



### Consortia from Past to Future

Journal:	<i>Library Management</i>
Manuscript ID	LM-02-2018-0006.R1
Manuscript Type:	Opinion Pieces
Keywords:	Consortia, Open Access, library history., Elsevier, Publishing, Fair Open Access

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Library Management

1  
2  
3           The great libraries of antiquity were more noted for being rivals than for being fellows.  
4  
5 We know that the library at Alexandria in Egypt exchanged copies with libraries in Athens but  
6  
7 we do not have any evidence of any sharing between the library at Alexandria and its rival in  
8  
9 Pergamum, on the west coast of what is now Turkey (Aman, 1989, p. 84). There was intense  
10  
11 competition between them in collecting manuscripts. Although the shortage of papyrus may  
12  
13 have other causes, Egypt banned the sale of papyrus to Pergamum in the second century CE,  
14  
15 possibly as an attempt to stifle its rival. Pergamum responded by exploiting parchment, so  
16  
17 perhaps a lack of cooperation can stimulate new developments, (Casson, 2001, p. 52; Martin,  
18  
19 1994, 51; Roberts and Skeat 1983, p. 6). The 120-volume catalogue of the Alexandria library the  
20  
21 Pinakes (Tables) created by its librarian, Callimachus (310–240 BCE), may not have been shared  
22  
23 with Pergamum but the library there developed a catalogue that was similar enough for ancient  
24  
25 writers to search both catalogues for the works they wanted to consult (Witty, 1958, p. 133 note  
26  
27 3, p. 135 note 21).

28  
29  
30  
31           While medieval libraries were known for chaining their books they did share manuscripts  
32  
33 for reading and copying, though not always without rancour (Kelly, 1980, p. 73). Seventeenth-  
34  
35 century Europe saw further developments in librarianship and library cooperation, some of it  
36  
37 initiated by philosophers and writers who were also librarians. The philosopher and writer  
38  
39 Lessing was Librarian at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel from 1770 to 1781.  
40  
41 While there, Lessing began an exchange programme with other libraries and proposed a  
42  
43 consortial acquisition scheme with the University of Göttingen. Goethe, who, among his other  
44  
45 government duties in Weimar, oversaw the libraries of Weimar and Jena, proposed a union  
46  
47 catalogue and shared collection responsibilities (Wormann, 1968, p. 340-341).

48  
49  
50           The great developments in library cooperation came about after the American Library  
51  
52 Association was formed in 1876. The first professional organisation for librarians, it made  
53  
54 cooperation central from the beginning. Melvil Dewey saw that individual libraries could not  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

bring about co-operative cataloguing or 'any other plan' without the communication and organisation of the ALA and its *Library Journal* (*Library Journal*, 1877, p. 170). The overriding purpose of the ALA was sharing information and resources:

It should be understood that such organization is not simply to create *esprit de corps* and to enjoy social intercourse with one another, but is a great labor-saving necessity; an economizer of time and money; a *desideratum* alike for library and librarian. Without such organization experience has sufficiently proved that Poole's Index will remain uncompleted; that each cataloguer will work alone and unaided on his copy of each book without utilizing to any proper extent the like labors of his fellows ... Individuals have neither authority nor ability to carry forward the needed work. It must be done by the co-operation of those most interested – the libraries' (*Library Journal*, 1877, 178).

The March 1877 issue of the first volume of *The American Library Journal* (later just the *Library Journal*) recognised that 'Of the standing committees, that on Co-operation will probably prove the most important organ of the Association, as most of the practical work will fall to its share or that of its sub-committees. The Poole's Index, Size, and Co-operative Cataloging matters ... are only a portion of the work to be done' (*Library Journal*, 1877, p. 251-2). One of the first topics the ALA addressed was the joint acquisition of library supplies. Catalogue cards, card cabinets, and other items were new technologies in the 1870s and had to be custom made. Standardising would lower the costs (Krajewski and Krapp, 2011). The Co-operation Committee set up a supply house to resell library supplies that were standardised and purchased in bulk by the ALA for resale (*Library Journal* 1877, p. 246-247).

Much of *Library Journal* in the ALA's first year carried reports on the shared development of standards in terminology, in book sizes, in the dimensions and layout of borrower cards and acquisition ledgers and in standardising cataloguing rules, much the sort of work that libraries have continued in developing today's FRBR and RDA, working not in co-ops or consortia as such but in committee work and panel meetings to bring libraries together on national and international levels.

