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PREFACE

I'm grateful to Peter Vidot for writing his history of the ANU Library in a relatively short time frame. We were conscious that little had been written on the history of the Library and that a succinct essay would be an appropriate way to mark the Fiftieth Anniversary of the University.

I began work in the Bodleian Library, Oxford in 1967. The previous Librarian J.N.L. Myres had retired in 1964. It was stated that he used the same ink quill pen which his predecessors had used in the early nineteenth century. In September 1996 the world of libraries and access to information has been transformed by the convergence of computing, telecommunications and content indexing exemplified in the Internet and the World Wide Web.

In 1976 when I became Deputy Librarian at ANU the only total access to the holdings of the Library was a union card catalogue in the Menzies Building with a partial back-up in the Chifley Building. Now in 1996 the contents of the world's libraries are available to users on their desktop as well as a rapidly increasing number of full text and visual image sources. The world of librarianship has been truly transformed in less than one generation.

In that period 1976-1996 major additional demands have been made on the Library by staff and students. Apart from the doubling of student numbers in that period the Library now provides Internet subject gateways and Internet training for staff and students. Library staff numbers have been reduced from 208 FTE's in 1976 to 160 in 1996, largely to “protect” the book and serial vote. The ANU Library staffing is now one of the lowest percentages of any major research library in the world. This is a matter of both efficiency in productivity terms but also of concern in terms of pressures on staff as identified in the 1995 Library Review. The move to a “cluster” grouping of the Library will hopefully bring a greater understanding of the complexity of Library operations and an ordering of priorities by the academic community even in a time of reductions in overall university funding. The Library, as Peter Vidot has written, is often seen as the heart of the university but if so it may be
in need of an occasional bypass! We hope the 1995 Library Review recommendations will receive the same sort of central University support Sydney University Library achieved after its 1994 Review.

Vidot's history has a common theme of both the tension and co-operation between the Institute of Advanced Studies and the Faculties (formerly C.U.C.) encapsulated most succinctly in the chapter on amalgamation. The Library, which tries to bridge the two major parts of the University has often found it difficult in achieving consensus within a University which for many purposes is divided into two discrete sections and which is currently embodied in the Senior Administrative structure of the University. The Library has established since 1979 various major across campus Advisory Committees with a membership of 92 academic staff who provide detailed policy advice.

There has also been tension over the years, alluded to in the text, between what might be called centralisation and branch library provision. I don't think that this applies any longer, particularly in a networked environment where access is increasingly moving to an electronic delivery of information on a twenty-four hour basis around the world. The main research collections of the University are relatively little used and the loan periods are sufficiently long that access to print material is relatively easy. The decision, however, to build both the Menzies and Chifley Buildings in the 1960's viewed from current perspectives was a major mistake on a number of grounds. It's easy, however, to have historical hindsight!

Two significant Library Reviews in 1982 and 1995, have provided bases not only for rationalisation of stock, albeit with inadequate building infrastructure, but also for a new client focus cluster approach which will be absolutely necessary in a time of decreasing resources, particularly in terms of science serial provision. In the last decade the academic community has moved more and more towards buying serials rather than books. This is largely due to the rising cost of serials, particularly in the sciences. With reference to serials the academic community around the world can no longer give away its intellectual property only to buy it back at ever increasing prices from a few multinational firms whose main aim is profit for shareholders rather than the equitable distribution of scholarly information.
The ANU Library has had over the years something of an “up and down” relationship with the National Library of Australia. A.L.G. McDonald and J.J. Graneek engaged in what might be termed interesting dialogues with Sir Harold White over issues such as Asian resource co-ordination and the Archives of Business and Labour. At the present time ANU and NLA have agreed to work towards establishing a joint National Asian Information Centre. Whatever happens in this context ANU Library needs to collaborate increasingly with the National Library in the Asia/Pacific area to facilitate resource sharing and collaborative access.

Finally I would like to thank all the Library staff throughout the period 1946-96, many of whom attended the launch of this publication. Their work, like that of most general staff, is often unrecognised in the facilitating of the teaching and research effort of the University. Library and IT staff will increasingly play a critical role in the effective access to research material and in the new modes of teaching/learning in the twenty first century.

It is fitting that Blackwell’s, who are leading the way in electronic access to full text data, are a part sponsor of this Library history. I should also like to acknowledge the support of Mrs Margaret Weeden (in memory of her husband Jock) in contributing to the publication of Peter Vidot’s history of the ANU Library.

Colin Steele

University Librarian

15th September 1996
INTRODUCTION

1946 saw the establishment by an Act of Parliament of a remarkably bold experiment, the Australian National University. It was singularly unusual both in Australia and on the international scene because it was founded as a purely research institution. The Library shares in the highly distinctive character of the larger body of which it is an integral and vibrant part.

The Library's history mirrors the complexity and richness of the University's development. The major themes to be explored in the following account of the Library are: the founding era under A.L.G. McDonald; the impact of the amalgamation of the old ANU and the former CUC; the decentralised nature of the Library system; the process towards unification and rationalisation begun under J.J. Grangeek, and completed under C.R. Steele; the major and successive restructures of the administration of the Library; and, the introduction and development of automation and access to the Internet.

The ANU Library is now one of the leading libraries in the world, not only for the uniqueness of its holdings (especially in the Sciences and Asian Studies), but for its highly innovative adaptation and implementation of automation. The Library is a major access point to many information technology networks and, as such, demonstrates a most contemporary commitment to the traditional library task of providing and facilitating access to material necessary for research.
ORIGINS AND EARLY YEARS
[1946-1960]

The Melbourne Years (1948-1950)

The Australian National University came into existence in 1946, by Act of the Federal Parliament. So began a bold experiment in the provision of a centre for advanced research in the major areas of science and social science. The driving force was the enthusiasm to take advantage of the Second World War’s end to reconstruct society.

From the beginning it was realised that the Library was to be a crucial part of the University’s operations. Another vital aspect of the University’s overall history, was that the 1946 Act, which established and incorporated it in the Australian Capital Territory, foreshadowed the eventual incorporation of the already existing Canberra University College (1946, No. 22 Sec.9).

At its first meeting on the 13 September, 1946, the Interim Council canvassed the issue of the Library, and what form it would take. All the basic needs were also considered from the provision of funds to the immediate commencement of ordering and cataloguing books and journals. The other important issue considered was the actual structure of the Library holdings, whether it was to be one central operation, or made up of a series of departmental collections, or a combination of these. The decision here was to leave a most enduring mark on the later history of the University, and of the Library itself, as we shall see. Eventually the Library was to encompass three main buildings (J.B. Chifley, W.K. Hancock and R.G. Menzies) with seven branch collections (Astronomy, Chemistry, Earth Sciences, Law, Medical Sciences, Physical Sciences, and the North Australia Research Unit (Darwin) libraries). The Institute of Arts Library remains separate from the University at the present time.

Later in that same September of 1946 the Library Committee of the Interim Council was established to oversee the foundation of the Library. This group consisted of Sir Eric Ashby as Chairman, with Professor K.H. Bailey, Sir Frederick Eggleston, and Mr H.J. Goodes. Their task was of singular importance since without an effective library there would be severe limitations to the intended fields of research.
The Interim Council began a period of much more intensive activity, and established monthly meetings in order to cover the work being generated by efforts overseas to enlist such prominent scholars as Sir Howard Florey, Professors Marcus Oliphant, and Keith Hancock and others for the staff of the new University. In 1947 the Library Committee recommended the immediate appointment of a Librarian. At the same time L.P. Fitzhardinge was appointed to make a survey of the [then] Commonwealth National Library holdings in the social sciences. The point of this was to ensure adequate research material support for the joint Research Schools of Social Science and Pacific Studies. There was need of a thoroughly comprehensive collection, and details of other nearby resources, to enable the task of Australia growing to a much fuller understanding of the region in which it was situated. There was also the consequence of this, that Australia would come to a deeper understanding of itself and its own institutions.

The following year (1948) saw some of the first appointments made to the new University, that of R.G. Osborne as Registrar and A.L.G. McDonald as Librarian. Both McDonald and his Deputy, Noel Stockdale were Melbourne graduates, and had worked in that University’s Library. McDonald’s brief included that he would work in Melbourne and Canberra. No sooner appointed than he began the awesome challenge of building a collection commensurate with the visions that had inspired the foundation of the University. H.C. Coombs summarised this keen sense of the need of planning to deal with the major issues which beset Australia following the World War - poverty, waste, unemployment, social justice, and international and racial misunderstanding:
We believed profoundly that the will to solve these problems was within us but were conscious of that much of the knowledge necessary to their solution was lacking. It was this consciousness that underlay the decision to establish the University, which we saw as a kind of intellectual power house for the rebuilding of society. (Foster, S.G. and M.M. Varghese. 1996. The Making of the Australian National University 1946-1996. p.19)

McDonald’s task entailed providing some of the essential sinews for such a demanding purpose. This function of the Library is mirrored elsewhere throughout the world in other universities where research plays a key role in their existence. The breadth of scope in the job required a high degree of vision in order to envisage the requirements of the different disciplines, and the necessary eye for the minutiae of organising such a collection. This meant that there was not a primary concern with acquiring more material simply for its own sake. McDonald was to reiterate this principle in 1955. The collection (referring to the main holding in particular) was to be a good working one in the area of social science.

During the period 1948-1950 the Library was housed in Wyselaskie Hall, Ormond College, University of Melbourne. This generosity on the part of Ormond College was, in the view of Stockdale, an important factor in the foundation of the new Library, because what is now the nearby Baillieu Library provided ready access to such essentials as an established catalogue, working tools and a reference collection.

There are two highly significant aspects to this phase of the Library’s development. The first is the extensive degree of consultation with the newly appointed academic staff, some of whom still worked in Melbourne, as well as with academics of Melbourne University. The second is the choice of classification system. Both McDonald and the first Chief Cataloguer (Jean Haggar) favoured the Bliss system because of its superiority to the existing Dewey system, and for its relative simplicity in comparison with that of the Library of Congress.

In the subsequent rapid changes and the moves towards automation of library processes, the Bliss classification was overtaken and faded through lack of support. At the time, however, it suited the nature of the collection that was being assembled so enthusiastically and painstakingly in Wyselaskie Hall. The Bliss system provided
a very useable arrangement of material in the social sciences. There were difficulties with mathematics, but these were dealt with by Maud Woolcock and Professor Patrick Moran once the collection was in Canberra. For all that, it is generally accepted, in hindsight, that the Bliss Classification was not an entirely happy choice. As Stockdale comments, it was expected to have become much more widely adopted than became the case, and the choice to adopt it was made very much in a pioneering context.

The process of consultation referred to already was an extensive one both in terms of quality and time. As Foster and Varghese comment (1996:84) 'McDonald fashioned the Library's acquisitions policy to meet the specific needs of the research schools, avoiding less directed purchasing which might lead to overlap with the holdings of the National Library....' McDonald used to confer regularly with Professors Frank Fenner and Hugh Ennor in Melbourne during 1949 and following their appointments within the new John Curtin School of Medical Research. The School existed, but remained to be built, and so its main figures continued their work where they were. Fenner and Ennor in Melbourne, Florey, Oxford, Eccles in Dunedin and Albert in London.

As a result of these meetings McDonald sought and acquired very significant back-runs of several journals, among them were the Journal of Biological Chemistry, the Journal of Bacteriology and that of Experimental Medicine, which became the foundation of the JCSMR Library. Similarly the areas of physics, mathematics, and the social sciences all advanced. In each instance there was active cooperation between the Library and the relevant academic staff. McDonald established the practice of asking newly-appointed professors and readers to submit lists of journals and books that they required. The University of Melbourne made a gift of about two hundred monographs, and the Medical Society of Victoria presented many publications of the New Sydenham Society. These were nineteenth century medical books.

Other areas in which collecting was vigorous included those of State and Commonwealth Parliamentary papers, Acts as well as English and Australian Law Reports. Woolcock, in a paper, the ANU Collections (1976), summarised the collection policy of the Library's early years. As well as the material just
mentioned, the Library also acquired a complete collection of British Command Papers in addition to government publications concerning the Pacific and South East Asia. The latter became part of government serials collection. Further important areas of acquisition were in anthropology of the Pacific and Australia, as well as in the era of contact history and exploration in the Pacific.

This array of material was made possible to be acquired for a number of reasons. First, McDonald and Stockdale scoured thoroughly the available booksellers catalogues (second-hand ones also) and bibliographies from many sources. Second, McDonald himself had a wide range of contacts through library channels and from his days in military intelligence. This netted for the Library sets of maps of the Pacific and other papers. Third, as Stockdale observes in some unpublished reminiscences (1996), the post-War era was a remarkably fortuitous one for the nascent Library, since the upheaval in Europe meant that many private and institutional collections came on the market. There was also the emergence of second-hand booksellers who specialised in ‘back sets of scholarly periodicals’. And fourthly, and very importantly, the University was in receipt of a handsome development budget in the form of a government grant of £325,000 per annum. Since there was little in the way of running expenses, no monies were required for buildings or the payment of staff, it meant that the Library had ample funds to proceed with its collection building. As a result, by the time the Library moved to Canberra in the December of 1950, it had grown to 40,000 volumes. Apart from this holding were 25,000 volumes or so of Chinese material acquired by C.P. Fitzgerald in Hong Kong during 1950. This latter item was the personal library of Professor Hsü Ti-Shan, former Professor of Chinese at the University of Hong Kong. Enid Bishop, who was later to become Divisional Head of the Asian Studies Collection in the Library, remarks (1982) that:

*The collection contained several thousand volumes, many of them rare and out-of-print, including a large number of works on Buddhism and Taoism, as well as many scholarly works in the fields of history, literature and philosophy.*

Amongst these classical works were others on more contemporary literature, history and political science.
Early Years in Canberra (1951 - 1960)

The original band of librarians which came to Canberra in December 1950 totalled nine, although McDonald was overseas during the year visiting libraries and booksellers in North America and Britain. Stockdale oversaw the move which passed off without any known loss of volumes. The Library was established in a portion of the former Canberra Community Hospital, quarters shared with the newly established research schools. This was to be its temporary home until the R. G. Menzies Building was opened in March 1963. The schools and the Library shared a tea-room, and the relatively very small group had a distinct familial aspect to it. In those days too Canberra was a pretty small country town, and Stockdale recalls some typical tales of such a situation, one of a possum "browsing" at night in the stacks, which dislodged several volumes in efforts to escape. The interchange of views in the tea-room generated a strong sense of community which bridged academic and general staff, and readily included visitors and newcomers. The latter meeting was valuable for themselves and the Library staff, and both were able to "follow the development of academic planning".

