

# Japanese Research Resources in the United States

**MIKI Mihoko**

University of California, Los Angeles Library

## **I. EAST ASIAN COLLECTIONS IN AMERICAN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES**

Majority of Japanese research collections in American academic libraries are housed at the East Asian library, a branch of the university's library system. Japanese materials are traditionally processed and shelved along with Chinese, Korean, and sometimes with other Asian language materials. These vernacular collections were established primarily to support the teaching and research programs of East Asian studies for their own institutions. Because of historical circumstances, it would be worthwhile to first examine Japanese research resources in the context with other East Asian language collections.

Presently the total holdings of East Asian materials in the United States reached nearly 11 million volumes, of which Chinese materials consist of 60%, Japanese 35%, and Korean 5%. (Table 1) The table intends to show the growth of East Asian collections from the formative years to the present, and the ratio of the three language materials to the entire collection. The increase of East Asian collections during the first three consecutive decades doubled their size every ten years. The same phenomenon in doubling its size occurred between the years of 1960's and 70's. After 1970, however, the growth rate tapered.

Before the outbreak of World War II, the interest in East Asian topics in academic institutions was grossly China-oriented and obviously the libraries' collections reflected this. During the first five years after World War II, the increase in Japanese resources was enormous. In fact, between the years of 1940 and 1950, the number of Japanese volumes expanded more than six times. Another interesting phenomenon was that another war, the Korean war, triggered the interests in Korean studies. The influx of Korean immigrants of the United States as well as deepening trade ties between Korea and the United States also influenced establishing Korean studies programs at various campuses. As a consequence, Korean collections developed rapidly. In the past 33 years, since 1960, the growth rates of Chinese and Japanese collections were approximately 4 times, while Korean language materials grew 23 times. Incidentally, the figures here include North American academic and public libraries as well as museum collections which were reported in the CEAL surveys.

There are presently about 50 academic institutions holding East Asian collections. (Table 2) The establishment year of those collections differs widely, the oldest being established before the turn of the century and the newest being as late as 1990. The table also indicates

Table 1. Growth of East Asian Collections in American Libraries

Year	Chinese	Japanese	Korean	Total
1930	355,000 (92%)	32,000 (8%)		387,000
1940	779,000 (90%)	90,000 (10%)		869,000
1950	1,188,000 (67%)	586,000 (33%)		1,774,000
1960	1,634,000 (64%)	894,000 (35%)	23,000 (1%)	2,551,000
1970	3,335,000 (62%)	1,881,000 (35%)	138,000 (3%)	5,354,000
1980	4,543,000 (60%)	2,804,000 (37%)	274,000 (3%)	7,880,000 *
1990	5,788,000 (59%)	3,590,000 (36%)	467,000 (5%)	9,958,000 **
1993	6,283,000 (60%)	3,747,000 (35%)	520,000 (5%)	10,725,000 ***

\* CJK combined microforms of 259,000 added to the total.

\*\* 113,000 volumes of CJK combined figures added to the total.

\*\*\* 175,000 volumes of CJK combined figures added to the total.

Table 2. Establishment of East Asian Collections and Holdings

	Year started	Monographs	Serials
Arizona	1964	157,852	815
Arizona State	1966	55,600	200
Brigham Young	1972	65,742	658
Brown	1961	93,878	237
Bucknell	1963	3,375	8
UC Berkeley	1947	672,074	4,053
UC Davis	1966	50,697	231
UC Irvine	1990	63,521	131
UCLA	1948	334,191	2,858
UC San Diego	1987	49,102	356
UC Santa Barbara	1967	100,807	1,165
Cent.f.Res.Lib.	1949	43,500	2,484
Chicago	1936	495,320	9,550
Colorado	1969	29,635	83
Columbia	1902	606,880	3,587
Cornell	1918	388,164	2,315
Duke	1940's	33,207	455
Florida	1965	20,657	41
Georgetown	1950's	38,666	216
Harvard	1879	818,838	12,230
Hawaii	1925	275,356	5,517
Hoover	1945	377,542	1,155
Illinois	1965	195,342	2,144
Indiana	1960	155,973	1,485
Iowa	1955	81,555	587
Kansas	1964	154,711	1,558
Library of Congress	1869	1,598,262	43,095
Maryland	1963	68,190	1,637
Michigan	1948	578,917	2,712
Michigan State	---	23,152	617
Minnesota	1965	101,183	998
Montana	---	277	10
NYPL	1911	156,231	1,149
North Carolina	1964	102,236	1,818
Notre Dame	---	1,247	80
Ohio State	1962	175,204	2,661
Oregon	1967	81,932	128
Pennsylvania	1938	124,189	193
Pittsburgh	1960	152,052	1,843
Princeton	1926	537,588	3,050
Rutgers	1970	105,311	1,353
St. John's	1966	38,528	134
Seton Hall	1951	9,877	30
So. California	1956	58,761	377
Texas	1958	74,875	411
Virginia	1950	33,714	161
Washington(St.Louis)	1964	112,487	928
Washington (Seattle)	1947	376,081	7,422
Wisconsin	1964	149,723	495
Yale	1878	559,976	2,402

the combined holdings of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean languages and the number of current serial titles received by each institution as of June 1993.