The move toward modern consortia intensified as the century closed. In a modest letter in the 1876 issue of *Library Journal*, Samuel Swett Green, Librarian of the Worcester Free Public

1  
2  
3 Library, proposed the concept of interlibrary loan, believing that 'it would add greatly to the  
4 usefulness of our reference libraries if an agreement should be made to lend books to each other  
5 for short periods of time' (Green 1876). Interlibrary loans were initiated informally at the  
6 University of California, Berkeley, in 1886 by its Librarian, Joseph C. Rowell, and officially  
7 sanctioned by the University in 1894 (*Joseph Cummings Rowell 1939*, p. 34-35). Rowel had  
8 started an exchange programme with other libraries a decade earlier (Peterson, 1982). In 1907  
9 the Library of Congress began lending its books to other libraries and by 1909 had lent more  
10 than a thousand books to over 100 libraries. By 1919, the ALA had adopted its first Interlibrary  
11 Loan Code (Frederiksen *et al.*, 2012). Today there are over seven million requests annually shared  
12 among the 10,000 users of OCLC's WorldShare system (WorldShare, 2017).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 The 1920s and 1930s saw further development in library cooperation with the founding  
26 of the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) in 1927. The worldwide  
27 depression in the 1930s made it imperative for libraries to share resources. Cooperative  
28 agreements were formed on a regional basis among libraries in the New York state in 1931,  
29 among libraries in the South in 1936, and, in 1931, the Claremont Colleges (Claremont Graduate  
30 School, Pomona College and Scripps College) joined their technical services departments  
31 together (Weber, 1976, p. 208). The outbreak of the Second World War required joint action to  
32 help research libraries acquire foreign library material. Initiated by Harvard, the Farmington Plan  
33 (1944) made joint purchases of mostly European materials. Intended to help dispose of  
34 agricultural surpluses in the United States, Public Law 480 (1961), also called the 'Food for Peace'  
35 programme, supported libraries by acquiring books from India and Africa in exchange for  
36 supplying those countries with American food and wheat that could be paid for with local  
37 currency or with books for distribution to American libraries.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Shared storage has an early history, with a 1901 proposal by Charles William Eliot,  
4  
5 Harvard's long serving president (1869-1909), culminating in the opening in 1942 of the New  
6  
7 England Deposit Library (Weber, 1976). The trend continued: the Research Collections Access  
8  
9 and Preservation (ReCAP) facility shared by Princeton, Columbia, and the New York Public  
10  
11 Library, built in 2000, now holds 15 million volumes and has a current capacity for 17 million, or  
12  
13 about a quarter of their combined collections. There are thirteen other shared facilities, most of  
14  
15 them dating from the 1990s (Payne 2007).  
16  
17

18  
19 Consortia, of course, are not unique to the West. Libraries in China were either imperial  
20  
21 or private, with no public libraries until something approximating one, the Jieshu Yuan (lending  
22  
23 library) of Zhou Yongnian (1730-1791) opened in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Modern public libraries did  
24  
25 not appear until early in the twentieth century. (Wilkinson, 2013, p. 932). China's development in  
26  
27 the 1980s put an emphasis on rebuilding education and impetus was given to expanding libraries  
28  
29 and library cooperation. Consortia in China have formed based on region, type, or administrative  
30  
31 division or some combination of the three. The Beijing Academic Library consortium with  
32  
33 academic members is one example, as is one in Tianjin. The Shenzhen Acquisitions and  
34  
35 Cataloguing Centre (1993) serves the public libraries in that city. The Shanghai Information  
36  
37 Resources Network, established in 1994, has members from each library sector. It shares  
38  
39 cataloguing, interlibrary loans, and provides patrons with a library card for access to all of the  
40  
41 members. Perhaps the best-known cooperative is CALIS, the China Academic Library and  
42  
43 Information System. Founded in 1998 and funded by the central government it hosts a union  
44  
45 catalogue for information and inter-lending. Other academic consortia are focused on social  
46  
47 sciences and humanities, medicine, or science and technology (Dong and Zou, 2009). In Taiwan  
48  
49 the Consortium on Core Electronic Resources in Taiwan (CONCERT), founded in 1998, (Ching  
50  
51 *et al.*, 2003, p. 306), provides joint purchasing leverage for libraries and is currently involved in a  
52  
53 boycott of Elsevier (Huang, 2016).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In Hong Kong, the Joint University Librarians Advisory Committee (JULAC) has been  
4 an outstanding example of cooperation among the eight government-funded universities and  
5 thirteen associates. Starting in 1967 as a committee to advise the heads of the universities, the  
6  
7 last decade has been especially productive in part because of technology and in part because of  
8  
9 closer cooperation encouraged by the University Grants Committee, the primary funding source  
10  
11 for the universities. Among other activities JULAC sponsors a union catalogue, patron-initiated  
12  
13 inter-lending between members, database licensing, monograph acquisitions, and common  
14  
15 access to member libraries. A shared storage facility has been planned: until it is constructed the  
16  
17 libraries have developed a virtual storage solution by agreeing to hold last copies of print journals  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 (Wong, 2016).  
23