Alongside the developments in the Old Hospital Buildings, the Library was responsible for the development of the first two science Branch Libraries, in the John Curtin School of Medical Research and for the Research School of Physical Sciences.

The temporary home posed its own problems because it was not designed as a library. Cataloguing proceeded under Woolcock's meticulous direction, and soon showed very early signs of outgrowing its accommodation. Huts in the area beyond the Physics Building were furnished to carry back sets of periodicals. This meant that there was little space for readers. Borrowings were very high. While the Library developed its full range of stock, it benefited greatly through having access to material on inter-library loan from the National Library where Sir Harold White had carried out extensive foundation and collection development work. At the same time that institution was still housed with the Parliamentary Library, from which it had emerged as a separate entity. This system of exchange ran informally to begin with, so that the University Library carried the administrative aspects of the loan handling. Other university and state libraries were also used, as well as obtaining copies of
material on microfilm from overseas.

A very important element in the development of the ANU Library and the much smaller (but steadily enlarging) Canberra University College Library (under Chief Librarian, Clare Campbell-Smith) was the close consultation and cooperation with the National Library. The primary focus of this enterprise was on collection development. The National Library had a very good Medical Science Collection as well as foundation for a contemporary Asian studies. There was, for example, a policy agreement arrived at in October 1955, and on the initiative of the C.U.C. The College began developing an Oriental languages course, under the auspices of its School of Oriental Languages which was established with a special government grant in 1952. Hans Bielenstein took up his position as Professor in 1953 and proceeded, with Campbell-Smith’s assistance to establish a collection to support the teaching of Chinese, Japanese and Indonesian. It was a slow process due to the political situation in China at the time. The agreement sought with the ANU and National Libraries was to establish ‘...a cooperative acquisition policy for Chinese and Japanese materials which would serve the interests of each institution while at the same time eliminating or at least substantially reducing wasteful duplication of resources’. (Enid Gibson. 1982. Aspects of Chinese Librarianship in Australia). Asian studies were reorganised then, ‘an extremely costly undertaking’ which it remains. There was a huge amount of available material, but a very small number of specialists ‘who would be capable of using it’.

In the agreement that was arrived at, the National Library was to cover the social sciences and ‘more recent periods of history’, while the ANU and CUC would share responsibility for traditional literature, history, religion and philosophy. The National Library was also to cover the collection of new papers and periodicals. This arrangement was generally adhered to and a union catalogue was prepared which ‘ultimately [became] the basis for an Australian union catalogue of such material’.

The CUC then advertised for and appointed (Enid Gibson, 1958) an Assistant Librarian to manage the new collection. This excursus into the CUC library is relevant to our narrative, since the story being chronicled is leading up to the fateful events of the late 1950’s. This was the period of the amalgamation, which will be examined in more detail in the next section. At the same time as the
School of Oriental Languages was developing, the College underwent substantial expansion in both the arts and science areas. The Oriental collection amounted to some 21,000 volumes of Chinese and Japanese material, of which only a minor amount was catalogued. The major task was to complete a full accessioning of material and provide a title catalogue. Academic staff were responsible for book selection.

The Library's Annual Report of 1957 raised the question that

*serious doubts have arisen as to the wisdom of having two separate collections of this specialised type of material. Proposals for the amalgamation of the two collections, under the charge of a fully-trained librarian with linguistic knowledge required, are now under discussion between the authorities of the two institutions.*

Throughout the history of the Library following the amalgamation in 1960, and especially in the period from the early 1970's onwards, the issue of rationalisation was a prominent one.

Bishop adds that a working party was established in 1958 from the CUC and ANU, which met several times

*to study the question of the formation of an Institute of Oriental Studies with the amalgamation into one library of the separate Oriental collections.*

No such institute ever came to exist, since the plans were overrun by other events, the amalgamation of the CUC and the old ANU.

The ANU Oriental collection was developed primarily to support the research projects of what was to become the Department of Far Eastern History in the Research School of Pacific Studies (now the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies).

In the meantime the Library in the Old Hospital Building advanced into the era of photographic reproduction in the form of a machine that used a wet copying process. There was also a microfilm reader. The newly available Library of Congress, *Catalogue of Printed Books* was very helpful, and other similar series were considered.
Training was very much an on-the-job affair, and an exacting one under the tutelage of Maud Woolcock and others. This preparation helped many through the Library Association registration examinations. There were opportunities to attend lectures which were given at the National Library on a wide range of topics. There was from the start a pronounced sense on the part of the academic staff that the Library was the heart of the University, and the sharing of aspects of research with the Library staff could only emphasise that reality. It also served to enable the Library staff to see that they were part of a much broader enterprise, that there were exciting outcomes possible from the neatly classified volumes that lined the shelves. There was an air of ease of integration with the wider University Community that was to fade somewhat as the institution as a whole grew larger and to that degree less personal.

All of this stands in relation to the speed with which the University developed. The issue of amalgamation had begun to be discussed seriously. At the same time the Library had reached a stock level of 100,000, which was phenomenal growth. The Asian material remained around 30,000 volumes, partly because of low usage re-
quirements, and partly because there was a marked lack of people in Australia with the necessary specialised librarianship skills, training and expertise.

The temporary home was well and truly outgrown. In 1951 McDonald, in a letter to the Librarian of the University of Edinburgh, Dr L.W. Sharp, observed that it would be four or five years before a permanent library building would be commenced. The same year Campbell-Smith was appointed as Chief Librarian in the Canberra University College. K. Bernie was later to join as Assistant Librarian. Across Sullivan’s Creek the Board of Graduate Studies examined the issue of membership and function of a Library Committee. The College already had one, but the University was not to have a permanent body until after the amalgamation in 1964.

The middle and late 1950’s are notable for the rapid expansion of both the ANU and the CUC, and the resultant demands this made on their libraries. In April 1953 the CUC portion of the Melbourne Building in Civic was destroyed by fire, and the whole institution was moved to the former workers’ hostel in Childers Street, Turner. The College sought funds for a library building and to increase its collection to support its various disciplines. In other words, the College had become, as Sir Keith Murray (Chairman of the Committee on Australian Universities - 1957) remarked, ‘a mature institution’ and as such commanded the need of a library to help further this maturity, not only at undergraduate but on the postgraduate level as well. In the meantime the National Library was very generous in lending, on a term basis, all its Chinese and Japanese material, as well as several runs of psychology journals.

Grenfell Ruddock, one of the architects engaged by ANU to take over from Brian Lewis, was firmly of the view that the Library should be the ‘academic focal point of the University’ and be built pretty well as the geographical centre of the campus. The original plan envisaged Chancellor’s Lawn as the focal point of the University. The result was that the Library building erected eventually and named R.G. Menzies, sits on the northern edge of this Lawn.

The Murray Report of 1957 on Australian Universities stated very clearly that both ANU and CUC needed vastly improved library accommodation, since both collections were housed in premises that were ‘fully taxed and …[a] most serious fire hazard’. There were problems nonetheless, and partly to do with the smallness of
Canberra, the population of which was then around 40,000. There were also objections to there being two Universities in such a small centre and there was opposition to Canberra having two major libraries, the prospect of which was regarded as ‘an unwanted luxury’. In fact development of the National Library was seen as a more urgent priority by some in Parliament.

McDonald’s original proposals for a permanent library building for the ANU were drafted within the context of the debate over amalgamation. In an undated and unsigned paper, presumably written in or about 1955, he canvassed background information and specific instructions for the architects and the possibility of incorporation. With the latter in mind he envisaged a central research Library and a separate one which focussed on undergraduate needs. The models for this were Harvard in the United States and Glasgow in Scotland amongst others. He reiterated most of these points in a document entitled Information for the Architect. This proposed that the Library was to have an ultimate capacity of 300,000 volumes, which was deemed to be sufficient for twenty-five to thirty years. A crucial part of the thinking in regard to this projected building was the assumption that the University would remain a small institution of about four hundred people in total. This, in retrospect, is very strange, since the planning for the city’s expansion was well advanced and it was expected that by 1980 the population would have reached 250,000. The new Oriental Collection was presumed to have only limited use, and was to be housed separately and have its own catalogue. There was to be space set apart for Special Collections in the stack areas, and the building was also to accommodate the University’s Records Room, a bindery, microfilm room and archives.

From the vantage point of middle 1990’s it is rather hard to grasp that there was not more foresight in the planning of the Library, especially in terms of space. McDonald, however, was working to provide a manageable working library whose primary focus was to be on the social sciences, since each of the Science Research Schools had their own collections. Future difficulties with storage were to be dealt with in the form of low-cost on or off-campus, purpose-built facilities. Even so, with the main collection numbering 100,000 by 1955, the JCSMR Branch collection 30,000, and the nearly 30,000 volumes of the Oriental Collection, it does appear that there was a significant degree of short-sightedness in the planning for the future.
All this stands against the background of very rapidly changing times, within the University itself, the College, and the wider political context. There was a desire to build a fine building, as well as it being functional. The eventual R.G. Menzies building was designed to be added to either in the form of extra floors or as an adjacent block. The latter was proposed vigorously during the time of the next Librarian, J.J. Graneek. The issue of the siting of the Library Building became a crucial one in the discussions on amalgamation, and somehow symbolic of a whole range of differences of points of view between the ANU and the CUC.
THE AMALGAMATION OF THE LIBRARY
[1954 - 1961]

Preliminary Moves 1954 - 1960

As was sketched in the previous section one of the major changes to the structure of the University was its ‘association’ with the C.U.C. This was announced in a letter from the Prime Minister, R.G. Menzies on the 17th December, 1959 to the University. Menzies said:

*We are inviting both institutions to cooperate in preparing a plan which will serve as a basis for association in one university, with one over-all governing body, one series of degrees and, as far as practicable, a common administration.*

In the same letter it was acknowledged that neither the University nor the College were in favour of association, but preferred separate development. The Murray Report is also referred to, especially its concern regarding the cost involved in providing the necessary range of postgraduate facilities in the College. Columbia, Harvard and Princeton are appealed to as places where there existed successful associations of postgraduate research and undergraduate institutions. Menzies was clear that

*It is not our intention that this decision should interfere with the work being carried on by either body or prejudice the proper exercise of responsibility by those who deal with graduates and undergraduates.*

This letter preceded the Australian National University Bill, 24 March 1960.

These statements came as the culmination of several years of strong debate. As time passed, the vigour and, at times, acrimony intensified. In 1954 a Working Party had been established to consider the amalgamation of the College and the University, and it recommended a trial association for five years with the aim of a more economic use of such resources as the Library. The general feeling in both institutions went as far as some type of ‘spiritual rather than physical’ bond, but lacked real enthusiasm for anything more concrete. In regard to the Library, the Board of Graduate Studies, made it quite clear that it had deep reservations about more formal cooperation. The central issue was that
Outright fusion would mean a radical change in book buying, physical association, and so forth. Changes of this type will impede the growth of a research library.

Amalgamation simply was not considered an option. In the area of the natural sciences, there were also notable hesitations again, lest the Research Schools’ energies be diverted from their primary purposes. A paper by Professors Trendall, Partridge and Spate focussed on the pertinent issue of the College’s paucity of Library holdings, and that a ‘…very substantial sum…would have to be set aside to provide the nucleus for a working reference library, including sets of more important periodicals’.

The debate during 1960 revolved around the type and location(s) of the Library building(s). In its unfolding we learn a great deal about the complexities of the social structure of the two institutions. We are confronted with statements bearing several layers of meaning and dynamism related to markedly competing, yet similar, interests.

McDonald presented a paper early in 1960 which examined the issue of the University as a whole. It was titled ‘Some questions that will require decisions’. These included the physical division of the University’s major book resources, finance, a Library Committee, the Oriental Collection, buildings and administration and staffing. The more recent history of the Library can be plotted quite comprehensively using these questions as theme markers. A Library Committee was not established, as was noted earlier, until 1964.

Central to McDonald’s conception of the place and function of the Library is his belief that

No library, particularly a university library, can exist ... in vacuo. A university library serves the university as a whole and many decisions about the library can only be made after the structure has been determined. With the formation of the University the book resources of the ANU and CUC become those of the University.

He advocated the physical division of resources so that the research and undergraduate collections would be separate. Nonetheless McDonald determined that there should be no duplication of material where this applied to rare and expensive mate-
rial, but that of ‘...commonly used material it is to be welcomed rather than frowned upon’. This view fits in very much with this concept of a ‘working’ collection, and of an era where funds were more plentiful.

All the Oriental material, comprising the Chinese and Japanese collections in Canberra, ought, he believed, to be gathered into one institution on linguistic and staffing grounds. This meant that all undergraduates and research resources were to be in one place, and the Institute to be under the university’s control, at least nominally.

The existing Library buildings of both ANU and CUC were cramped and temporary. The drawings for the new building were well advanced, but it was designed as a research library, and essentially for the Joint Schools, since the Science Schools had their own very-well stocked Branch Libraries. The proposed building accommodated only one hundred or so readers, and there was no provision at all for undergraduates.

A major player in the debate was the retired Harvard University Librarian, Dr Keyes Metcalf whose opinion was sought by McDonald and Campbell-Smith. He argued strongly for two separate libraries, that the undergraduate holding should be a ‘general reading collection’ but it also should include some research material, and the research requirements were for ‘...highly specialised collections...’. All members of the research schools should have access to the undergraduate (College) Library in order to preclude duplication. Metcalf believed that undergraduate teaching staff would have only comparatively rare need to use the research Library. Physical proximity of the building was deemed important. The two libraries represented different styles of collection, and so ‘...it would be unwise to combine them’. This was a construction of reality that the College staff were to reject most strenuously in the remainder of the year, although the eventual outcome was settled along these lines.

A committee was convened by the Vice-Chancellor (Melville) to consider library matters in relation to the association of College and University. In the discussions McDonald noted the issue of duplication, but regarded that the degree of it would be reduced by the close proximity of the research and undergraduate buildings. One problem area for the possibility of duplication lay with the Departmental
collections, and especially if there was no restriction on their growth. Another area of particular difficulty lay in the different classification systems (Bliss for the ANU, Dewey for the CUC and the UDC for the Science Collections). The Committee, which comprised only ANU members decided that there was ‘...no alternative but to proceed with the existing plans for a permanent building, and to study the most satisfactory physical allocation of the collections’. At the time the total CUC holding was 50,000 volumes, not counting its Oriental Collection, while the ANU had 150,000 volumes, 30,000 in the JCSMR Library, and some 30,000 volumes of Chinese and Japanese material. The CUC Library supported four faculties: Arts, Economics, Law and Science.

