the UCLA staff was placed in charge, with student assistants on a part-time basis as her staff. The financing of the processing was nearly nonexistent; there was never any consistent budgeting for it. A constant mendicancy from all conceivable sources had to be employed, and it did not suffice. The result was that Miss Rosenberg, retaining her previous responsibilities to UCLA, could attend to the Ogden only in odd moments; availability of clerks was similarly erratic. Because of UCLA's stack needs, lack of funds, and Miss Rosenberg's other duties, in 1963 several thousand volumes were repacked, stored, and are still awaiting processing.

One ludicrous instance of the monetary headache occurred when the Library Council wound up a fiscal year with \$6,000 in unexpended travel funds. Its then secretary, Librarian Donald Coney

¹In writing this paper I have been fortunate in being able to discuss the projects with the principals involved, especially Betty Rosenberg, in charge of the Ogden, and Theodore Grieder, of the Foot; obviously, their cooperation was the *sine qua non*. In addition, I have enjoyed access to the correspondence files of the projects and the minutes of the Library Council, and I further draw upon my own experiences as Dr. Grieder's assistant on the Foot. Many of my opinions naturally reflect theirs, but the conclusions I cherish as my own.

of Berkeley, appealed to the university's budget officer (since departed) to have the funds transferred to Ogden processing. The budget officer explained that a budget, as an instrument of fiscal responsibility, must be used as drawn up, and that if funds were needed for Ogden, why, all one need do is apply directly for such. Mr. Coney did so; his application was denied.

The unpacking was described by Dr. Powell: "A few [of the cases] at a time were then trundled into an empty ground floor room. There they were opened, and unpacked onto tables, with Betty and Wilbur [Smith, of UCLA special collections], putting aside the fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth century calf and vellum bound books, the sets, the encyclopedias and reference works and keeping *them* in the sorting room, to the number of fifteen thousand, while the nineteenth and twentieth century books, numbering sixty-five thousand volumes, were carried in open bindery boxes to the lowest level of the new stack. And I mean carried by hand, for there is no elevator to the lowest level." As many of the empty cases as would fit available storage were kept.

The work of unpacking and shelving was done by a crew of groundsmen. They filled up the shelves, starting at one end and finishing at the other, then returning and double-shelving. Dr. Powell tells of their reward: "Ogden couldn't resist buying remainders. He had multiple copies of Chandos' *Guide to Seduction*. That's what they got. Betty's idea, of course."

A rough attempt at organizing some collections was made, in Shakespeare, for instance, but not rigorously. The combination of haphazard pulling out of titles of apparent value and of double-shelving in no order resulted in the absence of any coherence in the bulk of the display. Consequently, some sets were never assembled (the 1st *Britannica* is still incomplete), and duplicates could

not be effectively gathered. A tedious complication resulted from Ogden's habit of inserting holograph materials of interest and occasional value in his books; each volume had to be leafed through for such material.

A proposal was made that the entire collection be kept intact on one campus, to serve as the nucleus of a linguistics center. This was rejected for several reasons. First, the purpose of the purchase, and the argument by which the special appropriation was gained, was to strengthen the smaller campuses. Second, as was in fact the case, Berkeley and UCLA, logical candidates for such a center, would already have many of the titles; undesirable duplication would result, whichever were chosen. Third, the "collection" was much more heterogeneous than had been realized; it was too undisciplined to be the focus of an institute. However, priority for linguistics choices was given to Berkeley.

A slip was made for each title. The books that had been gathered on the ground floor were listed by Miss Rosenberg or Mr. Smith, with some materials sent to the catalogers of the Clark library; STC, Wing, and Hain-Proctor numbers were given where appropriate. The remainder (in the subbasement) was listed, from the title page, by the student assistants; Miss Rosenberg had to revise each slip before accepting it. Where feasible, duplicates were collated onto one slip; often, however, they turned up only after slips were checked against those previously filed.

When several hundred slips were ready, they were routed from campus to campus in turn by mail. Each library would indicate on the slip whether it wanted that book. If a faculty member was personally interested in a title, that was noted. Many professors visited the collection, and selected books on the site. As might be expected, the libraries' routine checks of their holdings showed that the books were often already held. Dur-

ing the process of making selections, a need arose for indicating more than ordinary interest in a title; appropriate symbols were devised. These were operative in the event other priorities were of no assistance. A minor problem occasionally manifested itself when a library failed to indicate which of several editions collocated onto a slip was the one desired.