24  
25 Today there are 200 library consortia worldwide who are members of the International  
26  
27 Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC). The oldest is TRLN, the Triangle Research Libraries  
28  
29 Network in North Carolina (1933). Many, like CAVAL in Australia (1978) were started in the  
30  
31 1970s. Some, like LYRISIS (2009), are new and focus on digital projects, others, such as the  
32  
33 Legal Information Preservation Alliance are specialist.  
34

35  
36 At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Belgians Henri Lafontaine and Paul Otlet, creators of the  
37  
38 Universal Decimal Classification, envisioned a shared world-wide catalogue of all human  
39  
40 knowledge. By 1926 their index held 13 million cards, growing to almost 16 million author and  
41  
42 subject cards by 1934 when the project collapsed (Wright 2014; Rayward 1994). Their vision  
43  
44 failed but a later and import project resulted in a work whose title shows the nature of  
45  
46 cooperation behind it: *The National Union Catalog Pre-1956 Imprints: A Cumulative Author List*  
47  
48 *Representing Library of Congress Printed Cards and Titles Reported by Other American Libraries, Compiled*  
49  
50 *and Edited with the Cooperation of the Library of Congress and the National Union Subcommittee of the*  
51  
52 *Resources Committee of the Resources and Technical Services Division, American Library Association.* The  
53  
54 *National Union Catalog*, published in London by Mansell from 1968 to 1981, was a collaboration  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 among hundreds of libraries in the United States and Canada. The NUC originated in the  
4  
5 exchange of catalogue cards started in the early years of the twentieth century by the Library of  
6  
7 Congress, the New York Public Library, Boston Public Library, Harvard University Library and  
8  
9 several other research collections. By 1926 it had grown to two million cards. A \$250,000 grant  
10  
11 from John D. Rockefeller, obtained by the ALA, allowed the card collection to grow to over six  
12  
13 million author or title main entry cards by 1932 (*National Union Catalog*, 1968, p. viii). Similar  
14  
15 cooperation produced the 'Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue,' (now the 'English Short  
16  
17 Title Catalogue', ESTC, with coverage extending to the beginning of printing in England in 1472)  
18  
19 initiated by the British Library in 1976, ultimately involved contributions from over two  
20  
21 thousand other libraries. The computer, machine readable catalogue records, and OCLC made  
22  
23 shared catalogues and patron involvement simpler. OCLC, 'a global library cooperative', started  
24  
25 as the Ohio College Library Center in 1967 and now has 17,000 members and a database of 380  
26  
27 million records (OCLC, 2016) including those developed by the Research Libraries Group  
28  
29 (RLG), a shared cataloguing endeavour of 100 academic and research libraries that merged with  
30  
31 OCLC in 2006.  
32  
33  
34

35 In the 140 years since the founding of the ALA and the Library Association, libraries  
36  
37 have developed strong consortia on both national and international levels. In the 1960s, libraries  
38  
39 developed and adopted digital tools that made global sharing of records and materials possible.  
40  
41 What is common to all the above is the focus on shared cataloguing, the development of  
42  
43 standards, union catalogues, shared acquisitions and exchange, and alliances to develop and  
44  
45 implement new computer technologies. All of this, while aimed at providing better service to  
46  
47 library patrons, was internal to the library community. Technology and improvements in  
48  
49 communications have played an important part in building this foundation. The introduction of  
50  
51 parcel post, first in Europe in the 1880s and in the United States in 1913, made inter-library  
52  
53 loans for books affordable. Photostats and photocopiers made document and journal article  
54  
55 loans possible. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, libraries began the preservation and dissemination of unique  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 collections by filming and digitisation. Most recently the new Qatar National Library began an  
4 ongoing project with the British Library to digitise material relevant to the Gulf region, the  
5 Islamic world, and Arabic culture. India Office Records from 1763–1951, historic maps and  
6 atlases, and Arabic Manuscripts from the British Library on medicine, mathematics, astronomy,  
7 and engineering are now available in an accessible, high-quality format for scholars worldwide.  
8  
9 The join project has digitised 1.5 million pages in its first two phases. A third phase will add  
10 another 900,000 pages. The project has attracted more than 1 million users since 2014 (QNL,  
11 2018).