The Committee stated that there should be one Library vote. At the same time it rejected the notion of a Library Committee, at least one which had similar powers to that of the CUC. There was to be one Oriental Collection, which would be part of Institute of Oriental Studies. It would have its own Librarian, who would be subject to the University Librarian, and the main purpose here was to prevent duplication and ‘maintain uniform standards of cataloguing’.

A further meeting later in January 1960 affirmed the notion of a unified Library system for the University, no matter the outcome regarding ‘the location of buildings and the distribution of the collection.’ There should be a chief Librarian who would administer the whole Library. It was recognised that the proposed siting of the new School of General Studies (the former CUC) made it imperative that its library facilities be ‘...at no great distance...’. The planned siting of the ANU building, where the R.G. Menzie Building is now, was regarded as ‘too inconvenient’. Several other core issues were raised at this meeting. It was suggested again that Oriental Collections be merged and that the two Law collections also be merged. Honours and Masters students ought to have access to, and reading space, in the new building. This was argued strongly, and there was general agreement about it from both parts of the University. The far more problematic issue was that of access to the research material by undergraduates. Much later in the unfolding of events, in the late 1970’s this ready access was granted, but there remained some vigour of feeling regarding the consequent overuse of some books and the deterioration to them. Research workers were rightly considered to be serious workers, but it is questionable whether undergraduates were necessarily less so, as was the feeling held by some.
It was pointed out in these deliberations that the then current holdings of the two parts of the University were ‘not fully comparable with the main and undergraduate sections of Glasgow and Harvard Libraries’. This was a very limited criticism which does not take account of the extremely rapid enlargement of both ANU collections since 1948. The former CUC holding was considered rather basic, but had the foundations for a good humanities collection, which was a hardly developed area in the research collection.

Classification was another serious question. As we have seen McDonald chose the Bliss Classification, whereas the College adopted Dewey because it was widely used. Merging of the collections, and the necessary reclassification was going to be costly. Nevertheless the issue had to be faced, even though initially it was felt that the two classifications could co-exist.

The Committee was divided in its opinion, but the preponderant view was that there should be two main buildings. The situation was made still more complex in that the preparations for the building of the research library were well in hand. The site lay between the temporary Medical School Buildings and Garran Road, the access road was laid, the basic excavations had been made, and the tenders were about to be called. Prior to the amalgamation, the CUC site plan had included a library building somewhere in the vicinity of the present J.B. Chifley Building. A suggestion was made that perhaps the planned research library could be re-sited, more or less where the Chancelry Building is now, and the undergraduate library be placed adjacent to it. There remained a marked lack of clarity as to what was the better arrangement regarding the placement of buildings, and the nature of the undergraduate collection. This would need to include some research material to support the future work of SGS teaching staff and research students. Duplication of resources, especially science journals was accepted as inevitable, and was regarded as ‘customary in universities’. On the question of a separate Law Collection housed in its own building, the most that was assured was that consideration might be given ‘at some later date’. The Principal of CUC, Professor Burton, was to draft a document covering the ‘proposed functions and constitution of a library committee’.

The College had hoped for autonomy as a separate university, and the ANU had wished no diminution of its research orientation. CUC positions regarding the
situation were quite varied; that there should be one Library collection under one administration, although two main buildings were allowed for, and yet another was that the new undergraduate library should not be close to the research one lest those students be discouraged from using their own Library because of the distance from the lecture theatres. The point was also raised that a single building may well prompt an universal demand for departmental libraries, and thereby increase the probability of duplication. Departmental libraries were regarded as essential in the science areas. McDonald remained quite flexible on this question, but did insist that there were problems in not having such material under the Library's control - in the archival material the term departmental library has a slightly ambiguous aspect, because it sometimes clearly includes the established Branch Libraries as well as far less developed collections. Law made a strong case for a separate holding adjacent to its teaching facilities, and if possible that these be near to the Research School of Social Sciences. The names of the Library Buildings were also debated.

Professor L.F. Crisp had some typically emphatic remarks to make regarding the issues under debate. In his view the provision of Library facilities for the SGS students was a crucial test of the sincerity and good faith of both the Prime Minister and the ANU. Undergraduates could not have an education that would be up to national standards without a very extensive collection of books to serve both pass and honours studies. He argued that the SGS would need a minimum of 150,000 volumes and these to be sited in its teaching area. At the same time he did not preclude a joint facility with the Research Library on the suggested alternative site, but this building would have to be redesigned so that provision for undergraduate use was not simply 'tacked on'. The existing research building proposed was far too small. There ought be 'open access to a maximum of the whole collection except the very specialised research collections'. The point at issue, reiterated by others, is that such contact with the breadth of the collection can only serve to encourage students to pursue higher studies. Crisp held that the onus was on the ANU staff to 'face a transfer of site [and] a revision of the basic idea and plan of the University Library'. He was also of the opinion that the Dewey classification system, in whatever form, was the appropriate one to be adopted since it was already widely established in universities and Government Departments.

Professor Burton's suggested structure of a Library Committee which was pre-
sent to the members of the Joint Committee on Library Matters, was that it included the Vice-Chancellor, the Chief Librarian and two deputies *ex officio*, and three members each from the Institute’s Board of Studies and the School’s. Its functions were very much the same as those of the former College Committee. In the first place it was to advise the Chief Librarian and departments regarding any problems that the Chief Librarian might refer to it. It had the power to report to the University Council and both Boards of Studies. There was to be no interference concerning routine Library administration, although the Committee might advise on ‘broad matters of Library policy’, and make recommendations about future developments as these affect the Library or its policies. There was deemed to be definite need for its advice on long term policy issues. These ideas were not taken up substantively until 1964 when the Library Committee was instituted.

As may well be expected, the constructive debate over the Library was proving to be a major difficulty as the University Administration, under Vice-Chancellor Sir Leslie Melville, sought to effect the ‘association’. The architects of the Library were asked for a report by Melville, which was to go to the Council. It was to address the ramifications of the proposed fusion of the CUC-ANU especially with regard to the proposed Library Building. The report was preceded by a memorandum on the same issue. John F.D. Scarborough stated there existed the ‘architectural, structural, and mechanical engineering drawings and specifications for … a new post graduate Library building designed for a specific and selected site…’. Any change in location ‘would call for careful consideration of a site, new specification and wholly new plans’. This was an expensive proposition, and the University needed to be acquainted with the implication involved in altering the original plan or in devising a wholly new one. It was regarded as adequate to provide for some eight hundred readers and up to 120,000 volumes for undergraduate use. The proposed amendment was to take account of the different site and to re-arrange the Lower and Ground Floors. This was necessary in regard to book storage, reader accommodation, public space, and staff facilities. These were to be ‘…provided in an independent but closely related structure…’. That the building(s) be clearly an entity, and clearly recognisable as the Central Library was deemed to be important, administratively, economically, from the point of view of usage, and psychologically. To reinforce the costs involved the report emphasised that ‘…economies must be carefully related to any adopted policy’.
Some of the phrases in the Report, for example ‘...an independent but closely related structure’, were ambiguous which left the parties involved room for manoeuvre.

The Librarians and their staffs were to be consulted, since the ‘administrative and efficient functioning of such a combined design... could only be fully adequately assessed by them...’. There was to be close cooperation with the architects, ‘but the implementation of such a proposal does not appear insuperable if the appreciation of the necessity for some compromises proves possible and acceptable’. Compromise was the obvious key, but in the end there was little. The relative perspectives shared a profound belief in the need for strongly adequate library resources, but the attitudes towards the undergraduate training were framed in a context before there were major changes in such teaching. These made no allowance that, even early in their degrees, undergraduates would be expected to tackle primary resource material, and to evaluate secondary expositions critically.

The Report’s most significant statement came towards its conclusion, where it asserted that:

...the interests of the unified institutions and of all readers and staffs could, in the ultimate, be undoubtedly best served by the formulation and construction of a new and wholly re-designed entity, planned and developed specifically to serve and fulfil the required and specialised functions of this centralised and projected University Library.

Neither this nor the suggestion of compromise bore fruit.

The Joint Committee on Library Matters confronted the dilemma of whether to advocate pursuing the existing plan with no alteration, or of following up the suggestion of a total re-design, and whether that should be one building or two linked one. The decision, on the preponderance of opinion, was to proceed with the current plans but on the new suggested site. The undergraduate building could be built alongside. In this way, it was believed that there would be a substantial saving of time. The ANU members of the Committee were keen for immediate action, considering the cramped and fire-hazardous situation which existed for the Library. The interests of both the research workers and undergraduates were to be protected. Some of the CUC members argued that the University’s long-term interests would best be served by ‘...a single building, planned from the beginning for a comprehensive general
university library...'. This was considered imperative and, as subsequent history has unfolded, the correct view.

**The Amalgamation (1960 - 1961)**

Finding themselves somewhat thwarted, the CUC made a submission to Cabinet in mid-February 1960. The axes of the argument were the College’s need for its own central library, and the relatively great expense of the proposed research library, which was to have very limited accommodation for readers (100-140). The College needed a flexibly designed building which could be expanded easily as student numbers rose. The original numbers of readers to be accommodated was 800. Later estimates took this up to 1200 or more. The importance of an integrated system was that it provided undergraduates with ample opportunity to browse intelligently, and thereby exercise extensive reading.

Meanwhile McDonald advanced several comments on this submission, the core of which was his opposition on philosophical grounds to a single, central library, such as the Fisher Library at the University of Sydney. He was of the view that the proposed building was adequate and posed no competition to any undergraduate needs. He also saw no particular difficulty with a dispersed library system comprising several substantial departmental libraries. McDonald also believed that there was no need for a full catalogue in the undergraduate library, something which the CUC side had considered essential. The Vice-Chancellor was very strong in his support of this general perspective, and tended to view things in terms of the Research School’s needs. The crux of his position seemed to be primarily an economic one, since money which had been already outlaid on excavations and architects’ fees would have to be written off if there was a change of site. On the other hand it was strongly implicit in the College’s argument that the £650,000 to be spent on the research library could well go towards, and more efficiently, a single University Library. Melville considered that there would be ‘irresistible pressure’ for separate departmental libraries more conveniently located, if the research building was not proceeded with. He concluded his Submission to the Prime Minister saying that

*The University therefore asks that it be permitted to call tenders for the construction of its library building on the site approved...*
Failing this the University asks that it be permitted to call tenders on the drawings already made but adapted for use on the site suggested by the College...

And the University further

‘respectfully asks that it not be subjected to the delays, the expenses, the long arguments and the frustrations of planning a completely new building’.

The college made one further sally, submitting to the Prime Minister, in late February, the view that the ‘association’ of the two institutions had altered the context of the debate, and that the provision of an undergraduate library of just over 100,000 volumes with no union catalogue was discriminatory. Furthermore that the situation would militate against ‘the Government’s picture of a University of national standards in all aspects’.

In the end the argument was settled by a Prime Ministerial fiat in a telex to the Vice-Chancellor.

_I am satisfied that for reasons of both time and money the present library plans should be proceeded with forthwith. I regard the matter as urgent. I do not doubt that there would be some advantage to be gained by having a research library and an undergraduate library adjacent to each other. But the reasons now existing for prompt building on the already proposed site should prevail._

Cynthia James, the first Science Librarian, observed in an unpublished manuscript (1982), that this decision on the Prime Minister’s part was to have ‘far-reaching effects on the Library’s development which are still in evidence today.’ The effects are evident, because there are now three main Library Buildings, R.G. Menzies, J.B. Chifley, W.K. Hancock, and seven Branch Libraries which includes the Northern Australia Research Unit Library in Darwin. The Institute of Arts Libraries are not yet incorporated into the University system.

The pressures of the final months of the process prior to the Prime Minister’s statement took a severe toll on McDonald, whose health had been undermined by extremely long and strenuous hours of military intelligence work during the war. On medical advice he retired shortly before the building of the new library commenced.
His Deputy, Noel Stockdale was Acting Librarian in the interim. The Vice-Chancellor appointed a selection committee, two members of which were Professors Burton and Crisp.

Campbell-Smith made some very telling comments in a letter to Keyes Metcalf (6 April 1960). First of all, regarding the ‘association’, that it was a ‘reluctant union forced on the CUC and ANU’. As a consequence the ‘library may suffer badly [because of] short sighted jealousies and lack of vision’. Second, she states, without amplification, that there were many points of disagreement between McDonald and Stockdale regarding the new library building, and possibly about wider policy issues. Third, Campbell-Smith consulted with Andrew Osborn, then Librarian at the University of Sydney. This was done on the grounds that she believed him to be an outstanding librarian and, more importantly, ‘completely disinterested’ regarding the partisan views of the debate. Osborn was very strongly of the view that one main building would be a far more satisfactory proposal. Fourth, Campbell-Smith makes it very clear about her priorities regarding the effective administration of a university.

*I believe that the posts of Vice-Chancellor and Librarian are the two most important posts in the institution, if wise appointments are made here the University will have a good chance of success despite its somewhat unhappy start...*

*The first Librarian will determine the lines along which the library will develop - whether it will really be a university library of merely warring factions.*

The immediate concern was in regard to the Librarian, and Campbell-Smith canvassed both Metcalf and Osborn for suggestions. She rejected Osborn’s suggestion that she herself was a most suitable candidate, on the grounds that someone from outside Australia would have a better chance since he or she would have ‘no commitment to either faction and [be] bent only on building up a good all-round library’. McDonald who was about to retire, and whom she respected for his capacity to ‘put personal feelings and attachments aside’ and his integrity, had been too inclined to err ‘on the side of caution and the short term view’. She reiterates the basic College view of the inadequacies of reader accommodation in the new building.
In a letter to Professor Burton in late March 1960, she makes two further important points. First, that undergraduate numbers were expected to be around three thousand by the 1970’s; that figure was passed in 1967. Undergraduates rose from around eight hundred, at the time of the amalgamation, to three thousand two hundred in 1967. Postgraduates increased from one hundred and twenty to five hundred in the same period. Second, she forecast that the General Studies Library would be the main centre of activity by the 1970’s. Campbell-Smith also emphasised the need for thoroughly adequate work-space for staff, since that had a history of always filling up first. There should be a complete union catalogue in each building. Duplication was conceded to be necessary in relation to basic reference material, as well as some monographs and serials. This issue was to re-surface as a major problem and was only finally resolved in the radical rearrangement of the rationalisation undertaken in the long break of 1984-1985. Campbell-Smith noted that McDonald had proposed a capital grant for the College Library so that it could be brought up to 100,000 volumes over two or three years; a one hundred percent expansion. Thereafter £2000 per annum was considered enough to maintain the collection. The other feature of McDonald’s plan was to house all technical staff in the same building, but this too was queried concerning the adequacy of the space allocated.