As indicated before, priority for more specialized materials was given to intrinsic interest and to strength. Thus, marine materials went to the Scripps Institution of Oceanography at San Diego, Wing materials to the Clark library of UCLA, which if it already had a copy would retain an Ogden copy of better quality, returning the former to be distributed. The Clark agreed to make its Ogden acquisitions available for intercampus loan if their condition permitted. An indication of the quality of the various libraries' needs is that of Berkeley's choices; no other library was interested in more than half.

As mentioned earlier, priority for modern general books was to the three smaller campuses; as the contents of each packet of slips were allocated, the quantities assigned these three were equalized. Their numbers each ran about three times the number assigned Berkeley or UCLA. Losers often had their requests filled later as duplicates turned up; the notations on the slip sent for the first copy listed were of course valid for all duplicates. If no one was interested in a title, and UCLA did not have it, it was taken by UCLA; this was its rental charge. (Of course, this increased the number, but not the worth, of volumes it received *vis-à-vis* Berkeley).

Occasional reports were made showing the status of the distribution, with a breakdown for more valuable items. A major problem was keeping the slips moving among the campuses; an example from a letter in reply to a Rosenberg query reads: "Dr. . . . is off campus for the month of August and thus it will be

several weeks before he can reply to your August 8th letter in re the Ogden collection and slips on general modern books."

As each packet of slips was returned and had its contents allocated, the books were taken from the shelves and packed. The retained wooden cases from England were re-used, and then cardboard cartons were procured; the latter were fastened by the strapping machine in the UCLA library receiving room.

A debilitating factor was the large amount of duplication. In a sample, 90 per cent of the titles (as opposed to volumes or sets) had no duplicate copies or varying editions; thus, if a particular title were allocated to a library in 90 per cent of the cases that library had no choice in the condition or edition of what was received. Including duplicate copies and varying editions, some 18 per cent of the volumes (or sets) were duplicates. These varied from differing editions of Plato's *Opera Omnia* (Masilio Ficino translation)—one being 1590 Lyons, the other 1602 Frankfurt—to twelve copies of three editions of Tennyson's *Enoch Arden*.

Needs among the participants were such that few of the duplicated titles were not selected by more than one library. This was in part because the remainder slips were recirculated to Berkeley and UCLA for their college libraries; many general titles were then taken for duplicate collections. After the first year of processing, the New Campuses Project was inaugurated. Thereafter priority in remainders went there, both by direct selection by NCP and assignment of appropriate books by Miss Rosenberg. The considerable amount still remaining was disposed of through a student sale; through gifts to Los Angeles area libraries to which remaining slips were circulated (discontinued because of insufficient response); and by pulping.

Publicity was given the purchase in library journals, local newspapers, and university publications. Of course, a

comprehensive report cannot be undertaken until the distribution is completed.

In evaluating the distribution process, the major advantage is that no library is saddled with unwanted duplicates; each really wants all that it gets.

Difficulties in the processing start with the lack of funds; the results of that are apparent. Miss Rosenberg believes that more time should have been taken to unpack and shelve the books so that they might be alphabetized and sets gathered at that time; once up, they could not be satisfactorily organized. Much unnecessary labor could thus have been avoided with an orderly display, in that the many useless titles could have been weeded before further processing. An unlooked-for problem was that libraries whose want lists included titles likely to be in the Ogden often turned down opportunities to purchase when offered by a dealer, in the hope of getting them at no cost. Another was that as the only record of who received what was retained by Miss Rosenberg, there were rumors of UCLA aggrandizement; no effective way of combating this was devised, except that time heals.

Miss Rosenberg estimates that the ten thousand most choice volumes more than paid for the investment.

THE FOOT COLLECTION

Much of what follows is from *The Isaac Foot Library, a Report to the University*, by Theodore G. Grieder, published by the library, University of California, Santa Barbara, for the Library Council of the university, 1964; quotations are from that report. The distribution was under the general superintendence of librarian Donald Davidson of Santa Barbara. The detailed planning and execution was by Dr. Grieder, the librarian in charge of the project.

At the time of acquisition in 1962, the collection was in Foot's house in Cornwall. "He built his library of some fifty-two thousand books around his many

interests. Law, politics, history, religion were all represented." Later analysis showed the contents to include a three hundred-volume Milton collection, of which forty were seventeenth-century imprints (including a first and a second *Paradise Lost* and a first *Areopagitica*); forty-five hundred volumes of twentieth-century English literature; 125 English Bibles, from Tyndale's 1536 N.T. to the 1903-05 Doves Press; and sixteen hundred volumes on French history, 1789-1815, including six hundred on Napoleon and his family.