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 While the twenty-first century has given libraries new tools, the major challenges remain  
21 those of the past: financial and existential. Funding has always been important: libraries need  
22 money to pay their staff, to keep buildings open and operational, and to buy books and journals  
23 and other resources. Fires, floods, wars, insects, cultural genocide, and wilful neglect have caused  
24 the destruction of much of the world's heritage. Many people in ages prior to ours did not see  
25 the need for libraries, either public or academic. In nineteenth-century England, there was  
26 resistance to creating free public libraries, with the opposition arguing that if they did not pay for  
27 the working man's pint, why should they pay for his penny newspaper? (*The Publishers' Circular*,  
28 1874, p. 902). Libraries may be facing greater threats today: why pay for libraries and books  
29 when everything is free online? Austerity budgets in England have seen over 500 council libraries  
30 closed or transferred to voluntary or commercial firms and library-paid library staff cut by eight  
31 thousand, a loss of a quarter of total staff (BBC News, 2016). There is an increasing questioning  
32 if libraries and librarians are still necessary in this age of remote databases, Google, and self-  
33 checkout machines for the (allegedly) little print that remains and an assumption (falsely based)  
34 that librarians will shortly disappear (McKenzie, 2018). With declining budgets and ever-  
35 increasing costs, can libraries continue to survive? Or be privatised and taken over by Amazon  
36 (Lyons 2018)? That suggestion, published online in *Forbes*, caused a firestorm of rebuttal and was  
37 deleted from the *Forbes* Webpage. Did some library archive it before it was lost?  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 In October 2017, the Hong Kong Library Association had a workshop as part of IFLA's  
4 global discussion on 'how a united library field can tackle the challenges of the future'. Two of  
5 the HKLA workshop statements, looking forward five years, seemed particularly appropriate to  
6 the topic of united libraries. The first was 'we have moved towards deeper integration of public,  
7 academic and other libraries in Hong Kong, with equitable service across society...' and the  
8 second was 'All ... resources in Hong Kong libraries are accessible to all over the world...' The  
9 concepts of integration and global accessibility were practices workshops members thought  
10 libraries were good at. Among those practices are collaboration, networking, innovation, and  
11 quality of metadata ('Global Vision Discussion', 2017). For Hong Kong, open access has long  
12 been important and some, such as the University of Hong Kong (HKU), require researchers to  
13 deposit their work in an Open Access repository (Chan and Cheung, 2017, p. 490). Despite this,  
14 open access publication for HKU is still only 16 percent of total publication, varying among  
15 fields, with social sciences far lower in contributions than medical or physical sciences (Chan and  
16 Cheung, 2017, p. 495, 491).

17  
18  
19 While Google Scholar can find articles and book chapters contributed to institutional  
20 repositories there are drawbacks to this. Unless the publisher allows it (or the author or his  
21 institution pays for it) only the manuscript or unrevised proof is available, not the final, possibly  
22 corrected copy that would be necessary for a proper citation.

23  
24  
25 Major databases such as Project Muse and JSTOR excel in providing access to their  
26 collections of academic publications: good interfaces, good metadata, advanced searching. For  
27 open access the situation is still in its early stages but shows potential. The Directory of Open  
28 Access Repositories, *OpenDOAR*, lists over 3,700 repositories worldwide. The Directory of  
29 Open Access Journals (DOAJ) indexes almost 12,000 journals, over 70% at article level, and  
30 links to over three million articles. And, importantly, both *OpenDOAR* and DOAJ are  
31 international in their coverage, providing a platform for scholars to publish from anywhere in the  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 world. CORE (COnnecting REpositories), founded in 2011 and based at the Open University in  
4 Great Britain, aims to be the most complete aggregator of open access content. It currently holds  
5 almost 134 million open access articles, including many thousands from Elsevier and Springer.  
6  
7 CORE recently announced that it will partner with ProQuest to enable its open access content in  
8 ProQuest's Ex Libris Primo and Summon discovery interfaces (Fahmy 2017).  
9  
10  
11  
12