During the later part of 1963 Noel Stockdale, moved to South Australia to take up the task of founding the Library at Flinders University. The new ANU Librarian was J.J. Graneek who had previously served as Librarian at Queen’s University, Belfast. He was one of three people notable in the life of the Library to have contact with Queen’s. The second computer programmer, Tony Ashcroft came from that University to the ANU, and Rosina Perry, Divisional Head of Social Sciences and Humanities. Graneek was another in the traditional model of scholar-librarians and his field of investigation was the Dead Sea Scrolls. One of his first acts on taking up office was to ask the National Library for a list of their holdings in this area. As time passed the increasing speed and volume of administrative requirements must have made it very difficult to pursue such research in any consistent manner. This foreshadowed the move from the scholar librarian to that of the professional manager.

Graneek visited the Library prior to taking up his post. The main purpose was to make a survey of the Library and to submit a report of this, Plan of Library Development to the joint Ad Hoc Library Committee later in the month. A tale is told of his
coming across a packed tea room, somewhere around 3.00 p.m. on the second Tuesday of that same month. This was apparently something of a cultural jolt for him. The key elements of Graneek's plan was built on the foundations provided by the Institute of Advanced Studies and the School of General Studies holdings, and their distribution. The major premise was that there was to be an integrated library system. This allowed for a number of library units catering for special requirements. There was to be free access to all units. The School of General Studies Library was to contain a basic collection in all subjects, and complete collection in the Humanities. While this library would collect in the sciences generally, there was to be a specialised Science Library built nearer to the planned science buildings in the General Studies part of the University.

It was Graneek's view that the 'die had been cast' concerning the separate main library buildings. The research library admitted of only minor modifications, internal ones which could enable it to increase its capacity to 350,000 (from 300,000) volumes. Graneek summed up his position, that there were

*powerful arguments in favour of establishing a number of service points in close proximity to potential users, provided that there is a single administration, centralised processing, and (subject to appropriate limitations in special cases) free access to all sections of the library for all members of the University, if it is possible at the cost of some duplication to achieve a measure of unity in diversity which is likely to be markedly more efficient and educationally desirable that the monolithic alternative.*

In this Graneek seems to have drawn together the elements of both 'sides' and produced a workable compromise. There is much similarity with McDonald's overall purpose, except that Graneek planned a basic collection in the SGS Library of
200,000 volumes, which would expand to an ultimate level of around 500,000. There was to be a Law Library of 50,000 volumes, and the Science Library (SGS) was to have 100,000, the Oriental Collection about 150,000, and the specialist Science Libraries in the Institute maintained.

The Research Library foundation-stone was laid by R.G. Menzies, Prime Minister, in May 1961. At about the same time plans were finalised for the first stage of the General Studies Library. Both were to be opened in 1963.

As a temporary measure to help towards more effective access, the science material held in the Childers Street accommodation (the old College Library) was moved to the Physics Building on University Avenue. The aim was to provide staff and students of the Faculty of Science with a specialised service, as well as reducing some of the pressure concerning shelving space.

The General Studies Library was to be situated two hundred metres to the west of the junction of Ellery Circuit and University Avenue.

Two aspects of the Library holdings which were readily amalgamated were the Oriental Collections. There was to be an Institute of Oriental Studies which would
comprise the former College School of Oriental Studies and the old ANU Department of Far Eastern History, as well as the library holdings associated with each. Enid Bishop in her account of the developments of the East Asian element of the Oriental (now Asian) Collection (1982) observes that the agglomeration of the former School and Department with their libraries were to be known as the Centre of Oriental Studies. This term she remarks was actually quite nebulous, since the association was only a loose one. There were three reasons for using the name: in planning for an actual building, 'the establishment of joint publishing activity in the Asian field' and '...for the appointment of a Curator of the combined Oriental Collections'. No radical changes resulted from this arrangement since the constituent parts tended to continue to operate as they had before. The important point was that there was a definite notional unity.

Bishop suggests that the institution of the centre had little initial impact on library development, but that

*the fact of amalgamation of the two former institutions, ANU and CUC, did have a profound effect on the Library in general and the Oriental Collection in particular.*

In 1961 Mr Chaoying Fang was appointed as Associate Librarian and Curator of the Oriental Collection as part of the immediate steps taken by the University towards 'achieving total integration' of the collections and staff.

The very buoyant enthusiasm of the early years of collecting left its mark, especially in the area of a substantial backlog in cataloguing. The Oriental Collection had had little attention paid to it, which meant that Chaoying Fang had some 50,000 volumes to bring into order through reclassification. There were also the necessary physical moves of the collection and its staff. Despite these hurdles the task was completed in about two years. Bishop adds wryly that

*During this period, normal services had to be maintained and accessions were substantially increased.*

In this fashion, what the University itself described as 'a third major section of the University Library came into being', (alongside the Social Science and Humanities and formidable Science Collections) and at a time when Chinese studies were
beginning to assume a wider importance in Australia, and overseas. Chaoying Fang was appointed because he was an acknowledged ‘distinguished scholar librarian’. The perennial problems attached to Asian material, and especially Chinese confronted Fang as he set about building the collection. Classical material was becoming scarce and he had to scour book-sellers catalogues for material. Nonetheless in two years he acquired 11,000 volumes, and all from within the normal funding provisions.

In 1963 Mr Chaoying Fang moved to a research position in the U.S. but he left behind an established practice, both in terms of technical competence and confidence about the direction in which the Collection should develop.

This brief era in the life of the Oriental Collection provides us with an illuminating model of what was to be attempted over a longer period in the Library as a whole. Despite the deep tensions of the lead-up to amalgamation and the upheaval of that event, there was still much of the pioneering optimism present. This obtains notwithstanding Campbell-Smith’s statement regarding the conflict between the former ANU and CUC that

*There are vested interests on both sides, the College thwarted on independence, is determined to have the best kind of undergraduate university it can wangle and many of the ANU see with dismay the cracking of the ivory tower under the rude intrusion of undergraduates and will go down fighting.*

Division as deep as this suggests does not fade readily, but Graneek asserted that, and as amalgamation of the Oriental Collection foreshadowed, the Library was to be a unified service. Nevertheless the maintenance of the dispersed system was to make the task of unity all the more difficult, and especially with the very rapid expansion of the University in the following twenty years.
The First Phase (1961 - 1967)

The first few years of J.J. Graneek's term (1961-1972) as a librarian saw some moves towards a truly unified Library system, while the physical disposition of the Library remained much as it had been prior to the amalgamation.

The opening of the Menzies Library by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.
The significant features of this period were the completion of both Library buildings in 1963. Queen Elizabeth II, opened the R. G. Menzies Building on 13 March. The Duke of Edinburgh, in his inimitable manner, likened the assembled begowned academics to a ‘rose garden’. The Oriental Collection was then housed in the Menzies Building, where it has remained. The SGS Science Collection was moved from its temporary quarters in the Physics Building to the General Studies Library. A debate was in progress as to what name that Library should receive, and it was to be some years before that of J. B. Chifley was chosen. Plans were made for a Branch Library for the General Studies Science Collection. Similarly, in the Institute preparations for a new mathematics building were in hand, which would be part of the Research School of Physical Sciences. The Research School’s Branch Library was to be housed in the new building. The remaining major element was the preparation for the commencement of the construction of the proposed Centre of Oriental Studies. Stage I of this was to be completed in the same triennium, and was to have included the Oriental Section of the university Library. This overall plan was never effected, even though the Centre did partially eventuate as the Faculty of Asian Studies.

During the planning for the General Studies Library there was a visit to the University by Dr Keyes Metcalf, who assisted in the preparations for the new building. Campbell-Smith had charge of the Library. Sue Youngman (later to be the Law Librarian) recalls that the shift of the book-stock from Childers Street premises was made in one week-end; an ‘all-hands’ effort. The General Studies Library was one of the first new libraries of its kind in Australia.

The comparable shift of stock to the Menzies Building meant moving the books and serials from the old Hospital, as well as from the temporary storage area in some old Nissan huts nearby the Research School of Physical Sciences. In those early days the foyer was very open and led directly to a courtyard. The context was one of light and space, a strong stimulus for the pursuit of knowledge.

This period also saw the beginning of an end of an era. It was still a time of high employment and there was a marked amount of mobility, with many people working on a short term basis for the Library. Cataloguing procedures were on the brink of changing, especially in the United States where substantial preliminary work
had been done on the first efforts at producing machine readable records. Elizabeth Courtney holds the memory, along with others, of the long hours of verifying material meticulously in order to produce accurate files. The period also represents the close of the time in which the University was a very compact institution, that is looked back upon with understandably some affection and nostalgia. Automation began at the ANU Library in 1964 with the computer reproduction of Library of Congress cards.

Professor Noel Dunbar (Professor of Physics in the CUC from 1959, and later Deputy Vice-Chancellor 1968-1977) commented that J. J. Graneek was a ‘great centralist’ regarding the Library. This policy was put in place in July 1961, but by November pressure was already being applied from both sides of the University for a reversion to the previous mode of operation. This was a decentralised method of funding, so that, in the case of SGS, each department was to allocate monies which were spent as it saw fit. Graneek was nonetheless to provide regular statements of the funds given to the departments. He, however, did not favour rigid allocations, but preferred the flexibility of using the central fund to help departments as they needed assistance. The main ground for pursuing a reversion to the previous status quo was the perceived degree of delay in receiving orders. Graneek countered the proposal, saying that the new system was only a few months old and needed time to settle. It was actually in September that the new style of operation began.

At the same time there was a feeling on the School’s part (SGS) that it had to make a case for duplication of monographs and serials, since there was a question in people’s minds that perhaps the Institute tended to control the buying of material.

In the midst of this came a reaffirmation that the Library be a unified, single system with ‘centralised processing and (subject to appropriate limitation in special cases) free access to all sections of the Library for all members of the University’. The absence of a substantial public library service in Canberra was also another justification for the University Library being accessible to all students. Graneek held the view, in common with McDonald, that only honours and senior students should have access to the collection in the Menzies Building. Collection Building continued to be a major preoccupation together with the above issues throughout 1961-1964, as it had been since the Library’s inception.
1964 saw the establishment of the Library Committee. Up until then the former (old ANU) practice had been that there was no Committee, but the Librarian was a member of the Graduate Board of Studies. This had been the forum for considering Library matters, as it was appropriate.

The Library Committee was proposed in May, and the concept accepted as the Joint Committee of the Boards of the Institute of Advanced Studies and the School of General Studies in June. The Committee was appointed ‘...to assist and advise the Librarian and to act as liaison between the Librarian and the users of the Library’. It was hoped by the Directors and Deans that the committee would help to promote a ‘...better understanding between the Librarian and the Academic boards and would be of assistance to the Librarian in reaching and executing appropriate policy decisions and in such matters as staffing policy. This statement suggests the point of view that the Librarian and the Library were primarily at the service of the University. If so, then there had been a major change of attitude regarding the academic’s relationships with the Librarian, one in which the sense of the mutual cooperation of the early days of the University had given way to a pragmatic one. Yet the Library in the meantime was still considered to be the heart of the University, and the Librarian used to call on new staff members in order to ascertain their research and teaching needs.

The issues to which the Committee was to direct its attention included the estimates for the next triennium (1966-69), the General Studies Library in regard to general purchasing (most funds being outlaid on departmental requirements), the organisation of Library personnel, the relationship of departmental libraries to the main Library, and the vexing question of the processing backlog. Related to the last issue was whether books could be available prior to full cataloguing, and the suggestion of an increased staff to achieve a breakthrough in the arrears. The first meeting on the 4 August covered these questions as well as the further ones of policy on borrowing, control and prevention of theft, and elections to senior positions.

To advance the scope of administration of the Library, the Library Committee proposed the appointment of an Associate Librarian in both buildings. Clare Campbell-Smith was appointed to that position in the General Studies Library. The position in the R. G. Menzies Building drew a field of about a dozen or so applicants. In October
W.G. Buick was appointed. The broad areas of responsibility covered the general conduct and administration of the relevant sections. This meant overall supervision of the Medical and Physical Sciences Libraries, Mt Stromlo Library, and the New Guinea Research Unit Library in Port Moresby. The Associate Librarians were also to cooperate with academic staff in relation to the development of resources for teaching and research programmes, initiating proposals for purchases. The organisation of the reference sections and the maintenance of records and of statistics were part of the brief. The Institute Associate Librarian, would also act as Deputy Librarian as required.

Early in 1965 the cataloguing arrears stood at 12,000 volumes. Graneek advanced a number of reasons for this. The core issue however, was the fact that there had been only minor staff increases since 1960. Furthermore, there was the long preoccupation with the problems associated with the amalgamation. Staff had made a prodigious effort and, in the circumstances, should be congratulated. On the debt side, Graneek did mention the issue of staff resistance to change, the tendency to a lack of attention to detail, and the high incidence of staff turnover.

The long-term remedies involved reorganising the cataloguing Section, separating the clerical and professional functions in order to coordinate the process more effectively. Graneek also pointed out that the ANU Library staff were the lowest paid of all the Australian Universities.

The short term solution to the problem was to provide the necessary three staff members to help with the estimated 4000 man hours required to complete the cataloguing backlog. The extra staff would be needed for a year only, or the same end would be achieved through overtime granted to existing staff. The difficulty of the level of staffing and salaries was to remain one for some time. The introduction of automation would prove to be the effective means of keeping up with the cataloguing process, especially linked with the move away from the emphasis on original work.

As student numbers continued to rise, especially in the undergraduate domain, so did the problem of exit control security become a major one in the General Studies Library. Book losses became very significant. Campbell-Smith suggested that male
guards could be employed to supervise the Library exit at peak periods. The balance of their time could be spent in the constant task of reshelving. This proposal was adopted and there was a reduction in stock losses, but the most effective means came later with the introduction of the 'tattle-tape' system. This is so effective it occasionally embarrasses the innocent, but it serves to keep students more honest than they might well be.

By the mid-1960's accommodation pressures were felt in both main buildings. Campbell-Smith pointed out to the Principal of SGS that seating room available in the General Studies Library catered for only 19% of the enrolled students. Her concern was that the honours and masters students would be disadvantaged. The solution was at once simple and expensive, that is the extension of the building. It was also necessary to consider an increase in duplicate copies of much used books. At the time of amalgamation the most advanced planning foresaw a student population in the SGS of 4000. For that number, seating accommodation for 1000 students would need to be provided. The School's Registrar, Tom Owen, noted that the General Studies Library was capable of being extended easily to cope with future needs. He also mentioned the possibility of moving the General Studies Oriental Collection to the R.G Menzies Building, so as to provide more space for readers and for stacks.