Libraries established around the turn of the century are Harvard, Yale, the Library of Congress, Columbia, and Cornell which all are located on the East Coast. Several collections were founded immediately after World War II. However, many East Asian collections burgeoned in the 1960's when East Asian studies became a very popular academic program, coinciding with the strong American economy. Although the majority of these libraries attempted to maintain its collections in following years, several were unable to sustain their growth. On the other hand, even under today's economical constraint and the difficult financial reality faced by many academic institutions, new East Asian collections were established, which demonstrate that the interest in East Asian topics are still strong and alive in many universities and colleges. Incidentally, the institutions listed here are academic with the exception of the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library. These two collections hold indispensable research resources, and therefore are included in the list.

This table (3) rearranges total holdings of institutions in descending order of their collections. It shows the number of volumes added to the collections from the previous year. Also shown are the number of titles cataloged within the past year, and volume numbers of backlogs which are materials not yet cataloged. Twelve libraries own a total collection of over 300,000 volumes. These twelve libraries together own about 70% of the entire East Asian holdings. Libraries with holding between 100,000 and 300,000 volumes were 15, while the collection size of less than 100,000 made up 21.

The Committee on East Asian Libraries (CEAL) of the Association for Asian Studies has been conducting surveys of East Asian collections in North America. The statistics used in this paper are from the CEAL surveys.

Now, I would like to examine the current financial state of East Asian collections. (Table 4) The total amount of acquisition expenditures in 1992-93 was over 7 million dollars. The total expenditures of each institution are broken down into appropriations, endowments, grants, and East Asia program support. As to the source of income, 78% of the fiscal support for purchasing collections came from own institutions, and the rest from endowments and grants. The largest spenders for collection building were Princeton and Harvard, being over \$500,000, and Michigan, Columbia, UC Berkeley, and UCLA over \$400,000; Yale, and UC San Diego over \$300,000.

Finally I would like to examine personnel support. (Table 5) Library staff working for East Asian collections are divided into two groups: professional librarians with a Master's degree in Library and Information Science, and clerical staff. The numbers indicated here are full time equivalent numbers, not the head count of persons. The total number of full time equivalent working for East Asian libraries were 340, among them 155 professional librarians and 185 clerical staff. Five libraries employ librarians alone with no clerical staff, while three libraries employ four time more clerical staff than professionals.

Table 3. Holdings, Additions, Cataloged titles, Backlogs

	Holdings	Additions	Cataloged	Backlogs
Lib. of Congress	1,598,262	25,422	23,357	---
Harvard	818,838	21,809	10,355	38,000
UC Berkeley	672,074	6,388	6,388	4,000
Columbia	606,880	8,534	9,615	9,398
Michigan	578,917	17,094	10,106	6,250
Yale	559,976	15,461	12,646	31,000
Princeton	537,588	13,888	7,041	17,610
Chicago	495,320	8,873	4,415	25,430
Cornell	388,164	8,194	---	3,770
Hoover	377,542	7,162	6,032	1,276
Washington	376,081	11,022	13,397	0
UCLA	334,191	13,923	5,308	38,270
Hawaii	275,356	4,730	3,877	2,309
Illinois	195,342	5,407	3,052	8,000
Ohio State	175,204	8,061	8,059	16,453
Arizona	157,852	2,435	3,024	8,483
New York Public	156,231	8,635	5,898	2,056
Indiana	155,973	7,750	2,475	6,200
Kansas	154,711	6,486	4,230	4,297
Pittsburgh	152,052	5,391	3,634	22,791
Wisconsin	149,723	3,369	1,274	2,668
Pennsylvania	124,189	6,128	2,393	175
Washington U	112,487	2,130	1,137	1,128
Rutgers	105,311	2,010	---	3,000
Carolina	102,236	2,406	1,499	3,340
Minnesota	101,183	1,715	---	---
UC Santa Barbara	100,807	4,749	2,172	839
Brown	93,878	606	659	10,000
Oregon	81,932	1,913	---	---
Iowa	81,555	4,050	1,500	3,620
Texas	74,875	1,796	1,057	450
Maryland	68,190	3,488	---	---
Brigham Young	65,742	312	658	---
UC Irvine	63,521	28,865	1,991	51,134
So. California	58,761	1,676	1,071	---
Arizona State	55,600	1,353	1,091	9,245
UC Davis	50,697	2,378	2,690	1,856
UC San Diego	49,102	8,651	5,195	8,109
C. for Research Lib.	43,500	---	50	---
Georgetown	38,666	1,073	844	48
St. John's	38,528	1,362	139	918
Virginia	33,714	1,021	1,021	110
Duke	33,207	5,402	2,337	6,480
Colorado	29,635	3,776	1,686	1,092
Michigan State	23,152	540	420	200
Florida	20,657	1,763	333	120
Seton Hall	9,877	42	42	103
Montana	277	25	35	4,217