The university's survey team, librarian Edwin Coman of Riverside and Donald Fitch of Santa Barbara, prepared a detailed report and map on the site, facilitated by Foot's own disciplined shelving; the talented shipping agent employed made such emendations as were necessary later. The cartons when packed were marked to show room location of the contents, whose nature could then be inferred by consulting the report. "When these five hundred cartons arrived . . . , they could, thus, be assigned to library areas designed to receive particular author, period and subject collections."

The library at Santa Barbara was to house the collection during processing because its newly-enlarged building had the necessary temporary space. Four places within the building were taken, those in public areas being screened off with pegboard walls and lockable doors; the library reclaimed its property piecemeal as books were later shipped out.

The purchase price was £50,000. "Toward this sum, the libraries of the university provided four-sevenths of the total from their book budgets, and the President the remaining three-sevenths from special funds. It had been determined that the chief purpose in purchasing the Foot library was to benefit the smaller campuses; Davis, Riverside and Santa Barbara therefore each provided one-fourth (\$20,000) of the libraries'

share while Berkeley and UCLA contributed \$10,000, or one-eighth each." The processing budget included full-time salaries for a librarian and a clerk (who together did almost all the unpacking and packing), and sufficient funds for supplies, shipping, etc.

As each book was taken from its carton, it was assigned a spot in one of the author, period, or subject collections anticipated; the Cornwall survey and marked cartons made this possible. Priority in unpacking was given to those subjects in which the university's librarians had expressed special interest. When a collection outgrew its space, it or its neighboring sections were shifted in order to keep each collection together. "Collections unforeseen in the initial survey had to be accommodated." The few duplicates were placed in different collections where possible; thus, one set of J. A. Symonds' *Renaissance in Italy* was in "Italian history," another in a Symonds author collection within nineteenth century literature.

Planning had called for the shelving of only one symbolic volume of long periodical runs noted in the survey, but the necessities of checking contents of the run and of seeing what else was in the carton cancelled that. The cartons, and much of the corrugated packing materials, were folded and stored for the distribution. The first object was to get the maximum number of volumes shelved and organized, so that the participants could be made aware both of what was and, by referring to the survey, what was not displayed. Forty-two thousand volumes (80 per cent) came out the first time; the remainder was unpacked after sufficient shelves had been cleared by shipping.

"Before negotiations for distribution began, some basic decisions were reached. Of these, the most important had been determined before purchase: the chief purpose of the collections was to strengthen the libraries at Davis, Riverside, and Santa Barbara. Since the

smaller libraries each contributed twice the amount of purchase money contributed by Berkeley or UCLA, it was reasonable that they should expect twice the return of the two larger libraries. A second was related to the principle of building to specialized strengths: where strength in a subject or period already existed in a particular library, that library should receive priority for appropriate Foot volumes. A third was to distribute the Foot collections in a year, the period for which Santa Barbara had agreed to provide shelving space. A fourth was that no library should acquire collections whose titles duplicated its present holdings to any great extent.

"Collections should be distributed in blocks insofar as possible. The smaller libraries could acquire these blocks with far less duplication than could the larger libraries: the smaller libraries agreed in turn to list and exchange duplicates with one another. It was realized, however, that certain collections of particular academic interest—pre 1700 . . . imprints, for example—should be listed title by title and distributed on an individual basis to build to existing strengths on the larger campuses. . . . Since some method of assuring equitable distribution was essential, it was decided to set up what was called a 'unit system.' By this, the volumes in Foot's library—with the exception of Bibles, incunabula, manuscripts and letters—were each to be assigned a unit value, a unit being thought of as having a rough value of about four dollars. General collections . . . were assigned a unit value of one. More specialized collections, judged to be of greater academic and monetary worth were given higher unit values. For example, collections of minor authors in nineteenth- and twentieth-century English literature were rated at one unit per volume, whereas substantial collections of major authors were listed at two units per volume . . . ; STC books were given a unit value of four. . . ." Exceptional items were assigned unique unit values. Librarians

and interested faculty inspected the display by appointment only.