It is worth noting here that the University's policy had undergone a change in connection with Oriental Collection. During 1962, as Bishop states, the National Library of Australia withdrew the East Asian material that it had lent to the old CUe. This change of policy meant that the 'ANU had no further direct responsibility for the development or control of the National Library’s East Asian collections'. The agreement arrived at before the amalgamation meant the National Library’s collection focus was on contemporary Chinese material. As the University’s operations expanded there developed a strong research interest in contemporary China which covered any fields apart from linguistics and philosophical ones to include economics, political science and international relations.

As a result of this gradual but profound change of perspective, the Committee on Contemporary China was formed in 1967, the purpose of which was the 'coordinating, facilitating and promoting [of] modern Chinese studies throughout the University'. This meant that the University had to consider developing holdings of con-
temporary Chinese material to augment the extensive National Library collection. The principal areas that needed coverage were ‘... in periodical holdings and retrospective monographs published both before and after 1949’. The Committee also determined that the University’s research requirements would demand ‘considerable effort to increasing its holdings in the field to augment and complement what the National Library was doing’.

Further developments on space problems came up at a Library Committee meeting in July 1965. Some of these heralded the profound changes in the type of service which the Library, as a whole, would come to offer. First of all, the Librarian was commissioned to report at the Committee’s next meeting about the possibility of retaining the whole Oriental Collection in the Menzies Library. This would be an interim measure while the Oriental Studies Library was being built. Then there were proposals about commencing a reader education dimension of the Library’s services. This evolved from the increasing range of material becoming available at all levels of research, and in the interests of having the Library resources used more fully. The third item spilt over from a SGS Board of Studies resolution, that the Library Committee

*might give consideration to the formulation of a long term policy on the eventual size of the School of General Studies Collection and its rate of growth and the size of the General Studies Building of the University Library necessary to house that collection and seat students.*

As we will see this issue became quite a contentious one during the years following. Generally there was little significant and permanent physical expansion of Library space, not, at least, on the scale hoped for. In order to mount a substantial argument, photo-electric counting devices were installed, so that effective statistics of use could be compiled. The Committee also considered a Board of Studies resolution (SGS) concerning the establishment of the Science Library.

Other, related, concerns also began to emerge, ones typical of an expanding system which was originally designed to serve a smaller pool of users. One perennial was the issue of the time lapse between the publishing of a book and its eventual shelving. The L.C. Classification system was chosen to replace the existing Bliss, Dewey and Universal Decimal systems. In 1966 the reclassification project began
and was to last for several years. At this point the total collection was in the order of 384,000 volumes, so that the reclassification represented, as Cynthia James observed wryly, 'a considerable commitment'.

Alongside these developments the Library Committee proposed that there be further reorganisation of the library system. Principally this was to involve an extension of both the research and General Studies Buildings. The Menzies Building was to have an extension built in the form of an additional stack building, linked to the original one by a bridge. The new building was to occupy the Old Administration area. The extension was to have a minimum capacity of 750,000 books, and have not less than 500 carrels. In this way the R.G. Menzies Library would provide for all the University's research needs except for the existing Science Branch Libraries. The General Studies Library was to be capable of containing a maximum of 250,000 books and have seating accommodation for an initial number of 1250 readers, rising in stages to 2500. Late in 1965, it was agreed to concentrate the whole Oriental Collection in the R.G. Menzies Library. The proposal was also made that the Research School of Chemistry was to have a '...working research collection', which would be available jointly to the SGS Chemistry Department.

The fluidity of staff again became an issue to be faced, when George Buick resigned as Associate Librarian to take up his appointment as Librarian at the University of Papua New Guinea in Port Moresby. Jean Waller from the University of Singapore, was subsequently appointed in 1967 and was to remain on the library staff until her retirement in 1976.

K. Bernie was sent (1966) on a tour of the United States and British libraries, principally university ones, as a follow-up to a brief survey visit by J.J. Graneek (1965).

The report which Bernie presented on the findings of his tour was comprehensive. Graneek’s visit had focussed on library organisation and administration in general as well as investigating library architecture. Bernie’s task was

*to investigate more closely the recent advances in the mechanisation and automation of library processes and techniques.*
This is the first substantial mention of the question, and the first serious consideration of what was to become the central issue in the Library’s development, and one which was to cause much anguish in various ways. Bernie identified the principal benefits that automation appeared to be capable of producing eventually, as well as the more immediate problematic facets since so much of what was being done was still very much at the experimental state. The uncertainty created by this, and the lack of precision about the processes remained until the late 1970’s at least. At the same time developmental ground was being covered with extraordinary speed.

Bernie commented that the library profession as a whole had been

*deeply concerned for some years past in developing the most effective means of coping with the tremendous volumes of printed materials and other sources of information for which it bears primary responsibility of effective organisation and adequate utilisation.*

In this statement we see the core awareness of the Librarian’s purpose, but there is also the hint of what was to eventuate in the 1990’s, where libraries function equally (if not more so) as entry points to networks of information, as much as collectors of hard copy materials. Neither of these aspects sit with complete ease alongside the other.

Interest in mechanisation and automation grew from the need to obtain means of overcoming cataloguing bottlenecks, delays regarding orders and the shelving of material, and in the overall reduction of operating costs. It was in the United States that the most important experiments were conducted, since the necessary financial resources to carry the enormous expense of development were there as well as the breadth of institutional support. There were two practical issues which were to be major hurdles for computerisation. For mechanisation to work, several alternative records were necessary, and some means of connecting these, whereas a clerk could make obvious connections between the various files manually and more quickly. ‘Field length’ for records was the other problem, since authors and titles ‘do not lend themselves readily to coding into fields of field length’. Machine readable records were then possible, but the entries were truncated which led to confusing interpretations. The storage and print-out of records was also costly and time-consuming.
One of the main deterrents to the use of computers remained their slow speed of operation and their immense cost. On-line interrogation of records was theoretically possible, but it was quicker and cheaper to read the ‘traditional visible record’.

The most notable proposition according to Bernie was the project being undertaken by the Library of Congress, which was looking beyond its own institutional needs in seeking to produce machine readable catalogues (MARC). This material could be available world-wide, on a weekly basis, by means of magnetic tape copies. For such a project to be successful a willingness was necessary to be part of an integrated library system in some way,

*rather than each one tie itself too closely to an installation in some institution or government centre exercising financial or administrative control over it.*

Bernie concluded with the following points, that the greatest benefits of automation were likely to be in the area of information storage and retrieval, and in the production of periodical indices. At the same time there was need for greater communication between libraries. There was also looming the severe difficulty of the physical storage of material. He arranged for the supply of Library of Congress bibliographic data to assist the ANU’s reclassification project. Bernie’s final caution was that individual libraries ought not proceed with automation unless there was compelling need, and while fundamental research and experimentation was still to be carried out.

Parallel to these developments were others which had more to do with everyday events in the Library. For example, a problem had become apparent, from the Library’s perspective, of the need to ‘induce readers to make more use of the facilities which are provided’. There were also some practical aspects to this issue, including the lack of full air-conditioning, which was deemed to deter effective use of the Menzies building. The same problem was true for the General Studies Library. There, overcrowding complicated matters further.

The solution to the General Studies Library’s difficulty lay in an extension of the building and the installation of full air-conditioning. The Menzies Building was also to have its ventilation system upgraded in the same way. Stage II of the General
Studies Library was to provide additional stack space, as suggested by the Library Committee, for up to 250,000 books and accommodate 1200 readers. The building began in late 1966 for completion by February 1968.

Another important event was the appointment of a Coordinator of the Branch Libraries, to be effective from the end of 1965. The purpose was to ensure 'balanced development in the existing branch libraries'. At the same time these comprised the medical sciences, physical sciences, astronomy and law holdings. Law was in the process of being expanded, but the others were already among the most comprehensive of their type in Australia.

During this time the decision was made to establish two new research schools, in Chemistry and in the Biological Sciences. The Library had therefore to attend to building up effective working collections of books and serials.

The Annual Report for 1966 refers to the introduction of the Library of Congress Classification system as the 'most single event [of the year]...'. The system was chosen because it was the 'least unsatisfactory of those available at the present time' and, because of its already wide use, and the ready access to such items as printed card proof sheets, which it was hoped would lower the ANU Library's catalogue production costs. It was expected that the whole process would not be finished before 1976. At the same time the usual cataloguing proceeded apace at the rate of 20,000 volumes per annum, and there was no backlog with the science material.

**The Second Phase (1967-1972)**

Throughout 1967 the main issues to surface concerned the nature of the services to be provided for the new research School of Biological Sciences. A significant aspect of this was the enormous tensions between JCSMR, and Research School of Physical Sciences on the one hand, and The Faculties and the RSBS, on the other. The Library, unfortunately, was not seen as neutral because of its identification with the Life Sciences Library and with RSBS. This stemmed in part from the close working relationship between Cynthia James, Noel Dunbar, Denis Carr, and Ralph Slatyer
in the development of the Life Sciences Collection. There were doubts raised about the possibility of 24 hour access to the collection. The Librarian was asked to prepare 'notional drawings' concerning the mooted extension of the Menzies Building, extensions which were deemed by him to be essential by 1973-1975.

The question of the place of departmental libraries was also a prominent one, since no clear differentiation existed between a 'working collection' and a 'departmental library'. There were questions too about the power of virement in connection to funds which enabled departments to buy their own books. The problem was set against the background of a 'commonly held opinion that a policy ruling on departmental collections existed...'. Nothing appears to have been decided about this by the Committee or other bodies, while the librarian seemed moderately unconcerned so long as an appropriate balance was kept between the needs of the university as a whole and those of the departments.

1968 was a crucial year in the Library’s history, and as much for fresh insights into the needs of the system as for anything else. By this time it was unambiguously clear the Menzies Building was significantly inadequate regarding stack, staff and readers’ space. James comments

*In retrospect it is clear that the underestimation of the site of the research library caused problems well within ten years of its construction. It may have been adequate if there had been no merger, with a limited collection size and relatively small staff. Perhaps a decision with greater vision may have been taken if it had been made with less haste and the costs counted more.*

That things worked out as they did is one of those perennial problems, but as James observed the heating, lighting, and administrative costs soon overtook ‘the costs incurred in architects’ fees and site planning...’.

In September 1967 the Vice-Chancellor established four special committees to advise on the draft building programme for the 1970-72 triennium. One became known as the Vice-Chancellor’s Library Committee, with Professor J.D.B. Miller as its Chairman. Its specific frame of reference included a review of general Library policy in cooperation with the Library Committee, and to prepare a report regarding the size and development of the collection and its physical requirements over the
following decade. Account had to be taken of the existing capacity and the geographical dispersion of the Library system. The Committee was also requested to assess the Librarian’s proposals for capital expenditure in the forthcoming triennium against the preceding background.

Graneek’s *Report on Library Development with Special Reference to Undergraduate and Research Collections* appeared in essentially the same form in late 1967 and mid-1968. It was a Review of the Library from 1960 onwards and reveals some intriguing revivals, as well as much revision of earlier plans, and a very significant change of perception.

In November 1960 the University Council had approved a development plan for the Library. This foresaw a total of 350,000 volumes to be housed in the Menzies Building, that the SGS collection would rise from 200,000 to 500,000, and the Oriental Collection, housed separately, would comprise some 150,000 volumes. Besides these were the undergraduate Science Library with 100,000 volumes, Law with not less than 50,000, and solid working collections in the JCSMR, Research School of Physical Sciences and Mt Stromlo Libraries.

Graneek proposed a reorganisation of the Library structure:

> *After seven years of amalgamation we should be prepared to abandon the distinction between the Institute and the School, which has always been unreal in library terms, and to adopt in its place a more functional and rational differentiation between research requirements on the one hand and undergraduates on the other.*

This statement and its implications prompted wide ranging responses. At one level it signifies the realism of practice that, whatever the differences between Institute and School, the Library was a unified entity. On another level, Graneek’s postulation of the previously abandoned distinction between a research library as such and a library which focussed wholly on undergraduate needs, revived the former debate on the topic. This latter point was formalised through the survey and report by H.E. Maude, prepared for the Vice-Chancellor’s Library Committee in July 1968.

The major change which flowed from this re-focussing was that the General Studies Library (renamed the J.B. Chifley Building about this time) should be organ-
ised purely for undergraduates. Instead of its holding rising to 500,000 as planned, it was thought that this would be out of balance with that of Menzies Building. 250,000 volumes was judged to be a quite adequate working collection for an undergraduate library. The Menzies Building could be modified internally to carry a stock of 400,000 volumes.

Further to these proposals, Graneek also suggested that the idea of the Science Library be abandoned because there was no consensus on a site, as well as the scope and size of that collection. The separate Oriental Library was also to be abandoned, and the Chinese and Japanese material to be housed permanently in Menzies Building as an integral part of the research collection. The Oriental Collection was to have its own staff, who would oversee all aspects of its functioning. The Science Branch Libraries were to have their own holdings increased from around 25,000 to 40,000 volumes. The newly established Chemistry Branch Library served both the new Research School and the SGS Department. Law was envisaged to have a library of up to 10,000 volumes.

Graneek also pointed out some of the phenomenal growth of the library since its inception. The enormous output of material coupled with the expansion of the number of disciplines had resulted in a vigorous broadening of research. And this in turn had prompted 'fundamental changes in librarianship' concerning 'the extent and variety of the material to be supplied, revolutionary developments in the use of libraries for instruction and research and far-reaching advances in technology'.

Undergraduate needs had again come to be seen as being very specific so that what was required included a willing staff to provide guidance and stimulus, and a collection which would be an 'intelligible and attractive' conspectus of material. This Graneek believed would be more suitable to creating an 'inviting and stimulating atmosphere', whereas the sheer size of the research collection was regarded as potentially intimidating. At the same time he emphasised strongly that this 'separation in no way [implied] segregation'. The collections were to be open to all, and undergraduates would be encouraged to use the research material, and even have their own reading room in that Building. Graneek regarded the dual development of collections with the General Studies Library containing both undergraduate and research material as administratively untidy and academically illogical. Some of the
models for this restructure were Chicago and Harvard Universities.