Table 4. Fiscal Support of East Asian Collections

	Total	Appropriations	Endowments	Grants	EA Prog. Support
Arizona	\$61,094	\$61,094	---	---	---
Arizona State	\$38,993	\$37,093	---	\$1,900	---
Brown	\$36,659	\$8,000	\$253	\$28,406	---
Bucknell	\$4,135	\$4,135	---	---	---
UC Berkeley	\$456,393	\$355,560	\$47,262	\$9,071	\$44,500
UC Davis	\$62,592	\$62,592	---	---	---
UC Irvine	\$180,000	\$100,000	---	\$80,000	---
UCLA	\$408,318	\$301,318	---	\$85,000	\$22,000
UC San Diego	\$301,420	\$270,909	\$17,691	\$6,786	\$6,034
UC Santa Barbara	\$5,800	\$5,800	---	---	---
Cent.f.Res.Lib.	\$80,000	---	---	---	---
Chicago	\$291,264	\$129,738	\$60,291	\$72,809	\$28,426
Colorado	\$166,945	\$23,000	---	\$143,945	---
Columbia	\$461,170	\$320,039	\$77,431	\$17,150	\$46,550
Cornell	\$314,766	\$243,000	\$10,968	---	\$60,798
Duke	\$108,615	\$73,006	---	\$28,128	\$7,481
Florida	\$21,000	\$21,000	---	---	---
Georgetown	\$28,456	\$20,960	---	---	---
Harvard	\$521,778	\$24,980	\$186,783	\$278,667	\$31,348
Hawaii	\$115,100	\$104,900	\$1,200	\$9,000	---
Hoover	\$271,174	\$241,174	---	\$25,000	\$5,000
Illinois	\$117,194	\$81,561	\$9,116	\$26,517	---
Indiana	\$143,449	\$80,049	\$2,400	\$39,000	\$22,000
Iowa	\$76,875	\$53,875	---	\$23,000	---
Kansas	\$106,473	\$101,519	\$954	\$4,000	---
Maryland	\$30,000	\$30,000	---	---	---
Michigan	\$493,534	\$441,534	\$20,000	\$32,000	---
Michigan State	\$65,000	\$45,000	---	\$20,000	---
Minnesota	\$62,000	\$60,000	\$2,000	---	---
Montana	\$40,800	\$20,400	---	20,400	---
North Carolina	\$37,677	\$19,107	\$8,570	\$10,000	---
Ohio State	\$167,563	\$120,463	\$29,000	\$18,100	---
Ohio	\$5,835	\$5,535	\$300	---	---
Oregon	\$46,487	46,487	---	---	---
Pennsylvania	\$164,398	\$162,301	\$1,097	\$1,000	---
Pittsburgh	\$178,371	\$144,482	---	\$33,889	---
Princeton	\$530,051	\$412,051	\$30,485	\$28,338	\$59,000
St. John's	40,000	---	\$35,000	\$5,000	---
So. California	\$68,995	\$55,400	\$2,400	\$1,000	\$10,195
Texas	\$50,500	\$50,500	---	---	---
Virginia	\$25,000	\$25,000	---	---	---
Washington (St.Louis)	\$40,000	\$40,000	---	---	---
Washington (Seattle)	\$271,994	\$215,474	---	\$18,520	\$38,000
Wisconsin	\$110,258	\$110,258	---	---	---
Yale	\$363,030	\$336,030	---	---	\$27,000

Table 5. Personnel Support of East Asian Collections

	Professional FTE	Clerical FTE	Total
Arizona	3	0	3
Arizona State	2	1.5	3.5
Brigham Young	2	1	3
Brown	2	0	2
UC Berkeley	4.75	11	15.75
UC Davis	2	1.4	3.4
UC Irvine	2	2	4
UCLA	4	11.6	15.6
UC San Diego	3	2.75	5.75
UC Santa Barbara	2	2	4
Cent.f.Res.Lib.	1	0	1
Chicago	5	10.1	15.1
Colorado	1	3	4
Columbia	11	14	25
Cornell	3.3	5.25	8.55
Duke	2	2.5	4.5
Florida	.85	1	1.85
Georgetown	1	.5	1.5
Harvard	12.86	21.68	34.54
Hawaii	6	2	8
Hoover	6	10.3	16.3
Illinois	3	3.25	6.25
Indiana	3	4	7
Iowa	1.55	1.07	2.62
Kansas	1.25	3.75	5
Lib of Cong	12	3	15
Maryland	1.5	1	2.5
Michigan	7	6.75	13.75
Michigan State	.5	.1	.6
Minnesota	2	1.5	3.5
Montana	.05	.07	.12
North Carolina	2	2.4	4.4
Ohio State	4	4	8
Oregon	3	1	4
Pennsylvania	1	2	3
Pittsburgh	4	4	8
Princeton	7	11.5	18.5
Rutgers	1	2	3
St. John's	1	1	2
Seton Hall	1	.5	1.5
So. California	2	1.25	3.25
Texas	1	2	3
Virginia	1	0	1
Washington (St.Louis)	2	0	2
Washington (Seattle)	7	12	19
Wisconsin	2.5	2.5	5
Yale	7	10.5	17.5

## II. JAPANESE RESEARCH RESOURCES IN THE UNITED STATES

Now I would like to move on to our primary topic, Japanese research resources in the United States. I will examine the topic from the following five points: 1) Acquisitions of Japanese research resources; 2) Efforts in collection building; 3) Resource sharing and access of information; 4) Librarians; 5) A new direction which Japanese collections have taken.

### 1) Acquisitions of Japanese Research Resources

Concurring with the increase of Japan related programs at various campuses, the number of Japanese library collections has grown. (Table A) In 1964 only two institutions, that is, University of California at Berkeley and the Library of Congress reported holding over 100,000 volumes. Today there are 12 institutions reporting to hold over 100,000 volumes of Japanese materials. In 1964, 7 libraries had holdings of more than 50,000 volumes, today there are 18 libraries. Presently there are about 30 academic libraries in the United States actively engaged in acquiring Japanese materials.