13  
14 Just as in the shared creation of the *National Union Catalog* or ESTC in the past, this is  
15 where the future of consortia needs to advance. We need the same ability today for allowing the  
16 discovery of digital works in scattered repositories, with metadata sufficient for retrieval and  
17 access globally. Libraries took the lead in getting their institutions to move into open access. Can  
18 libraries become the force that would link repositories together? Open access, if articles simply  
19 remain as academic fodder filling hidden silos, is still no access. Building a repository is  
20 expensive in terms of time, staff, and digital resources. Cooperatively sharing the costs regionally  
21 and globally would continue our cooperative/consortial tradition and keep libraries in the  
22 forefront of providing affordable access to information.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 According to a study by the Max Planck Society, libraries worldwide spend '€7.6 billion  
35 in subscription fees for access to between 1.5 million and 2 million new papers annually, or  
36 between €3800 and €5000 per paper', many of them from high-priced subscriptions from  
37 companies like Elsevier (Vogel and Kupferschmid, 2017). It is difficult to justify that price when  
38 Elsevier can report profits of almost 40%. Even at its high point in publishing, 31,000 papers in  
39 2013, PLOS ONE accounted for only about two percent of that output, but only at a cost of  
40 USD 1,500 to USD 2,900 (approximately €1300 to €2500) for Article Processing Charges (PLOS  
41 ONE, n.d.). Some consortia have been criticised as being mere buyers' clubs, only concerned  
42 with lowering costs but not using their financial leverage to obtain longer-term benefits. In 2017,  
43 academic libraries in Germany joined together in what could be a 'Not Buying Club' by refusing  
44 to renew their Elsevier subscriptions. Formed into a group called 'Projekts DEAL' they are  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 resisting the high subscriptions of Elsevier and other publishers by refusing to buy unless they  
4 are charged a reasonable fee in return for open access worldwide for German authors. Should  
5 they succeed in bringing costs down to €1,300 per article, a level they consider reasonable,  
6 libraries could collectively save five billion euros, money that could go back for books and other  
7 resources. Elsevier extended the German subscriptions in 2017 while negotiations continued.  
8  
9 DEAL broke off negotiations in July 2018 when they reached an impasse ('DEAL and Elsevier  
10 negotiations', 2018). In Asia, the Consortium on Core Electronic Resources in Taiwan  
11 (CONCERT), representing 220 institutions, has taken the same steps, with over 75% of  
12 members cancelling their 2017 Elsevier subscriptions ("Big Deal Cancellation Tracking". n.d.).  
13 Elsevier also extended CONCERT's subscriptions to the end of 2017 as negotiations continue.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Elsevier has experienced additional pressure from German academics who have resigned  
25 as editors and members of Elsevier editorial and advisory boards ('Researchers Resign  
26 Editorship of Elsevier Journals' 2017). The Germans are not alone. Almost 17,000 other  
27 academics, researchers, and librarians worldwide have also signed an online petition to boycott  
28 Elsevier (*The Cost of Knowledge*, n.d.). Universities, funding agencies, and taxpayers have already  
29 paid for the research: they shouldn't have to pay unreasonable sums for it again in subscriptions  
30 or in unreasonable article charges to make it 'free'. Libraries have avoided cancellations because  
31 of fear of faculty reactions when needed journals are cut and an assumption that they are  
32 powerless in a battle with the major publishers. Faculty have been supportive, as seen above.  
33  
34 And it is the publishers, not the libraries, who have the most to lose from the cancellation of  
35 unreasonably-priced and unsustainable subscriptions. Publishers in the United States in 2015 had  
36 almost US\$28 billion in revenues (International Publishers Association 2016) while total US  
37 library expenditures were approximately \$22 billion ('Global Library Statistics', n.d.). While much  
38 library expenditure is for salaries, almost 40% of academic library expenditure in the United  
39 States goes to collections. Academic libraries in the United States spent \$2.6 billion on their  
40 collections in 2008). Globally, academic library expenditures were over \$14 billion and total  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ('Academic Libraries Survey', 2008 | 'Global Library Statistics', n.d.). Libraries are a major  
4 industry and can exercise some degree of market power. What other market do the publishers  
5 have their journals except for the libraries? According to the Association of American Publishers,  
6  
7 97% of STM journal subscriptions are institutional and subscriptions account for 84% of their  
8 revenue (Association of American Publishers 2015).  
9  
10  
11  
12

13  
14 The libraries in Germany and on Taiwan have made a stand and continue to hold their  
15 positions. This could, however, become an 'Academic Spring', failing to survive the harsher and  
16 ruthless world outside of Academe. An earlier boycott by Dutch universities of Elsevier resulted  
17 in a three-year settlement in which the Dutch universities, who had wanted to make their articles  
18 open access without any charges, settled for only a third of their original demands (Grove, 2015).  
19  
20 It remains to be seen if this uprising will succeed and if it will spread to other regions. Will there  
21 be a compromise that ultimately favours Elsevier? Or could the refusal of the libraries to  
22 compromise become a template for the future of library cooperation, not only in securing better  
23 'deals' but also in moving away from traditional publishing. As Alex Holcombe and Björn  
24 Brembs wrote in a recent THE article, rather than 'continuing to work with the legacy  
25 infrastructure of Elsevier', German universities should consider 'walking away from the  
26 negotiating table and seeking a broader consortium to collectively create a service market based  
27 on a modern IT infrastructure that can accommodate all scholarly works' (Holcombe and  
28 Brembs, 2017).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Academics, of course, publish to be read. They must also publish in top journals to score  
45 points on various government/funder assessment exercises. Publication must be in top-level,  
46 peer-reviewed international journals, most of which are distributed by the major publishers. How  
47 can journals with such standing be created and maintained outside of those publishers? For those  
48 academics who are willing to take the risk and boycott Elsevier or other publishers and publish  
49 instead only in conference proceedings and on specialist sites, there is the danger that it will  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 make it difficult if not impossible for libraries to acquire, to make accessible, and most  
4 importantly, to preserve their works. Libraries and research institutions must work together to  
5 make this material available in one common database, and it must be on a scale and quality to  
6 compete with Science Direct or Springer. The major publishers stand on their reputations, but  
7 universities also have reputations and credibility that they already use behind their presses and  
8 their own research publications. Universities and libraries can provide the necessary peer review  
9 to open access material just as they do now for publishers. It would be (or should be) expected  
10 that repositories run by universities would have a standard of excellence for deposit. However,  
11 deposit is only one part, and perhaps the least important part. What is most important is  
12 dissemination. A recent initiative by teaching faculty and librarians, Fair Open Access (FairOA,  
13 <https://www.fairopenaccess.org/>) maintains a set of five principles: transparent ownership,  
14 authors' retention of copyright, open access, no fees for publication, and fees paid to publishers  
15 are transparent and proportional. Starting in 2015 with funding from the Association of  
16 Universities in The Netherlands and others it was able to flip four journals in linguistics to fair  
17 open access. Journals in the fields of mathematics and psychology will begin publishing in 2018.  
18 The twenty journals published by the FairOA Open Libraries of the Humanities are funded by  
19 subscriptions from almost 200 libraries in 15 countries (Holcombe and Wilson, 2017)