Before canvassing briefly the material in Maude's report it is interesting to note the response of the Registrar, Ross Hohnen. He focussed on the numbers presented by Graneek, but read them against the entire holding. Graneek spoke of needing space for 400,000 volumes, and Hohnen pointed out that with existing Social Science and Science Collection and the Oriental Collection, there were already 500,000 in the Menzies Building. Similarly when the Life Sciences Building was complete, that it would absorb some of the Menzies Building’s holding. Hohnen also noted parallel issues around the numbers of volumes in the Branch Libraries. On the basis of this construction of the situation Hohnen rejected Graneek’s claimed need for a compactus in the Menzies basement, on the grounds that there was ample space in all existing buildings for another decade. There had to be a comprehensive statistically based justification for any enlargement of library capacity.

The views of Graneek’s proposals, as canvassed in Maude’s report, revealed the same dichotomy of positions that were constellated during the debate over the siting of the Library. There was not however, a clear-cut division between the Institute and School. The overall Institute view was negative, which assumed that the social science researchers would be severely and adversely affected by the extra volume of user traffic in the Menzies Building. Generally the Research Schools were indifferent since they had their own specialist libraries, except in the area of what was to become Earth Sciences. Others in the Institute were strenuously opposed on the grounds that the proposed separation of collections would have a ‘sterile and destructive’ impact on all levels of intellectual pursuit.

Within the SGS reactions varied, from that of the Science departments which mooted joining with the Research Schools concerning library facilities, to that which suggested the formation of specialist libraries by related disciplines (e.g. Classics and French). From another perspective the Faculty of Arts presented deep-seated opposition to Graneek’s plan, and proposed instead the development of a Humanities focussed library based upon a vertical division of material.

It is important to note two points about this situation. First, there was strong support both from Institute and SGS for need of browsing. This was regarded as an
essential feature of learning. Opinions on borrowing rights were divided, especially of research material. The outcome was that fourth year honours, masters students and ‘selected’ third year undergraduates could be given such borrowing rights. Second, the analogy drawn from the particular undergraduate-research relationship at such universities as Chicago and Harvard was rejected since Australian teaching procedures were considered to be very different. Furthermore, the basis for any division in the holding should be in terms of subject, and not that of educational stage.

By the close of 1968 Stage II of the General Studies Library was completed with air conditioning included. A Branch Library had been established in the Research School of Chemistry, and Stage I of the Law Library was built. The Partridge Committee had recommended that a major extension to the Menzies Building not be carried out in the 1970-72 triennium. Plans for a major project in the following triennium were considered, along with providing airconditioning and compactus storage.

There remain two more important items to consider in this section. One was the issue of the Law Library, and the other the administrative restructuring of the Library as a whole.
The Law Faculty's grumbles centred on lack of facilities, paucity of the holding and inadequacy of staffing vis-a-vis the rest of the system. For example, in 1968 the holding was 23,000 volumes which was compared unfavourably with those of McGill and Columbia Universities (75,000 and 165,000 volumes). There was also a push for the Law Librarian to have status of Reader.

In response Graneek was understandably firm about the administrative unity of the Library. He also queried requests for material which was available elsewhere in Canberra. As regards staffing Graneek pointed out that Law with two full-time staff compared equitably with the JCSMR, which had only two full-time and one part-time staff members. He also refuted the need for the librarian to have any status higher than that of a lecturer.

The debate was an ongoing one. Graneek remarked on ‘fissile trends’ in science especially (e.g. the proposal for a Geology Branch Library) with some asperity. He was in favour of a biological sciences library in some form. Associated with this was the issue of departmental libraries. Graneek was concerned only if there was to be any charge against the Library system for the maintenance of these, and should there be unique material in these which ought to be accessible to the University as a whole.

In 1969 the Earth Sciences Branch Library was established, based on a collection drawn from the Research School of Physical Sciences Library and some material from the Geology departmental library. The Earth Sciences Library Advisory Group was also set up.

The administrative reorganisation was underway already (1972) with the appointments of a Readers Advisor in the Chifley Library (Dorothy Enderby), and of a Law Librarian (Peter Biskup). Graneek introduced the structural changes following Clare Campbell-Smith's retirement in 1971. Other elements helped prompt the restructuring, among them the extreme rapidity of the collections' expansion (492,702 in 1969, 538,317 in 1970, and 588,419 in 1971), the progress of reclassification, and the need to reduce serial subscriptions.

Graneek's plan needs to be taken in conjunction with his earlier proposal re-
garding the nature of the holdings in the Menzies and Chifley Buildings. Even though this was largely rejected, the overriding purpose was to surmount the general lack of cooperation regarding acquisitions. James remarks that there was little evidence of joint operation, or even that it was thought necessary. Graneek was also determined to offset the physical distance between the main buildings. The marked centralist focus that is evident in the reorganisation was also constitutive in Graneek’s proposal, circulated to Heads of departments, for the 1973-75 triennium. This canvassed the book and serial expenditures, their opinions regarding the foreshadowed introduction of subject librarians (Science had had one from 1967, Cynthia James), the implications of the Copyright Act in relation to expanded photocopying services and the application of computer technology. In addition there was a very substantial building programme put forward. This included a multi-storey extension to the Menzies Building having the capacity of up to one million books, expanded reader accommodation, and even a refectory for the use of staff and readers. The Biological Sciences were to have a Library of about 100,000 volumes, serving the needs of the Botany, Zoology, Forestry, Biochemistry and Psychology Departments. The Law Library’s second stage was included with a capacity of up to 95,000 volumes and around 265 readers.

The restructuring of the Library was to take effect in January 1972. Its principal features are threefold. First, there were to be two Associate Librarians, each having supervision of two portions of the Library’s operation. One, Jean Waller, (appointed in 1966 as Graneek’s Deputy) had charge of Collection Building and Reader Services, and the second, K. Bernie had charge of Administration and Technical Services. Collection Building included Science, Social Science, the Humanities and Government documents. Readers Services also embraced the whole system, with reference librarians in each principal building, and assistants in the Branches. Interlibrary loans were included in these services. Administration covered the areas of automation, financial statistics, personnel and buildings and equipment. Technical Services took in acquisitions, serials, cataloguing and reclassification. Between these lay the Asian Studies Division with Enid Bishop as its head. This had two main sections, East Asian and South and South-east Asian. The Division was responsible for its own technical services, collection building, and reader services (vernacular language material). In order to highlight the unity of the system the Librarian moved his office from the Menzies Building to Chifley. Graneek’s aim was ‘to carry inte-
gration of the library still further and to eliminate vestiges of the IAS/SGS dichotomy’.

The subject specialists were an entirely new feature in the Library Service whose purpose Graneek sketched as being

*responsible, in close collaboration with the relevant academic departments, for book selection and bibliographic research in the areas of their subject of specialisation....*

Subject librarians were an extension of reader services. Apart from their specialised bibliographic work, they also had an instructional role in relation to users. By this means the subject librarians embodied their particular bibliographic skills and those of an information specialist. This type of librarian brought into sharp focus the problems concomitant with the provision of an ever ‘more sophisticated information service’ (Marjory Day, 1972). The time required to satisfy ‘customer requirements’ was also to become a crucial issue later in the Library’s history. At the moment of their introduction it was not easy to foretell the range of consequences of the new services, and especially in the areas of communication between clientele and library, and of the generation of new ideas and programmes.

1972 was significant in a number of ways. J.J. Graneek retired late in the year. The JCSMR and Research School of Physical Sciences Branch Libraries enjoyed their recently completed extensions. Dermid McGrath was appointed as the Social Sciences Librarian, and Kay Britcliffe as the Humanities Librarian. Rhoda O’Shea took over as Law Librarian and Y.S. Chan became Senior Librarian in charge of Contemporary China Studies. Alongside these went continued work in support of the newly established Humanities Research Centre. Considerable work was done in the acquisition of complete serial runs and basic multi-volume works for the Life Sciences Library. MEDLARS, the on-line medical sciences bibliographic service still had rather limited usage. The book stock stood at over 600,000.

At this point the Library was very much on the brink of a totally new era. The three crucial issues of the next phase of the Library’s history were to be space, the ever greater financial constraints, and automation.
THE AGE OF AUTOMATION
(1973 - 1996)

Introductory Moments

During Graneek’s final years as Librarian automation made its first substantial appearance. Elizabeth Hesterman, the Library’s first computer programmer produced a report in 1969 on automation in the library. Overall it was a conservative approach which took account of access to the University’s Computer Centre, especially the cost effectiveness of any work done. Hesterman felt that a fully-automated system would not be welcomed by users and, since it could take upwards of a year ‘to prepare book cards, programme the system and install the data collections system’, that it would be too expensive an undertaking in time and resources. Nevertheless, full automation should be planned for, and ought be carried out in modular fashion.

By 1971, with the help of the use of the Canberra CAE’s computers, print-outs for the reserve books and current serials were available. Two more processes were being ‘actively developed’. One was a semi-automated control of staff and post-graduate loans and, the other, a comprehensive acquisitions record.

In 1972, with the new Life Sciences Library in advanced stages of planning, a Working Party was established under Cynthia James to study ways of introducing computerisation of the Life Sciences Catalogue. Other working parties were also set up to improve communication with other committees and the broader University community, academic and general staff. In part, aside from the practical nature of such groups there seemed perhaps, to have been a conscious attempt to break down the view of the Library as a distinct, almost tribal, entity within the University. Subject area user committees also came into being and proved to make significant contributions to book selections, and in the elimination of wasteful duplication. It is worth noting, that ever since the inception of the Library, there had been a strong cooperative effort in relation to book and serial acquisition. This operated with awareness of the need to provide efficient service to readers and to use financial resources with care. Inevitably, a situation such as this leaves scope for manoeuvre and manipulation in regard to vested interests. Generally, from the library’s perspective, the issue has been the provision of a high standard service within given financial boundaries.
Throughout these years the reclassification programme continued and was pretty much completed by 1973. This, as much as the Administrative reorganisation in 1972, helped bring a pronounced sense of unity to the Library system. The real sense of efficient oneness would not come until the major rationalisation of the book stock during the 1984-85 long vacation. From then the number on a book or serial held in the main library buildings referred to a specific place on a shelf. There remain some relics of the old system with the rump of the Bliss Collection (A.D. Hope Basement), and the Harvard Yenching for the Asian Collection (Chinese and Japanese vernacular).

Two events during 1972 were to have important repercussions on the library. The first was the visit to the Beijing Library (now known as The National Library of China) and the Library of Peking University by a delegation from the University which included Library staff. The National Library’s holdings were over nine million and the University’s approaching three million volumes. This was an historic visit and laid the ground for future staff exchanges. It was also possible to make contact with booksellers and publishers, at least to have some first hand information and better understand the problems of supply. Information was gathered as well on contemporary Chinese publications. During this period there were several specialist Librarians who came on secondment from the National Diet Library of Japan.

The second event was K. Bernie’s tour of England and Germany in the southern hemisphere spring. His brief was to study applications of technology and automation to library procedures. This meant the whole range of what was available and comprised electronic photographic and microfilm readers, computerised circulation systems, and the introduction of these into the University system. His work included appraisals of the national bibliographic centres in England and Germany, and the products of firms who now specialised in library equipment. The most crucial outcome of this tour was the realisation that effective use of such equipment and bibliographical sources required a high degree of cooperation and coordination between Libraries. James followed up this study in 1973 when she toured North American and European libraries in regard to information retrieval and computer based services. Within this study there was particular attention paid to reader education. Around the same time the Library became involved with a long-term project sponsored by the National Library of Australia, the Scientific and Technological Information Services Enquiry.
Automation in the Library extended to such lists as current periodicals received, American area current acquisitions, a catalogue of the Government Publications Room, course listings and a complete catalogue of the Reserve Book Collection.

As the Library's processes became more complex and demanding, in-service training came to be seen as being essential to the administration, technical and reader services in order 'to keep pace with University growth and with most new demands' [1993 Annual Report, The Library].

There were other notable developments around this time. One was the publication of two documents by the Library, from Advanced Studies came the Bibliographic Aids to Research in History and Politics, especially on Australian Topics, and from the General Studies came the Guide to Reference Material in Asian Civilisations. The other was a seminar held at the National Library of Australia on national information policies. Australia was then recently a member of OECD group of countries, and was noteworthy because it lacked a '…stated national information policy'. The Library's efforts in publishing bibliographic guides as well as the provision of access to such on-line material as MEDLARS (Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System), was a party to shaping this policy. The whole field was still pretty uncertain, with enormous potential, and driven by great enthusiasm.

The ongoing issue of space remained a vital one. Jean Waller, as Acting Librarian, noted for the Menzies Building Review Committee, in early 1973, that the problems being experienced arose 'from the original concept of that building as a research library…'. The building now housed a more extensive collection and more staff than had been envisaged. Waller later presented a modified proposal (to that of Graneek) which still involved a free standing extension to the Menzies Building, but reduced from eight to four floors. The suggestion was partly on aesthetic grounds, and partly for cost efficiency's sake. The larger floors could be utilised more effectively and require less staff. Similar space problems faced the Chifley Building to cater for the expected six thousand or so undergraduates by 1980. Waller emphasised also the changes in undergraduate teaching practice, where it was now expected that such students engaged in primary research. She also justified the subject librarians on the grounds that they contributed to the increased sophistication of collection
building and reader services. An extension of the service was needed because of the expansion of the number of subjects being taught and researched, and the decentralised nature of the Library.


In September 1973 the newly appointed Librarian, Milton Simms, (previously at James Cook University, Townsville) visited the Library. During this brief time of familiarising himself with the Library's operations, Simms sketched the directions in which he saw it progressing. First of all he reiterated a familiar theme, that of the increased consciousness 'of the necessity to plan all development in terms of known needs and cost effectiveness'. Secondly, through access to the machine-readable catalogue records of the NLA 'automation of Library systems would bring improved service to readers and also allow Library staff to devote more time to higher level professional duties'. Were full automation to be adopted, it would take some while for its advantages to become apparent. Simms took up his appointment at the beginning of 1974. There were at the time, however, significant difficulties in the introduction of automation.

To assist in swift delivery of serials these began to be received by airmail rather that the more uncertain speed of surface post. In the same way microforms of catalogues were much cheaper than hardcopy versions. As we saw already, computer access to MEDLARS, and the Chemical and Biological Abstracts, was regarded as imperative as a support for research. All of these elements tended to converge on another emerging dimension of Library service, that of teaching-learning, in which it
must play a positive role in influencing educational programmes and play an equal role with the teachers...’. This, at least, was the view of H.W. Peters (of the W.A.I.T., now Curtin University of Technology) as recorded by Dorothy Enderby.

Waller summed up the predicament facing the Library in a typically succinct fashion.

For centuries University Libraries were content to collect, then, more recently, to disseminate materials for their own clientele. We are now in the decade where we are part of a national and, in some cases, international network of total information services and what is done in Boston and in Birmingham today benefits the ANU tomorrow.