The collections from the first unpacking were listed. Total volumes and units were given for each. In block areas, appropriate subdivisions—topical, imprint, or author, for example—were made, with their discrete subcounts. In individual-listing areas, STC, Wing, and Hain-Proctor books were listed by their catalog numbers where existing; otherwise, short title data were given, with consultation in Brunet, Halkett and Laing, etc. as needed for identification. If such material was incorporated into a subject collection, such as "Cromwell," the books which would otherwise receive individual listing were included.

Each list was mimeographed, and five copies sent to each library. Advanced notice of the subject matter of forthcoming lists had been given so that interested faculty would be able to reserve time for considering selections. The list included a due date for return of a marked copy indicating bids.

Each library made an "A," "B," "C" or no bid for the entries on the lists. The first priority for determining recipients was the policy of building to strength: "first chance at Foot's exceptional collection of three thousand English civil war tracts (1640-1660) was given to the Clark library of UCLA while the second went to Berkeley." As with the Ogden, the Clark library agreed to lend those acquisitions able to stand it. Second was the quality of the bid, "A" defeating "B." Third was the area encompassed by the bid: Riverside bid for and received all twentieth-century English literature, vanquishing the bidders for individual authors therein. Fourth was the unspent quota. After the initial unpacking and evaluation, "it was calculated that the three smaller libraries should each expect to receive unit totals of about 15,000." These were in proportion to the monetary investment of each. Libraries were cautioned not to expect more than 90 per cent of their allotted units, be-

cause of likely undesired remainders, but "final unit totals for all libraries except Berkeley exceeded these calculations. Berkeley's unit total was slightly lower because the value of its Bible collection—estimated to be worth in excess of \$20,000, though not given unit valuation—had to be considered in reaching an equitable distribution."

If bids were still in conflict, there were two systems of resolution. In small issues (usually defined as fifteen units or less) a coin toss was generally acceptable. If there were a number of such smaller conflicts on a given list, such as nineteenth-century English literature, the coin would determine the order of rotation to be followed in assigning recipients for the entire list in dispute; this was modified as necessary to give equality in unit count. In large issues, negotiations by the parties involved was necessary. Dr. Grieder often made suggestions to such disputants; sometimes a last resort was "If I don't hear from you by (date), I shall distribute thusly: . . ." with considerable success in resolving disagreements. In the case of areas not bid upon, he exercised salesmanship on likely takers. An instance of a right hand not knowing involved Foot's first Florio's *Montaigne*, valued at 375 units (\$1500); one library vigorously held out for it, only to discover that it had long had an Ogden copy in processing!

Books from the second unpacking that fell in areas already chosen by libraries were automatically sent to those libraries; otherwise, they were listed in the same manner as initially.

When the contents of a given list had been allocated, copies of the master lists, indicating bids and winners, were Xeroxed and sent to the participants. Thus all were kept *au courant*; further, losers still eager for parts of a collection could contact the winners independently. Additionally, periodic status-of-distribution summaries were sent, which included potential problems for which suggestions for solutions were requested.

A variety of stratagems was employed by the libraries. The method of aggressive bidding for large areas, coupled with extensive waivers in others, satisfied its practitioners. Some of those who received non-unit-valued materials questioned the "reasonable worth" placed upon them *post facto*, which worth of course affected their remaining quotas. Some were reluctant to make block bids because of the likelihood of heavy duplication of existing holdings; this of course was in line with the policy for the distribution. Thus these last at the end had large unit gaps to make up, and were given priority in choice of late-listed areas. A general spirit of cooperation pervaded the undertaking.

After the allocations for a given list were made, the books therefrom were packed in the previously stored cartons. A strapping machine being financially out of the question, a wire wrapping apparatus was rented for the duration. The wire sufficed for the short hauling involved in motor freight and interlibrary bus. A few pieces were mailed.

Publicity for the collection was made by publication of *The Isaac Foot Library*, mentioned above. A shortened version appeared earlier in the staff weekly of the University of California, *University Bulletin*, October 28, 1963, pages 80-84. Faculty and friends were thus informed of the new acquisitions. The compiled master lists were indexed and microfilmed; book copies were made therefrom and placed at the reference desks of the university's libraries, so that detailed listing of the contents and locations of the Foot library is available to patrons. Additionally, notices appeared in local newspapers.