20  
21 Together, the above are three harbingers of what consortia could do: universally linked  
22 repositories, united opposition to unreasonable pricing, and the return of scholarly publishing to  
23 the institutions that pay, often double and triple, for it. There is one more component that must  
24 also be present the key in open access: making it discoverable. Libraries and vendors have  
25 invested much effort and money in providing their patrons what their patrons get in Google: a  
26 single interface with a single search box. Many libraries now have a one-search box on their  
27 library page and users expect it to search across all the library's databases. Unlinked resources are  
28 not found. In June 2018, the Modern Language Association announced that it had signed an  
29 exclusive agreement with EBSCO for both database and discovery access for the MLA

1  
2  
3 International Bibliography, citing the costs involved in working with multiple vendors ('Letter to  
4  
5 MLA Bibliography Customers', 2018). The International Coalition of Library Consortia  
6  
7 responded with a Letter of Opposition, noting that this was done without consultation and that  
8  
9 70% of the ICOLC libraries used Summon, Primo, OCLC and other discovery services, meaning  
10  
11 that MLA would longer be discoverable for them and forcing some to cancel their MLA  
12  
13 subscriptions ('Consortial Letter of Opposition', 2018). MLA is a significant resource and was  
14  
15 just adding full-text to its index. As a stand-alone it would still be useful but, like most currently  
16  
17 isolated institutional repositories, something that only a few would know about and even fewer  
18  
19 use.  
20  
21

22 Historically, libraries have benefited from working together. Like our librarian ancestors  
23  
24 we need to look at the world as it is and create a vision where our libraries move forward  
25  
26 together into a better future. This should be a revolution with library characteristics, leading to a  
27  
28 future of information access with the library characteristics of transparency, free access,  
29  
30 adherence to standards, and communication.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References:

- Aman, M.M. (1989), "Document delivery and interlibrary lending in the Arab countries", *Interlending & Document Supply*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 84–88.
- Association of American Publishers, *PSP Bulletin*, Volume 14, No. 2/3, Fall 2015.
- BBC News. (2016), "Libraries 'facing greatest crisis'", 29 March, available at: <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-35707956> (accessed 29 October 2017).
- "Big Deal Cancellation Tracking". (n.d.). SPARC, available at: <https://sparcopen.org/our-work/big-deal-cancellation-tracking/> (accessed 1 February 2018).
- Brown, P. (Ed.). (1980), *The Book of Kells: Forty-Eight Pages and Details in Color from the Manuscript in Trinity College, Dublin*, 1st American ed., Knopf: distributed by Random House, New York.
- Casson, L. (2001), *Libraries in the Ancient World*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Chan, G.R. and Cheung, A.S.-C. (2017), "The transition toward open access: the University of Hong Kong experience", *Library Management*, Vol. 38 No. 8/9, pp. 488–496.
- Ching, S.H., Poon, P.W.T. and Huang, K.L. (2003), "Managing the effectiveness of the library consortium: a core values perspective on Taiwan e-book Net", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 304–315.
- "COAR Strategic Plan". (2015), available at: <https://www.coar-repositories.org/about/coar-ev/strategic-plan/> (accessed 1 November 2017).
- "Consortial Letter of Opposition to MLA's Exclusive Relationship with EBSCO". (2018), available at: <http://icolc.net/statement/consortial-letter-opposition-mlas-exclusive-relationship-ebSCO> (accessed 29 July 2018).
- The Cost of Knowledge* (n.d.), available at: <http://thecostofknowledge.com/>.
- "DEAL and Elsevier negotiations: Elsevier demands unacceptable for the academic community" (2018), 5 July, available at: <https://www.hrk.de/press/press-releases/press-release/meldung/deal-and-elsevier-negotiations-elsevier-demands-unacceptable-for-the-academic-community-4409/> (accessed 29 July 2018).
- Dong, E.X. and Zou, T.J. (2009), "Library Consortia in China", *LIBRES: Library & Information Science Research Electronic Journal*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 1–10.
- Epstein, K. (2012), "'Academic spring' sees widening boycott of Elsevier over access", *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, Vol. 344 No. 7846, pp. 4–5.
- Fahmy, S. (n.d.). "Enhancing library discovery services with CORE content | Jisc scholarly communications", available at: <https://scholarlycommunications.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2017/12/14/enhancing-library-discovery-services-with-core-content/> (accessed 28 January 2018).
- Frederiksen, L., Bean, M. and Nance, H. (2012), "A brief history of international interlibrary lending and document supply", *Global Resource Sharing*, Chandos Publishing, pp. 11–33.
- "Global Library Statistics". (n.d.)., available at: <https://www.oclc.org/en/global-library-statistics.html> (accessed 31 January 2018).
- "Global Vision Discussion : Report of the Hong Kong Library Association meeting, 'How a united library field can tackle the challenges of the future' – Hong Kong Library Association | HKLA". (2017),, available at: [https://hkla.org/hkla\\_news/global-vision-discussion-report-of-the-hong-kong-library-association-meeting-how-a-united-library-field-can-tackle-the-challenges-of-the-future/](https://hkla.org/hkla_news/global-vision-discussion-report-of-the-hong-kong-library-association-meeting-how-a-united-library-field-can-tackle-the-challenges-of-the-future/) (accessed 1 November 2017).
- Green, S.S. (1876), "The Lending of books to one another by libraries." *Library Journal*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 15–16.
- Grove, J. (2015), "Dutch universities and Elsevier reach deal over open access", *Times Higher Education (THE)*, 10 December, available at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/dutch-universities-and-elsevier-reach-deal-over-open-access> (accessed 6 January 2018).