A crucial part of the thoroughgoing change of the Library system which Simms proposed involved a management study of its processes. The purposes were the minimising of costs and the development of skills necessary for future development. All of which required a deeper grasp of user needs, the cost effectiveness of Library organisation and philosophy, and the development of more efficient use of Library resources to create alternative approaches servicing user needs. The programme had to be demonstrated to be financially and operationally worthwhile. Library personnel were urged to participate actively in the whole process, since this was deemed ‘essential for their understanding of the need for changes, the direct benefits they can be expected to bring, and the need for continuing growth and evolution in the future’. This bold project was plagued with technical problems, especially in the production of catalogues, e.g. there was none available for the Hancock Building during 1975-76.

1974 saw the introduction of the ‘tattle-tape’ system, which was implemented in the face of significant losses of stock (e.g. 1968 saw 1105 volumes disappear at the replacement cost of $12,650). Cooperation with the NLA took the form of a new understanding of cooperation in relation to Chinese and Japanese acquisitions, and in coordination of bibliographical services. Similarly, progress with, AMRS (Australian MARC Record Services), which later evolved into ABN (the Australian Bibliographic Network) and thence world-wide on-line services. In this manner automation provided cheaper and more efficient provision of information and resources to the various users.
Staff turnover was still an issue, as it had been in earlier years, with its disruptive impact on the Library’s capacity to provide effective service. As a means of helping to redress the situation, a Library Training Officer was appointed to coordinate in-service training. It also prompted the beginning of a longer analysis of the various jobs within the Library, and the preparation descriptions to facilitate classification, selection, training, transfer and promotion.

The other important feature of 1974 was the Hobbs report of the development of the South East Asian bibliographical materials. The direct outcome of this was the appointment of W.G. Miller as Senior Librarian in charge of the South East Asian collection. The library also established formal links with the National Diet Library (Japan) with a view to developing computerised bibliographic controls (MARC).

Several long-term staff retired or resigned during the year: Rhoda O’Shea, Elizabeth Hesterman, Minna Dawes, and K. Bernie.

1975’s highlights included the emergence of a Library management group, the formal retirement of K. Bernie in May, commencement of the Library user survey, the arrival of the Mortlake Collection, the inauguration of the Library Staff Committee, the introduction of microfiche to the catalogue, and the appointment was announced of Cynthia James as the Science Librarian to be based in the Life Sciences Library. It was also the last year of growth in the Library Staff.

On the automation front there was the very important development of the negotiations and contract with Libramatic Systems Pty. Ltd (ADAPS) ‘to provide a computer based cataloguing system as a bureau basis’. The Univac 1108 computer was ‘housed’ in the lower ground floor of the Menzies Building.

The Life Sciences Building was opened, the New Guinea Research Unit closed, and the newly established (1973) Northern Australia Research Unit re-stocked, and housed after the depredations of the cyclone in Darwin. The extension to the Menzies Building was dropped in favour of a wholly new building to be erected immediately to the north-west of the Chancelry. This would have become the research holding, with the Menzies building focussed on the Asian collection and Chifley on undergraduate services. Nothing eventuated because the federal Government of the
day cut that type of capital funding in the Budget for 1975. The speed of events was such that the Librarian was to note it had 'not been an easy year'.

1976 saw equally major changes. These were the establishment of the Science division, and the appointment of Colin Steele (from the Bodleian Library) as Deputy Librarian (replacing Jean Waller who retired in mid-year). The University sought an overseas person, who would bring fresh scholarly and technical awareness to the challenges confronting the Library. Further use was made of on-line bibliographic services available through the NLA and CSIRO, emphasising the marked shift of libraries to being key access points for information, rather than being focussed on acquiring and managing databases.

There were other important appointments, that of Richard Anderson as Divisional Head of Technical Services, and Anthony Ashcroft as the Library's Systems Programmer. Sue Brudenall became Divisional Head of Undergraduate Services in the Chifley Building. Cynthia James, Divisional Head of Science and Enid Bishop was made Acting Divisional Head of Social Sciences and Humanities. Elizabeth Richardson became Anderson's assistant, and later(1982) took over as Divisional Head. She also secured a Fulbright Scholarship about this time to study automation and the structure of technical services. The report which emerged had a very substan-
tial impact on the Library. Michael Evans was appointed as James’ assistant in 1977, and became Divisional Head in 1982.

These new organisational structures were a major part of the Library’s response to developments within the University, and in the wider world of information services. In the introduction to the annual report the process is described as ‘a quiet revolution... led by radical and imaginative changes in the Australian National Library’s information services...’. All of this is part of the creation of ‘more efficient national resource sharing systems’. The Library established its own Research and Development Unit to coordinate thinking and planning in regard to user needs, the design of new Library buildings and better use of existing ones, to consider the implications of ‘steady-state’ philosophy as applied to libraries, and to analyse the inter-library loan system vis-a-vis others in the ACT.

The new Library building which had been expected to be available in 1978 or 1979 was now unlikely to be completed before 1982-83, provided that funds could be obtained. They never were. As an interim measure the University allocated some 10,000 sq. ft. in A.D. Hope building basement. This move had the potential to solve some storage problems, but it also would create yet another unit of dispersal within the Library system. The Instructional Resources Unit was housed, at the University’s request, in the Chifley basement. This, in hindsight, was seen as a mistake since the expected interaction never ensued.

The on-line service, MEDLINE, was introduced, and thereby expanded access for the medical sciences’ research. The point of contact for this system was through the Department of Health. In the course of the year both of these systems became available in the Life Science Building.

Other significant features of the year were the establishment of the Projects and Planning Sub-Committee (PROPLAN), which later in the year became known as the Policy and Planning Committee (POLPLAN) (a high level policy body for the Library). Professor Ralph Elliott became Chairman of the Library Committee. The beginning of a much needed stock rationalisation began with 15,000 books moved from the Menzies Building to Chifley.
1976 is, in retrospect, a pivotal year the history of the Library. Automation is underway, as is some degree of rationalisation, and there is an ever sharper awareness that funding was to become a long-term problem. The results of the Library survey suggests substantial shifts in thinking as regards student access to the various collections, and concerning undergraduate teaching methods. The structural changes made were also as much a response to these views, as to the pressures from the wider University and beyond that from the world of information services. The following years were to be very testing ones because so much was to happen and seemingly at ever greater speed. The task of being part of a very open-ended experiment was far from simple and could be rather daunting. Increasingly the process of change revealed the fragility of traditional management systems, and it was to take some time for a measure of stability to return. This experience was not confined to the Library, but was endemic throughout institutions of all types at that time. As the key provider of access to information the Library retains its role as the 'heart of the University', although this is not necessarily a view held universally. The Library is nevertheless, its own entity.

Colin Steele (1980 -)

The following section takes the narrative of this chronicle from 1977 through to the Review of the Library published in 1995. It covers a period of great significance in automation, Library organisation and management, and collection development.

In order to facilitate these complex ends the Librarian Milton Simms was commissioned by the Vice-Chancellor, Professor D.A. Low, to pursue detailed research into all aspects of automation. This meant that the Deputy Librarian assumed administrative charge of the Library on a day to day basis.

An early highlight of this period was the reception of George Ferguson’s *Some Early Australian Bookmen*, as the one millionth book (in 1978). In the midst of jubi-
lation there was also the sombre awareness that

The coming years will performe see more movement of material around the campus to effect long-term rationalisation of resources and to meet the growing space needs. This, however, will not be achieved without significant staff costs.

This was a notable event, apart from the Governor General’s presence, for McDonald and Graneek were also there together with the Librarian and Deputy-Librarian. While the ANU rejoiced in becoming only the third Australian University to reach a stock level of a million books, it also faced an implacable challenge. The Menzies Courtyard ‘disappeared’ to become a current serials and microfilm reading room, which provided shelving space for an extra 20,000 volumes elsewhere.

Around this time there is a noticeable broadening of encouragement for staff at all levels to pursue professional development activities. Involvement of that kind was deemed to reflect ‘the increasing depth of professional knowledge and academic background of the Library staff members’.

The millionth book arrives at the Library. Sir Zelman Cowen, then Governor General of Australia, Professor D.A.Low, Milton Simms, Colin Steele, J.J. Graneek and A.L.G. McDonald.
As part of the greater professional integration, the Library Committee also has a fuller interaction with the Library, which was viewed as 'more recognition by the University of the problems facing the Library'. These were financial, managerial, and space, together with the more intangible issues of morale and the wider relationship with the University and the NLA. To assist in confronting these issues, inter-Divisional working parties were established to consider such questions as inter-library loans (and possible changes), audio-visual services, conservation, storage, flexitime, and policy and procedure changes. Throughout the years since its formation in 1964 the Library Committee played a vital role in the Library’s operations, and was blessed with several very strong-minded and effective Chairmen who had a clear perception of the Library’s central role in the life of the University.

Colin Steele was appointed as Librarian in late 1980 following the retirement of Milton Simms. J.J. Graneek died during the year, and A.L.G. McDonald was to die in early 1981. In a few brief months a wholly new era was swept in. Tony Barry was appointed as Deputy Librarian in June 1981 with more than a weather eye on development in automation.

1982 was a particularly momentous year because of the publishing of the *Report of the Review Committee of the Australian National University Library*. This committee was under the Chairmanship of Professor I.G. Ross. The Report brought to light many issues of which people were aware, but which needed to be treated comprehensively and on the foundation of substantial research. The Library was recognised as the primary unit in the University concerned with the provision of information, and so with the acquisition, cataloguing and conservation of material to be made accessible to the user community, and in the provision of access to national library networks. The principle proposed as governing the development of the Library was that any major growth should be in relation to the three major buildings, and that there must be a rationalisation of material within these. Placement of material was to be in accordance with the considerations of location of similar material, predicted use of acquired material, and access to collections. To aid the collection building and location of science material the Librarian was to establish committees to formulate the necessary policies. Similarly there was to be a committee to 'formulate guidelines for collection building and location in the Social Science and Humanities'. Other areas of concern included the acquiring of storage space on campus,
developing a rationalisation programme with the NLA and CSIRO, CCAE (now the University of Canberra), Schools of Art and of Music, National Gallery, and specialised government libraries. There also remained the vexed question of ‘libraries’ that were not part of the main system. This issue gradually sorted itself out over the next decade. Automation and staff training were further notable facets of the Report, as well the prevailing issue of heavily trimmed budgets. Worse was to come, however, with the very severe impact of the 1986 devaluation of the Australian dollar on the buying power of the bookvote. This was especially critical since up to ninety percent of serials and monographs are bought overseas.

There were several outcomes to this report, which are best summarised from the 1985 Review of the Report. Prominent amongst these was the restructure of the Library Committee in order to give a broader representation of the University. In its new composition it had specific representation of computing and information services, students drawn from undergraduate, part-time and postgraduate groups, as well as members appointed by the Vice-Chancellor and representations from the Institute and the Faculties. The Committee’s role was revised so that it could act as arbiter in disputes between users and the Library and have a more tangible hand in overall policy.

Despite financial stricture the Library had amassed a total of 1.3 million volumes by 1985, but was concerned about aspects of weakness in the Social Science and Humanities and the Asian Collections. The Science collection was pretty much comparable with similar overseas holdings, and prominent within the Australian context, especially in Mathematics, Biochemistry, Geology and the Earth Sciences in general. That this was so is a great credit to Cynthia James with the assistance of Professor Dennis Carr and others from the academic community.

During 1984-85 the collections were rationalised so that Menzies Building contained the Asian collection and the preponderance of the Social Sciences, Chifley Building, Humanities and the balance of the Social Sciences, and the J.G. Crawford (formerly Life Sciences and later Hancock) Building the Science Collection. Rationalisation took place over an eighteen-month period which was preceded by widespread and thorough-going consultation with all aspects of the University community. Its success stems from the very careful planning and the unique levels of
cooperation and patience which obtained during the process. There was a standardising of Short Loan in Chifley, Crawford and Law Libraries, and of opening hours between all main buildings in order to provide staff and users ‘roughly the same’ measure of access. This extended and refined the reorganisation of Short Loan Services following the survey (1980) by Laurie McGrath of ORAM (Office for Research in Academic Methods). The major issues for students throughout this time were those of Library opening hours, photocopying and Short Loan. These, too, were addressed as part of the rationalisation programme.

In regard to policy and coordination of collection building a series of senior advisory committees were formed: Social Sciences and Humanities Library Advisory Committee (SSHLAC), Asian Studies Advisory Committee (ASLAC, later known as APLAC, Asia Pacific Library Advisory Committee), and Science Collections Advisory Committee (SCICAC, later known as SCILAC, Science Library Advisory Committee). There were also separate committees for the Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Earth Sciences, and Mathematical and Physical Sciences. A further series of liaison committees within some Schools and Faculties complete the consultative structure. Part of the general brief here was to produce ‘detailed collections building statements…’. The Library Review based its ideas for the Advisory Committees on the very successful Science Periodicals Advisory Committee established about 1979, worked to overcome academic factional tensions in the initial organisation of the Life Sciences Library.

The Library still experiences difficulties in providing thoroughly adequate resources in the major research areas and Asian Studies, a fact which is linked directly to the funding shortfall, and the tendency for new areas of teaching and research to be engaged in without sufficient consultation with the Library.

Microforms were also thought to be an effective way of coping with expanding publication rates, and the costs of hardcopy material. User resistance undermined that hope. This particular point underscores the Library’s increasingly extensive use of reader education programmes for undergraduate, postgraduate, and staff, so that fuller and more effective use may be made of the existing resources. Alongside such information access education provided by the Library is the range of instruction offered by the University’s Information Technology service. By the middle 1990’s a
significant degree of convergence has become evident between these two bodies in respect to providing access to information networks. This, as much as the more traditional areas of cooperation, emphasises the need for continuous consultation.

The AWA URICA system provided the means of overcoming the inconsistencies in the records as regards the catalogues, but also made it possible to provide access to other databases. Reclassification and the development of the automated catalogue made it possible to effect the wholesale rationalising of the collection. The next step was to be the introduction of ‘on-line public access catalogues’ (OPAC) in 1986. This service expanded enormously subsequent to the use of INNOPAC system which came into service in 1995. It is important to note two points here, firstly, that the early systems took longer than expected to become fully operational, and, secondly, that the Library funded these developments in automation with all the attendant experimentation and difficulties from its own financial resources. Programmes had to be written specifically for ANU use, and the acquisitions system author for example, was Robert von Nesselrode, the Library’s computer programmer. During the period 1976-1984 the Library attempted to develop its own systems, but these were marked by major technical problems. The URICA system was adopted in 1984 because it was an integrated one, and it ran very successfully (with incremental modifications) until its replacement with the INNOPAC system in 1995.