Most of the policies in the Foot distribution turned out quite well, as indicated in the foregoing. Berkeley and UCLA generally picked individual titles from among the more valuable areas; thus, their selections represented a much smaller amount of duplication than did those of the smaller campuses, offsetting what

might otherwise be considered a disparity in *pro rata* profit. The host library, Santa Barbara, was recompensed for its troubles in two ways: the natural advantage of greater opportunity for inspection, and the opportunity to cream the remainders. The New Campuses Project took the balance, including several old Bibles, an *O.E.D.* and a *Britannica* eleventh.

One of the difficulties is that the smaller libraries are to list and exchange duplicates. As they have not yet processed their Foot acquisitions, this remains to be worked out. A second is that the more valuable Bibles were somewhat too hastily listed, in an effort to show immediate results of the purchase; inaccuracies resulted. A third is that librarians seem often loath to pick gross areas; they prefer individual titles. A fourth was the acceptance of "reasonable worth" valuations *post facto*, as mentioned previously. In any case, all seem most pleased with the purchase and its distribution.

CONCLUSIONS

In drawing conclusions from the processing of the Ogden and of the Foot, it must be emphasized that the Foot was an exceptionally orderly library, a collection of collections, built upon disciplined lines, and that the Ogden was not, especially with the bookstore thrown in. Again, the Ogden was a new venture for the libraries; with the Foot purchase, the Library Council had a better idea of the problems and procedures involved, and was able to provide proper support for the undertaking.

The most important conclusion, which cannot be overemphasized, is that the books must be organized at the time they are shelved; each book must be given a rational location; whether that is topical or alphabetical, or some combination of the two, is dependent on the nature of the collection, the purpose of the purchase, and the ingenuity of the librarian in charge. As a corollary, as

much as possible should be shelved and organized before displaying, listing, and bidding.

In effecting this, it is desirable that the nonprofessional staff on the project be of well-rounded college backgrounds; it is more efficient to be able to have a book accurately assigned a place when it is taken from the box and not after it is placed on a shelf. Of course, there would be a section for materials of uncertain classification which awaits the librarian's decision. An alternative possibility is to have newly unpacked materials trucked to the librarian in charge. If listing is to be by collection, the librarian assigns the topic; if by title, either the clerk submits a brief entry on an enclosed slip, the librarian revising same, or the librarian himself makes the entry.

The problem of maintaining a steady flow of books for examination by the librarian and providing him sufficient other professional tasks, is difficult in such a small-staffed, narrow operation. The librarian will either be sporadically idle, or will himself have to participate in the physical labors of the processing. The latter is of course more likely, as an attempt to schedule the librarian into professional duties unconnected with the project is dangerous. Dr. Grieder feels that the librarian is thus best a fairly sturdy male, and because of the largely physical (and grimy) activities, not overly concerned with his own image.

Next in consequence to organized shelving is the processing budget. It must be sufficient to cover costs of staff, supplies, and shipping for the entire project.

The job is best done with minimal delay. In both Ogden and Foot the host library kept taking back its shelves as soon as available. Further, the morale of the participants is affected by a protracted distribution.

Whether listing is by title, collection, or both, it is best to type the lists for mechanical duplication; this will allow simultaneous bidding by all. In the Foot,

the lists served later for notification of allocations and for compiling a checklist. With good communication, matters proceed at a steady rate. One should not allow considerations of speed to overcome those of sufficient accuracy in listing, however; no library will be pleased if it receives books it does not want.

There are two suggestions to assist the individual libraries participating in such projects. One is that monetary investment in the purchase by the libraries themselves insures close attention to the distribution and gives leverage in preventing inequities. The other, both Miss Rosenberg and Dr. Grieder feel, is that the greater the provision made by a campus for its faculty and librarians to visit and inspect the display, the better that campus' selection.

One note on negotiating such a purchase from the agent: because of the many parties involved in the buying, their representative does not usually have as clear authority as if he represented only one library; thus if the prize is to be won the buying parties must make a rapid decision on each problem and communicate it posthaste to their negotiator.

The benefit of the purchases to the university has been felt. Often a professor whose field falls within the scope of the Ogden or the Foot will, when first arriving on one of the smaller campuses, be surprised at the depth of holdings in his specialty. Aside from scholarly considerations, there is no question of the monetary worth of the acquisitions.

Dr. Powell said at the 1959 California Library Association meeting mentioned before, "A great pity that the UCLA library school was not in operation when Ogden arrived. I am not thinking of a cheap labor supply, as has sometimes been true, at least when I went to school, but rather of the Operation Ogden as a demonstration of what you do when you get a bibliographical bull by the tail." The penning of that bull is here described. ■■