Let's further examine current collection holdings by institutions. The table (B) shows holdings of monograph collections with bound serials included in the first column; then the number of microfilm reels holdings; third, the number of new volumes added in the past year, and in the last column, the number of current serials subscriptions. There are 12 collections with holdings in excess of 100,000 volumes; 9 collections with holdings between 40,000 and 100,000; about 20 collections with less than 40,000 volumes.

As to annual acquisition rates, although the Library of Congress Asian Division was able to acquire more than 11,000 volumes, the largest acquisition among the academic libraries was 7,545 volumes. Only four collections acquired over 5,000 volumes; while four additional collections acquired over 4,000 volumes, and another three in excess of 3,000 volumes. An average acquisition by an academic library amounted to less than 2,000 volumes.

The fact that Japan publishes about 45,000 titles annually, of which certainly not all books have scholarly value, yet the amount of titles acquired by American libraries seems only a fraction. Moreover, libraries are not only acquiring current publications, but retrospective materials as well. Therefore, the number of publications acquired for Japanese studies is extremely small compared to the publication outputs in Japan. These figures simply indicate that Japanese collections in the United States have failed in keeping up with resources produced in Japan.

As to serial acquisitions, 7 academic libraries acquired more than 1,000 Japanese serials, and an additional 2 acquired more than 800 serials. *National Union List of Current Japanese Serials in East Asian Libraries of North America* which was published in 1992, lists approximately 5000 current titles being acquired by 32 academic libraries. This number of current titles is about half of the serials which include trade and scholarly journals available in Japan.

Over the past three decades, acquisition rates of Japanese publications by academics have diminished. Many institutions invested money in acquiring Japanese resources. However, the



	1964	1975	1980	1990	1993
Table A. Arizona	5,500	31,462	21,162	33,756	36,676
Brown	---	284	---	---	5,780
Bucknell	---	4,000	3,700	---	3,350
UC Berkeley	112,838	170,005	199,573	280,379	297,148
UC Davis	---	5254	8,883	14,345	17,558
UCLA	35,000	66,180	75,019	115,251	127,694
UC San Diego	---	130	130	10,657	20,328
UC Santa Barbara	---	14,869	20,083	34,401	38,354
Chicago	20,685	68,484	94,185	142,808	154,239
Colorado	5,000	7,705	2,426	3,328	5,558
Columbia	70,000	137,117	161,441	207,789	221,025
Cornell	15,000	30,471	38,950	63,965	86,519
Duke	1,600	3,200	8,350	12,980	24,611
Florida	---	2,974	3,112	---	8,000
Georgetown	---	6,000	10,000	15,998	18,100
Harvard	92,562	139,918	167,920	207,116	239,664
Hawaii	61,993	72,017	81,842	110,659	115,010
Hoover	45,000	78,562	94,857	129,472	140,806
Illinois	---	30,662	40,402	52,120	54,337
Indiana	5,190	16,123	21,605	31,929	47,593
Iowa	2,200	6,175	15,000	---	27,210
Kansas	4,265	24,786	30,339	47,644	54,357
Lib. of Congress	453,911	550,909	678,454	750,486	793,998
Maryland	70,000	83,638	28,848	40,905	30,577
Michigan	77,620	138,259	151,528	223,724	243,787
Michigan State	600	4,820	4,820	---	4,000
Minnesota	3,000	15,691	20,076	---	33,170
NY Public	7,000	10,460	17,000	49,650	55,031
North Carolina	---	1,339	2,200	3,951	4,593
Ohio State	780	9,383	12,476	49,143	67,764
Oregon	1,700	11,716	16,434	---	39,620
Pennsylvania	8,000	24,063	26,940	30,789	36,681
Pittsburgh	---	8,180	14,192	29,175	29,139
Princeton	18,161	53,914	70,442	114,437	134,627
Rutgers	---	750	1,500	3,734	4,390
Seton Hall	5,000	6,000	8,000	---	1,257
St. John's	---	200	1,000	---	1,077
So. California	---	---	---	13,030	13,445
Texas	8,250	22,501	27,667	42,768	41,626
Virginia	2,000	1,020	1,020	5,658	6,566
Washington(Seattle)	19,124	49,084	87,165	102,325	112,516
Washington(St.Louis)	---	32,798	37,203	41,610	43,340
Wisconsin	2,000	33,090	37,590	49,780	51,676
Yale	35,000	93,024	119,568	173,514	189,664