There is direct correlation between the advances of automation and the Library’s organisational structure, in so far as the former has precipitated change. There were several divisional changes from 1982 onwards. The original five divisions (Science, Asian Studies, Technical Services, Social Science and Humanities and Undergraduate Services) were reorganised under two divisional headings, Information Services and Collection Management. The other parts of the organisational structure are Administration and Computing and Networking. The redeployment and consolidation of staff and physical resources was necessitated by the successful impact of automation, and by the gradual diminution of staff numbers. Colin Steele (1992) states

*I do not subscribe to the viewpoint that electronic access is ‘extra work’. All effort has to judged against priorities. The only way to redeploy staff is to change partially in line with the priorities of our modus operandi and to work with the academic community in the more interactive provision of information.*
Steele touches on an issue which had become one of radical importance for most institutions with a service orientation, that it is overall the entity’s needs which determine what service is provided, rather than those of groups which comprise the whole.

Throughout the period just traversed there were several fascinating developments linked with the changes brought about by automation, academic needs with respect to collection management, internal and external changes for staff, and in user services and educational. At face value, so much of the change appears to be driven by ever increasingly sophisticated applications of computer technology. There is also the impact of the monetarist imperatives which have been profound and widespread. The emergence of new thinking and practice are also testimony to the human capacity to adapt to new situations, so the process of change is a continuing ebb and flow of compromise.

The sequence of change regarding the main catalogue through the traditional cards, to microfiches, and thence to on-line computer access ‘reflects the Library’s [ongoing] wish to improve user access to information about the Library’s holdings in a decentralised campus…’.

The pace of automation can be gauged in part from the fact that 600,000 records were processed by URICA by the end of 1985. At the same time this work had to take account of the ‘geographically separated disciplinary groups on campus…’. By 1987 it was possible to gain access to URICA from terminals within the Library’s Buildings and Departments and Centres. In a few more years (1996) it was possible for each academic and postgraduate to enter the system through the computer in their office.

The next important phase of automation was in the area of circulation and acquisitions. The Science Library in the W.K. Hancock Building (formerly Crawford Building) was the first to have a fully automated circulation system in 1988. Automation of acquisitions ensured ‘a reliable supply of major publications thus reducing efforts on the part of academic users and Library staff’.

The world-class Science holdings of the ANU Library became the foundation for the marketing of Library resources. At the time (1988) there was much talk of an
amalgamation of the Canberra CAE and the ANU, but the crucial issue was the fact of reduction in budgets for both the NLA and CSIRO in regard to their science collections. This left the ANU with the premier collection, and the expertise to exploit the market but also increased demands.

During 1989, amidst the broader restructure touched on before, the Deputy-Librarian’s position became that which had ‘specific responsibility for computing and networking activities’. This followed the rationale behind the reorganisation in administration which sought, first to emphasise the Divisional Heads’ line of responsibility and, second, ‘to recognise the increased workload and importance of the computing and network area which underpinned nearly all Library activities’. Adjunct to these movements, the Library Staff Advisory Committee was formed, with the purpose of enhancing communication within the Library as a whole. At the same time the staff association, HAREA, also had an active role in monitoring the effects of changes on staff. It has been closely involved with similar re-organisations since the late 1970’s.

1990 saw some glint of relief as regards the space problem with the Library acquiring the use of the refurbished basement of the Hancock Building. A compactus was to be used to house material for long-term storage. There was also a refining of the collection rationalisation so that the Menzies Building came to have as its focus Asian Studies and Official Documents with some Social Science material, the Chifley Building became the major Social Science and Humanities holding, with a primarily Australian focus, and the Hancock Building carried General Science, Geology, Life Sciences, History of Science and was the central repository for science serial back sets. During the early 1990’s the Geology Department’s Library was disbanded. Some of the holdings went to the by now well-established Earth Sciences Library, and the rest to the Hancock Building.

On the automation front the search began for a replacement for the URICA system. In the meantime the *Ross Report on Library Provision in Higher Education Institutions* repeated other, earlier, urgings for ‘national institutions and cooperative activities’. It also highlighted the pioneering work engaged in by the ANU in relation to the Australian Academic and Research Network (AARNET). This, with later access to the Internet, makes the way open towards the fact of ‘virtual’ libraries. The
Library was also well connected with other aspects of the 'Electronic Library' concept through its provision of access to satellite television, and the mounting of the International Economic Databank (IEDB), also known as STARS, on the campus local area network. These developments were to be followed by access to the Reuters database. Regarding the former item, the Library combined with the University’s Computer Service and the National Centre for Development Studies to facilitate access to the World Bank, UN, OECD and other economic databases.

These examples stand as vivid evidence of the degree of involvement achieved in international networking and electronic data provision. In this we see that a radical change of ‘attitude of mind in librarianship’ has occurred. It was further impelled by the ‘inexorable rise in serial subscriptions’, which have had such a dramatic ‘impact on the nature and structure of university libraries around the world’. So much so that sheer size is no longer applicable as the ‘...main single criteria of library effectiveness’. The human consequences of these changes are hard to read without a thorough anthropological analysis. The relationship between user and staff must also have changed, for if libraries are closed longer than they are open, and if their use is generated by only twenty per cent of their stock, a very real autonomy of action now belongs to the user. The computerised access relativises the staff to some extent, except in the act of educating the reader towards that degree of independence. The nature of the research library’s function has shifted accordingly ‘from ownership to access’. Around these elements gather the issues of collection development and management.

The Asian Collection provides us with an apposite example of the scale of changes undergone. This process began, in part, with the visit of the then Deputy-Director of the National Library of Beijing (later, China) Mr Tan Xian-jin, followed by several exchange librarians from that and other major Chinese libraries. In 1985 Susan Prentice spent six months in Beijing on exchange, the first non-Asian librarian to do so. Earlier still, Enid Gibson and others, played a prominent role in the Library Seminar that was part of the International Congress of Orientalists in 1971. The role of Y.S. Chan was central in the physical growth of the Chinese collection. As the University’s research and teaching interests expanded in response to regional developments, the Asian collection reflected this with its expansion into South and South-East Asian material, especially Indonesian. The management of the collection is very
much labour-intensive, and expensive particularly because of the vernacular scripts (character based). Only in 1996 did CJK (Chinese, Japanese and Korean) technology become available which could handle such material for acquisitions, cataloguing and so forth. In some ways the Asian aspect of the Library, for all its importance to expanding research interests and needs, sits somewhat uncomfortably concerning resources, in a system which increasingly is more uniform.

The Science collections, which absorb the larger amount of the Library's budgetary allocation, are equally important, if not more so, since the University has from its foundation had a very high national and international research profile in the Medical and Physical Sciences. Later it added Earth and Biological
Sciences, and more recently Information Technology and Engineering.

Law has also seen massive expansion, so much so that it has been the only Library to secure physical extension of its premises in the last decade or so. Professor Ross, as Acting Vice-Chancellor opened the much needed extensions in 1983. The collection was automated and LC Classification adopted for part of it, and the Moys system for the purely legal material. The latter was chosen because of its adaptability to different legal systems, rather than patterned too closely to one country’s system (as the L.C. is, for example).

In the 1990’s the Library has continued to be confronted by several challenges most of which stem from the economic situation, advances in computer technology and automation, and the impact of fresh areas of research and teaching. Integral to the response to varied factors is that staff members (full-time equivalent) are now in the order of one hundred and fifty-five, whereas in 1987 they were about one hundred and eighty. In 1976 there were two hundred and eight Library staff.

One of the recurring questions is exemplified in the ‘vigorous dialogue’ conducted by the scientific community of the University over the ‘need to move from historical budgeting to formula funding in science’. A major difficulty which emerges in such discussions, as with all disciplines, is the general reluctance to drop old initiatives when new ones are being promoted energetically. The all-round costs of these shifts in emphases mean that the Library ‘...may have in the future to accommodate staffing as well as book and serial resources’ in its deliberations. An issue because staffing numbers have been pared back so much since the mid-1970’s, is that any significant increase in services will require more staff. It is believed that

*This approach will provide a framework for user groups to establish priorities for their library needs in an integrated manner.*

Underlying these questions lies the continuing saga of contention over resources that has been played out between the Institute and Faculties, and their respective Boards, since 1960.

To help facilitate the Library’s increasingly complex role in the University, it was agreed in 1993 that the new Chair of the Library Committee would be the in-
coming Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Millicent Poole. This move was also seen as complementing the fact that the Information and Technology Strategy Committee was chaired by the other Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Sue Serjeantson.

The Librarian took an active role (as Chairman of the CAUL Datasets Committee) in the negotiations with the then Department of Employment Education and Training over funding for the creation of ‘database access to certain subject areas to the university community throughout Australia’. The Librarian’s leadership role in relationship to the ‘dramatic nature’ of change in libraries is further reflected in his role as a ‘key member of the organising committee’ for the Australian Academic Conference (1993), *Changes in Scholarly Communication - Australia and the Electronic Library*. The Library established, under the directorship of Tony Barry (1992), the Centre for Networked Access to Scholarly Information (CNASI) as a means of providing ‘forward thinking on the rapidly changing electronic environment...’.

In 1994 the Victorian Association of Library Automation paid the Library the great honour of granting its national VALA award to the Computing and Networking Centre in recognition of its highly innovative and creative work. Colin Steele was the first Australian, and non-American, to be invited to the U.K. to give the prestigious Follett Lectures on Information Technology and Libraries in 1995.

Such developments are striking reflections of the Library’s commitment through its strategic plan, to

*the delivery of networked information services, based on global access and rapid delivery, to the individual user’s desktop, regardless of time or location...*

There remains ‘an urgent need for suitable, on campus, library space to house new collections’. Cooperation with other institutions is crucial to providing and maintaining this type and quality of service. A new initiative is being pursued with the NLA in regard to the Asian Collection. It is in the form of collaborating with the National Library in the establishment of a National Asian Information Centre (NAIC). This comes within the principle of creating and monitoring ‘value-added library and information services and network training [for] the wider community’. The purpose of an approach of this kind is to provide a high level of coordination and flexibility in
library services. The new dimensions of access make it possible to provide on a
global scale, by electronic means what was once confined to the intriguing array of
card indices.

The Library's Strategic Plan has formulated an objective for the coming years:

to prepare a clear University-wide agreed statement of the level at which
material will be collected for subjects researched or taught at the University, based on the resources available to each area.
Friends of the Library

This important group came into being in late 1978 and began functioning in 1979. One of the driving forces behind its establishment was a former Librarian Jack Graneek, and among the more prominent figures in its subsequent history have been the current Librarian, Colin Steele, and Robert Barnes, who has been Honorary Secretary since late 1979. The first Chair of the Friends was Emeritus Professor J.J. Auchmuty.

The Friends were founded to provide promotional and financial support to the

*Two Friends of the Library, Judith Wright and Emeritus Professor A.D. Hope*
Library. The more specific role was to be in the purchase of rare material relating to Australia, Asia and the Pacific, with special reference to the productions of Australian private presses. The group was also to mount exhibitions of material drawn from the Library’s own Book Collection.

In recent times much energy has gone into acquiring books for such assemblages as the Brissenden, John Hardy, Cecil Gibb Collections, as well as the Twentieth Century Literature in English Project. This is a follow-up to the very successful venture concerning Australian Literature. A most significant earlier project was that of establishing The First Fleet Books Collection Project in 1988. The wide range has included material from the Classics to the History of Science.

**Rare Collections**

The Library has a unique variety of rare books given its Australian setting and its comparative youth in relation to the much older libraries of Europe, Asia and North America.

The policy of acquiring complete sets has been abandoned in recent years, and replaced by one in which only single items are purchased. The last major collection to be acquired was the Hartley Grattan (1981). This comprises the personal library of Dr C. Hartley Grattan, formerly of the University of Texas (Professor of Commonwealth History), and has significant coverage of Australian History, Anthropology and Literature. In 1975 the Library bought the magnificent Mortlake Collection which contains a range of English Literature dating from 1780-1914, and is illustrative of ‘all aspects of life in England...what was read and written during that period, what was written about it later, what was taught, what entertainments were available, what was thought suitable for children to read...’.

In the area of serials there are several remarkable examples, especially in Science (particularly Life Sciences). The oldest set is that of the *Royal Society of London Philosophical Transactions* v. 1-177, London, 1665-1886. There are many others in Science, History, Classics, Economics, Anthropology, Mathematics, as well as sets in German, Spanish, French, Russian, not to mention those in Asian languages, especially Chinese, Japanese and Indonesian.
There are also a number of notable Gift Collections, examples of which range from the Polish Collection (mainly history and culture), the Joseph Needham Collection (Chinese works on mathematics and physics), the Berg Collection (Southeast Asian anthropology and linguistics), to the Barnes Collection (principally Old and New Testament, Patristic Studies, together with those of religion in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds).
CONCLUSION

This chronicle closes with a number of brief reflections. First of all the three most significant events of the last fourteen years are the 1982 Review, the rationalisation process over 1984-1985, and the 1986 devaluation of the Australian dollar. Directly related to these is the perennial issue of space. Within very few years each of the Library buildings will be full. The geographical dispersal of the collection, thirdly, continues to have major implications ‘for the overall administrative arrangements and the way in which the Library is organised and managed’, both in regard to the Library itself and to its many uses.

The Library has met several major challenges over the years, and a microcosm of these may be found in a story from the NARU Library. During the move to its permanent house in 1982 the card catalogue was jolted off the back of a truck at one of Darwin’s busiest intersections. Not only computers can go ‘down’. What marks the history of the Library is its remarkable capacity for adaptation, and creative responses to quite unpredictable circumstances. By means of such services as those provided by CNIP (Centre for Networked Information and Publishing), the Library seeks to give dynamism to its mission as the primary supplier of access to information for the University.

The way forward for the Library is best summarised by the principal objectives enumerated in the Strategic Plan (1995):

- delivery of networked information services based on global access and rapid delivery to the individual user’s desktop, regardless of time or location;

- establishment and monitoring of library and information services and network training to the wider community within Australia and the region;

- awareness, development and use of appropriate information techniques to facilitate teaching and research, including electronic publication;

- expansion of the Library’s training role in the area of information technology literacy skills tailored to the needs of user groups on campus;
• a library structure with the flexibility to accommodate change and the provision of quality service support mechanisms.

There remains the challenge of attempting to harness the often disparate energies of the various segments of the University in regard to their requirements of the Library. In addition there is also the need for the Library to continually re-focus its own energy to address the fresh demands that the future will impose on its resources of skill, ingenuity and insight.
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