- 1  
2  
3 Holcombe, A.O. and Brembs, B. (2017), "Open access in Germany: the best DEAL is no deal", *Times*  
4 *Higher Education (THE)*, 27 December, available at:  
5 <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/open-access-germany-best-deal-no-deal> (accessed  
6 6 January 2018).
- 7 Holcombe, A. and Wilson, M.C. (2017), "Fair Open Access: returning control of scholarly journals to  
8 their communities", *Impact of Social Sciences*, 23 October, available at:  
9 [http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2017/10/23/fair-open-access-returning-control-](http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2017/10/23/fair-open-access-returning-control-of-scholarly-journals-to-their-communities/)  
10 [of-scholarly-journals-to-their-communities/](http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2017/10/23/fair-open-access-returning-control-of-scholarly-journals-to-their-communities/) (accessed 9 January 2018).
- 11  
12 Huang, Yan-Jyi. (2016), "Taiwan Tech to Discontinue Subscription to Elsevier ScienceDirect Starting  
13 2017 - NTUST Library", available at: [http://library.ntust.edu.tw/files/16-1025-](http://library.ntust.edu.tw/files/16-1025-58346.php?Lang=en)  
14 [58346.php?Lang=en](http://library.ntust.edu.tw/files/16-1025-58346.php?Lang=en) (accessed 5 January 2018).
- 15 International Publishers Association (2016). *Annual Report 2015-2016*. International Publishers  
16 Association, Geneva.
- 17 "Joseph Cummings Rowell, 1853-1938 [In Memoriam, 1939]". (n.d.). , available at:  
18 [http://content.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb0m3n99bs&brand=calisphere&doc.view=entire\\_text](http://content.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb0m3n99bs&brand=calisphere&doc.view=entire_text)  
19 (accessed 27 October 2017).
- 20  
21 Kopp, J.J. (1998), "Library consortia and information technology: The past, the present, the promise",  
22 *Information Technology and Libraries; Chicago*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 7–12.
- 23 Krajewski, M. and Krapp, P. (2011), *Paper Machines: About Cards & Catalogs, 1548-1929*, MIT Press,  
24 Cambridge, Mass.
- 25 Lawlor, H.J., Armstrong, E.C.R. and Lindsay, W.M. (1916), "The Cathach of St. Columba", *Proceedings*  
26 *of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature*, Vol. 33,  
27 pp. 241–4.
- 28 "Letter to MLA Bibliography Customers". (2018). Modern Language Association, available at:  
29 [https://www.mla.org/Publications/MLA-International-Bibliography/About-the-MLA-](https://www.mla.org/Publications/MLA-International-Bibliography/About-the-MLA-International-Bibliography/Letter-to-MLA-Bibliography-Customers)  
30 [International-Bibliography/Letter-to-MLA-Bibliography-Customers](https://www.mla.org/Publications/MLA-International-Bibliography/About-the-MLA-International-Bibliography/Letter-to-MLA-Bibliography-Customers) (accessed 29 July 2018).
- 31 *Library Journal: Journal of the American Library Association*. (1877). F. Leypoldt, New York. vol. 1.  
32 *Library of Congress and American Library Association (Eds.). (1968), The National Union*  
33 *Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints: A Cumulative Author List Representing Library of Congress*  
34 *Printed Cards and Titles Reported by Other American Libraries, Mansell, London*.
- 35  
36 Lyons, K. (2018), "'Twaddle': librarians respond to suggestion Amazon should replace libraries",  
37 *The Guardian*, 23 July, available at: [http://www.theguardian.com/books/2018/jul/23/twaddle-](http://www.theguardian.com/books/2018/jul/23/twaddle-librarians-respond-to-suggestion-amazon-should-replace-libraries)  
38 [librarians-respond-to-suggestion-amazon-should-replace-libraries](http://www.theguardian.com/books/2018/jul/23/twaddle-librarians-respond-to-suggestion-amazon-should-replace-libraries) (accessed 26 July 2018).
- 39 McKenzie, L. (2018), "Reports of libraries' demise, based on flawed jobs data, are greatly exaggerated",  
40 available at: [https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/01/05/reports-libraries-demise-](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/01/05/reports-libraries-demise-based-flawed-jobs-data-are-greatly-exaggerated)  