Table B. Japanese Volumes, Microforms, Additions, Serials

	Volumes	Microform	Additions	Serials
Library of Congress	771,543	22,455	11,511	18,662
UC Berkeley	297,148	---	2,246	1,789
Michigan	229,205	14,582	7,545	1,650
Harvard	219,447	20,217	4,804	1,110
Columbia	217,566	3,459	2,987	1,021
Yale	189,644	---	5,690	1,175
Chicago	151,588	2,651	3,927	1,748
Hoover	140,806	---	2,654	235
Princeton	130,807	3,820	4,271	1,226
UCLA	127,694	---	4,193	982
Hawaii	108,026	6,984	888	684
Washington	106,611	5,905	3,498	863
Cornell	86,519	---	2,946	586
Ohio State	54,594	13,170	4,633	470
Illinois	53,787	550	1,097	270
NYPL	53,300	1,731	2,700	402
Kansas	52,857	1,500	2,104	195
Wisconsin	51,676	0	951	174
Indiana	46,233	1,360	3,250	249
Washington, St. Louis	43,340	---	852	193
Texas at Austin	41,382	244	632	182
Oregon	39,507	113	687	164
Arizona	36,676	---	606	118
UC Santa Barbara	36,354	2,000	1,413	245
Pennsylvania	35,892	789	2,007	115
Minnesota	33,000	170	717	135
Maryland	30,577	---	1,461	---
Pittsburgh	28,169	970	1,885	210
Iowa	27,200	10	550	43
Duke	24,130	481	5,083	234
UC San Diego	20,254	74	3,967	144
Georgetown	17,772	328	561	53
UC Davis	17,403	155	910	59
So. California	13,013	432	161	83
UC Irvine	12,696	77	6,918	27
Florida	8,000	---	58	18
Virginia	6,500	66	224	70
Brown	5,780	---	174	14
Colorado	4,466	1,092	1,880	24
North Carolina	4,374	219	257	80
Rutgers	4,356	34	27	48
Michigan State	4,000	0	20	---
Bucknell	3,350	---	---	1
Seton Hall	1,257	0	4	2
St. John's	924	153	35	6
Notre Dame	725	---	---	30
Montana	167	---	22	2
Arizona State	---	---	337	---
Brigham Young	---	---	124	18
Cent. f. Res. Lib.	---	---	---	651

fiscal support at most institutions have been far from sufficient to support and sustain research needs at most campuses. Moreover, as topics on Japanese studies diversified, it became even more difficult to acquire needed materials by scholars. Worse yet, the devaluation of the American dollar against the Japanese currency became a major threat to Japanese collections. The high currency value of the Japanese yen tremendously diminished overseas buying power. It seems no matter how hard we tried to convince library administrations in receiving additional allocations, the harsh reality of exchange rates consumed them.

Now, I wish to examine the financial state in which Japanese collections have been placed. The table (C) indicates the expenditures on acquiring Japanese materials. Unfortunately the latest survey which was shown earlier, did not provide CJK language break down expenditures. Therefore, the figures shown here are the survey results for 1990. The total expenditures for acquiring Japanese publications were about 3 million dollars of which 86% of the financial support came from our own institutions and 14% from endowments.

American academic institutions have been facing severe budget cuts and obviously East Asian collections could not have escaped this since they are part of the system. Ever rising publications and shipping costs along with the dollars's diminishing value have been a big blow to meeting the demands on Japanese research resources. Consequently, Japanese collections have failed to sustain its growth to provide adequate research needs.

Relying on budget allocations provided by institutions have been by no means sufficient. Fortunately, the Japanese collections could receive outside financial supports from government agencies, mainly from the Japan Foundation and the Japan-United States Friendship Commission (JUSFC).

Even though the grants provided by the two agencies were very limited, nonetheless, JUSFC contributed greatly in building Japanese research resources for graduate students and faculty, while the Japan Foundation's Library Support Programs have helped strengthen the development of small to medium-size collections mainly at under graduate levels, and also contributed greatly in establishing new Japanese collections. Thus, the grants provided by the two agencies have complimented each other, and today's Japanese collections cannot be discussed without mentioning their support. In fact, the grants, especially the JUSFC grants not only played significant roles in building today's Japanese research resources, but also provided an impact on how librarians acquired materials in a coordinated manner.

During the past several decades, the total number of Japanese materials in the United States has now accumulated to over 3.7 million volumes. The majority of these materials are subjects in humanities. It is difficult to asses the strengths and weaknesses of each collection, partly due to the fact that Japanese collections were acquired in order to support institutions' research and teaching needs, and those researchers' needs and demands have shifted over the course of years. Certain collections are strong in certain subject areas, however, it is obvious that there are gaps needed to be filled. The realty is that it has been extremely difficult to maintain specific subject collections, since many libraries had to struggle in acquiring just basic research needs in the face of financial difficulty.

Table C. Acquisitions Budgets for Japanese Materials, 1990-91

	Total	Monographs	Serials	Library's Own Budgets	Funds from Within Univ.	External Funds
Arizona	34,427	21,446	12,981	34,427	---	20,000
UC Berkeley	187,522	76,861	100,621	150,416	21,769	15,337
UCLA	160,141	144,298	15,843	102,386	27,755	30,000
UC Santa Barbara	28,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	9,000	---
UC San Diego	140,771	86,756	54,015	126,949	0	13,822
Chicago	134,420	97,021	37,399	68,168	0	66,252
Columbia	240,000	184,800	55,200	150,000	50,000	40,000
Duke	43,064	21,810	12,539	22,539	11,810	8,715
Georgetown	15,000	15,000	---	15,000	N/A	N/A
Harvard	196,163	155,275	37,023	9,500	186,663	JUSFC
Hawaii	N/A	46,157	---	26,157	---	20,000
Hoover	176,539	154,469	22,070	145,206	1,333	30,000
Indiana	55,000	39,000	16,000	46,000	---	9,000
Lib of Congress	270,000	210,000	60,000	270,000	0	0
Maryland	58,000	13,000	45,000	58,000	0	0
Michigan	277,350	166,000	110,000	214,530	---	JUSFC
Minnesota	17,650	9,400	---	17,650	0	0
Ohio State	148,844	130,844	18,000	95,518	32,776	20,550
Oregon	25,000	---	---	25,000	---	---
Pennsylvania	122,115	99,615	22,500	101,300	0	20,815
Princeton	210,000	175,000	35,000	145,000	---	56,000
Texas	35,000	20,000	15,000	35,000	0	0
U Washington	130,245	74,194	56,051	96,029	0	34,216
Washing. (ST.L)	25,800	25,800	N/A	20,000	5,800	0
Wisconsin	61,502	---	---	60,002	0	1,500
Yale	196,210	146,210	50,000	141,210	25,000	30,000

## 2) Past Efforts in Collection Building:

Recognizing the importance of building Japanese research resources, the Japan-United States Friendship Commission started to provide grants to thie ten major Japanese collections in 1978. Libraries which received grants formed the regional libraries consortia. They were East Coast, Mid-west, and West coast libraries consortia.

The East Coast Libraries Consortium was composed of four libraries: Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. The consortium members engaged in cooperative collection development and public services within the consortium and agreed upon three items: 1. Exchanging lists of expensive publications to be purchased among the member in an attempt to avoid duplicate orders. 2. Acquisitions of local history materials by region. They divided Japan into four regions and each library was assigned to collect primary historical source materials from each region. 3. Compilation of current serials holding lists of the member libraries. In 1988 it was decided that further allocation in history was desirable and the following division resulted: Columbia would collect postwar international financial and political relations; Harvard — contemporary Japanese economic policy; Princeton — postwar interest groups; Yale — contemporary life in Japan. The union list of Japanese serials of the consortium members was published in 1985 and updated in 1989.

The Midwest consortium was composed of Universities of Chicago and Michigan libraries. They engaged in the following activities: coopertative acquisitions to avoid duplicate purchases, free photocopying and interlibrary loan services, providing travel grants to scholars to conduct research at consortium libraries. They also established a special program called “on-demand purchase program” of which a portion of the fund was set aside to accommodate “demand purchase” of titles requested by non consortium Midwest libraries.

On the west coast, University of California, Berkeley and Hoover Institution of Stanford made up a consortium. From the outset, they set aside one quarter of the grant money for a joint survey of the collections. As a result, four joint checklists have been compiled and distributed. The remaining three quarter have been spent on coordinated acquisitions in various subjects. For local historical materials, of which they were limited to prefectures and cities' history only, were collected by each library dividing Japan in the middle. A faster delivery system of interlibrary loan between the two libraries has been developed in addition to reciprocal loan privileges.

For geographical reasons, the libraries of the Universities of Washington and Hawaii did not form consortia but received the JUSFC grants. These were the original ten libraries.

In 1989, University of California, San Diego and University of California, Los Angeles were joined by establishing the Southern California library consortium for Japanese studies. Each library concentrated on acquiring materials covering specific subject areas. UCLA concentrated in the areas of modern history, politics, education, sociology and law; while UCSD focused on the areas of international relations, trade, economics, company histories. These efforts have resulted in building complementary Japanese collections and in minimizing duplication of efforts and materials.

As we quickly observed, the JUSFC had provided incentives for acquiring Japanese resources cooperatively, and consequently provided tremendous contributions in building Japanese library resources in a coordinated manner. Unfortunately, in 1990 JUSFC decided to discontinue the support it had provided in the past and abruptly terminated the grants.

### **3) Resource Sharing and Access of Information:**

Even though Japanese resources are primarily to support research and instruction for faculty and students of their institution, in reality they are used by scholars from other private as well as public universities and colleges, by people from various industries and businesses, by people from government agencies, by the media, and by private researchers. In fact, academic Japanese collections serve all kinds of researchers and information seekers regardless of their status and locations. Limited resources as they may be, they have been shared and used by various kinds of people.

Introduction of computers to East Asian libraries lagged many years behind the mainstream of the American library world. In April 1983 the Research Libraries Information Network's (RLIN) Chinese-Japanese-Korean (CJK) program became operational, and ten years later in 1993, the number of CJK records entered into its database by the 37 participating institutions has grown to over 1.2 million. On the other hand, in 1986 the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) also became operational with CJK materials. Today, 42 institutions catalog their materials with OCLC/CJK. In addition, numerous libraries use OCLC/CJK services for technical processing and retrospective conversion. As of June 1994, more than 600,000 unique titles were entered and its holdings exceeded 1.7 million. These two national online databases exchange CJK data on a regular basis, and today we are able to determine at a glance which libraries in the nation hold what materials. Moreover, all East Asian libraries employ the same cataloging, classification scheme and subject headings of the Library of Congress, and data can be utilized by all libraries throughout the United States. Having been able to share CJK cataloging records can be said to be the most significant milestone occurring in the entire East Asian community thus far.

Moreover, the use of Internet made it possible for anyone with access to a computer, regardless of location, to check the holdings of libraries throughout North America and in many European countries. The overwhelming majority of East Asian libraries catalog their materials online today. So far as current materials are concerned, the majority is recognizable online. However, true Japanese resource sharing and accessing information have not yet been attained for the following two major reasons. 1) Many Japanese collections lagged behind in converting old manual catalog cards into machine-readable form. 2) Definite shortage of Japanese resources in American libraries necessitates relying on libraries and online systems in Japan to supply information and materials to American scholars. However, scholarly information flowing from Japan to American libraries through Internet has been unfortunately, extremely limited, while the reverse is not. American libraries urgently need easy access to Japanese to Japanese databases to identify materials and access information and, at the same time, to have easy transfer of materials by FAX or by other electronic means. Inter-library

borrowing from the National Diet Library is so costly and time consuming that many American libraries hesitate to use the system.

An encouraging development occurred recently, however, regarding the flow of Japanese government documents. The Japan Documentation Center (JDC) headed by Ms. Ichiko Morita was inaugurated in March 1994 at the Library of Congress. JDC is a cooperative effort between the US Congress and the Japanese government to provide timely knowledge of and access to Japanese public policy documents. JDC's goal is to assist American policy makers and the public to better understand Japan.

Past efforts made in sharing resources among Japanese collections were the publications of union lists of current Japanese serial holdings. Between the years of 1985 and 1988 the three regional current serial lists were compiled and published separately. In 1992 *the National Union List of Current Japanese Serials in East Asian Libraries of North America* was published. The union list included current serials titles subscribed by 32 institutions. As a follow up of this publication, a union list of serials which include current as well as retrospective titles held by American libraries would be useful.

#### **4) Librarians:**

A 1991 survey shows that Personnel working for Japanese collections were divided by functions such as acquisitions, cataloging, and reference. (Table D) For each function, the number of full time equivalent professional librarians and non-professionals were counted. Total full time equivalent persons were 130, of which 56% were professional librarians and 44% clerical staff. The library of Congress employs over 42 full time equivalent which was roughly one third of the total personnel working for Japanese collections.

The statistics unfortunately cannot distinguish quality of librarians. However, something to be noted here is that there is a definite shortage of qualified Japan librarians. Unfilled professional Japan librarians' positions have often been filled with persons whose language ability are somewhat limited. Even those with adequate language ability are not necessarily qualified for the job. The shortage of qualified Japan librarians have been a concern for many in the past and present.

American library education has no bearing toward East Asian librarianship. Most librarians are simply not prepared for dealing with vernacular materials when entering into the East Asian library field. We had to educate ourselves on the job which vary significantly from positions, area and nature of responsibility and size of collections. In the past, two major Summer Institutes were conducted for the education of East Asian librarians by receiving the grants from the Department of Education. Through a grant from the Japan Foundation, a workshop designed solely for librarians working for Japanese materials was conducted for the first time in 1992 by the members of the Subcommittee on Japanese Materials of CEAL.

Recognizing the importance of librarians working with Japanese materials, the Japan-United States Friendship Commission provided funds for periodic regional Japan librarians conferences. In the past, regional conferences of the East coast, Mid-west, and West coast libraries were held independently. Three day conferences usually consisted of: reports of

Table D. Personnel Support of Japanese Collections 1990-1991

	Acquisitions		Cataloging		Reference		Total
	Prof.	Cleri.	Prof.	Cleri.	Prof.	Cleri.	
Arizona	0	0.4	0	0.4	0	0.2	1.0
Arizona State	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.75
Brigham Young	0.5	0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0	3.0
UC Berkeley	1	1.5	0	1.6	N/A	N/A	4.1
UCLA	0.5	0.53	1	1.6	0.5	0	4.13
UC San Diego	0.75	0.9	---	1.0	0.25	0	2.9
UC Santa Barbara	0.1	0.13	0.8	0.25	0.1	0	1.38
Chicago	0.8	2	1	1	0.2	0.1	5.1
Columbia	0.65	2	1.5	1.5	0.35	0	6.0
Duke	0.75	1.25	1.0	1.5	0	0	4.5
Georgetown	0.45	0.25	0.45	0.25	0.1	0	1.5
Harvard	0.5	1.34	1.26	1.5	0.5	0	5.1
Hawaii	0.5	---	2.0	1.0	0.5	0	4.0
Hoover	0.35	1	1	1.5	0.4	0.3	4.55
Indiana	0	1	2	1.5	1	0	5.5
Iowa	0.03	0.15	0.03	0.15	0.03	0	.39
Lib of Congress	1	0.8	23	6	7.25	4.5	42.55
Michigan	0.25	1.25	1.33	0.33	0.5	0.25	3.91
Minnesota	0.3	0.4	0.35	0.2	0.2	0.2	1.65
Ohio State	0.7	1	1	1.5	0.3	0	4.5
Oregon	1	0	1	0.5	0	0	2.5
Pennsylvania	0.33	0.5	0.33	0.5	0.33	0	2.0
Princeton	0.5	1.55	1.65	1.0	0.25	0	4.95
Rutgers	0.2	0.2	0	0	0.2	0	0.6
Texas	0.15	0.35	0.2	0.65	0.1	0	1.45
Wisconsin	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.25	0.25	2.5
Washington (St. L)	0.35	0	0.3	0	0.2	0	0.85
Washington(Seattle)	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.3	0	2.5
Yale	0.75	1.5	2	1.5	0.25	0.1	6.1

activities of each library; surveys conducted regarding Japanese collections and services; study opportunities on such topics as Japanese reference skills and library management. Sessions on online catalog of RLIN and OCLC/CJK systems and demonstrations of those systems were often provided. The regional Japanese conferences provided opportunities for librarians to ponder how to improve services to users, how to improve our own skills. Additionally they provided the opportunity to interact among fellow librarians and faculty from a wide variety of institutions, to share information about common concerns, to discuss confronting problems, and to attempt in solving problems cooperatively.

As technology advances, and the restructuring of library systems prevail in most institutions, the need of the librarians' education became extremely crucial. For East Asian librarians, mastering East Asian librarianship has been as important as receiving professional development education in general librarianship in the field of new technology, cataloging, collection development, personnel and library management.

##### 5) New Direction For Japanese Collections:

JUSFC's sudden announcement of terminating library acquisitions supports for the major collections caught everyone by surprise. The reasons behind the termination were: the Commission's own financial resource became low; increasing number of libraries seeking and



receiving Commission support; increasing number and cost of Japanese publications; the emerging new technology that opened new avenues for national and international shared cataloging, shared collection development, sharing of resources, and collaborative bibliographic tools. The Commission wanted to develop a new long-term policy and solution to meet its obligation to the libraries. In the past, the Japan Foundation and the JUSFC supported Japanese collections under separate mandates and guidelines. However, the circumstances surrounding Japanese materials had changed and the two government agencies wished to reassess their past programs. For this reason, both organizations conducted a joint meeting in Washington D. C. in June of 1991 with participants comprised of scholars, librarians, library administrators, and technology experts. Its goal was to seek ways to address the national needs for Japanese language materials in a fair, effective, and coordinated manner. The charge in the meeting was to consider mechanisms to produce and realize a coordinated national strategy in order to guarantee a steady long term flow of Japanese materials into US libraries. Toward the end of a day long meeting, the participants agreed to create a committee to further pursue and implement the goals.

Six month later in November, another conference, the National Planning for Japanese Libraries, took place at the Hoover Institution, Stanford.

#### **A. The National Planning for Japanese Libraries:**

The conference aimed to report and exchange information and ideas, to evaluate past and present practices, and to discuss possible solutions to major problems concerning Japanese collections. A total of 28 librarians along with some faculty, and representatives of the JUSFC and the Japan Foundation's Center for Global Partnership also attended as observers.

After two days of discussions, the participants identified specific needs for the future of Japanese collections, and created the nine Task Forces to address the most pressing issues and devise plans for future actions, under the leadership of the National Planning Team for Academic Libraries. The topics dealt with by the nine Task Forces were: 1) regional documentation sharing; 2) sharing of multi-volume sets; 3) sharing of current serials; 4) sharing of newspaper backfiles; 5) exploring future areas of cooperative collection development; 6) retrospective conversion; 7) user access to materials; 8) access to Japanese databases; and 9) training and recruitment of librarians. After a short period, the Task Forces completed reports which included a summary of the conference proceedings and future planning process, and submitted them to the newly created National Coordinating Committee on Japanese Libraries (NCC). The NCC was established in December as recommended by the Washington meeting.

#### **B. The National Coordinating Committee on Japanese Library Resources:**

"The mission of the NCC is to mobilize the resources of information providers, information users, and funding organizations toward the long-range goal of creating a comprehensive national system of cooperative collection development and ready access to Japanese information in as wide a range of fields as possible for all current and potential users in North America" (CEAL B. 96, p. 53, 1992). The NCC headed by Amy Heinrich of

Columbia University has a membership of about a dozen comprised of faculty, directors of organizations, and librarians who have met regularly during the year. "The NCC made a commitment to follow through on all the projects developed by the nine Task Forces of the National Planning Team." (CEAL B. 96, p. 48, 1992) The establishment of the NCC was met with great expectations by not only Japan librarians, but also by many East Asian librarians.

NCC's regular meetings' reports and activities have been made available periodically to the library community orally and in written form. After two and a half year of the NCC's existence, how far has the NCC advanced to carry out its mission? In other words, one can simply question how far has the NCC committed to follow through with the projects developed by the nine Task Forces.

Unfortunately, for outsiders of the NCC, a concrete visible activity taken was in the area of the multi-volume sets alone. It is understandable though that the newly created NCC required ground work before initiating any actions. However, one cannot help but wonder why so many projects were unable to rise above ground. The fact was that almost all Japan librarians were involved in preparing the Task Force reports and were ready to work and collaborate in any way possible when called upon by the NCC to make our plans and visions a reality. Meanwhile, many Japan librarians' expectations on the NCC have faded away, unfortunately, as months and years have passed.

Nonetheless, criticism is not constructive. The fact is that information technology made libraries' operations at each institution unprecedented, interconnected, and interdependent. Even though individual librarians were hired to fulfill responsibility at our own institution, our actions undoubtedly influenced other countless libraries' users. Good cataloging records are beneficial to not only our library users, but also to users of other Japanese collections. Sound book selections and collection development benefit users at our institution as well as for numerous Japanese study scholars in other institutions. Efforts in converting our library's manual catalogs into the machine readable form not only benefit our library users, but also users of other institutions. In today's electronic age, individual librarian's actions have an impact on the whole library community. For this reason, the responsibility and challenges bestowed to individual librarians have never been greater today than in the past, and we librarians need to recognize this simple fact.