41 [based-flawed-jobs-data-are-greatly-exaggerated](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/01/05/reports-libraries-demise-based-flawed-jobs-data-are-greatly-exaggerated) (accessed 10 January 2018).
- 42 Martin, H.-J. (1994), *The History and Power of Writing*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 43 Matthews, D. (2017), "German universities plan for life without Elsevier", *Times Higher Education*  
44 *(THE)*, 5 September, available at: [https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/german-](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/german-universities-plan-life-without-elsevier)  
45 [universities-plan-life-without-elsevier](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/german-universities-plan-life-without-elsevier) (accessed 23 October 2017).
- 46 Matthews, D. (2017), "'No deal' between Germany and Elsevier: what would it mean?", *Times Higher*  
47 *Education (THE)*, 3 August, available at: [https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/no-deal-](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/no-deal-between-germany-and-elsevier-what-would-it-mean)  
48 [between-germany-and-elsevier-what-would-it-mean](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/no-deal-between-germany-and-elsevier-what-would-it-mean) (accessed 22 August 2017).
- 49 OCLC (Ed.). (2016), *OCLC Annual Report*, OCLC, Dublin, Ohio.
- 50 Palumbo, M. (2013), "Leibniz as Librarian", *The Oxford Handbook of Leibniz: Edited by Maria Rosa*  
51 *Antognazza*, available at:  
52 [http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199744725.001.0001/oxford](http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199744725.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199744725-e-008)  
53 [hb-9780199744725-e-008](http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199744725.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199744725-e-008) (accessed 24 October 2017).
- 54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Payne, L. (2007), *Library Storage Facilities and the Future of Print Collections in North America*, OCLC  
4 Programs and Research, Dublin, Ohio, available at:  
5 <http://www.oclc.org/programs/publications/reports/2007-01.pdf> (accessed 26 July 2018)
- 6 Peterson, K.G. (1982), "Joseph C. Rowell and California's Bacon Library", *The Journal of Library History*  
7 (1974-1987), Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 278–290.
- 8 "PLOS ONE: accelerating the publication of peer-reviewed science". (n.d.)., available at:  
9 <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/publication-fees> (accessed 6 November 2017).
- 10 *The Publishers' Circular and Booksellers' Record*, (1874) 8 Dec, p. 902
- 11 "QNL Extends Partnership with British Library", (2018), available at:  
12 <https://www.qnl.qa/en/about/news/qnl-extends-partnership-british-library> (accessed 30 July  
13 2018).
- 14 "QS World University Rankings 2018". (2017),, available at:  
15 <https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2018>.
- 16 Rayward, W.B. (1994), "Visions of Xanadu: Paul Otlet (1868-1944) and Hypertext", *Journal of*  
17 *the American Society for Information Science*, Vol. 45 No. 4, pp. 235–250.
- 18 "Researchers resign editorship of Elsevier journals". (n.d.)., available at:  
19 [https://www.hrk.de/press/press-releases/press-release/meldung/researchers-resign-editorship-  
20 of-elsevier-journals-4237](https://www.hrk.de/press/press-releases/press-release/meldung/researchers-resign-editorship-of-elsevier-journals-4237) (accessed 10 January 2018).
- 21 Roberts, C.H. and T. C Skeat. (1983), *The Birth of the Codex / Colin H. Roberts and T.C. Skeat*, Oxford  
22 University Press for the British Academy, London.
- 23 "ScienceDirect | Elsevier's leading information solution | Elsevier". (n.d.)., available at:  
24 <https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/sciencedirect> (accessed 5 November 2017).
- 25 Spezi, V., Wakeling, S., Pinfield, S., Creaser, C., Fry, J. and Willett, P. (2017), "Open-access mega-  
26 journals: The future of scholarly communication or academic dumping ground? A review",  
27 *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 73 No. 2, pp. 263–283.
- 28 Staikos, K. (2004), *The History of the Library in Western Civilization*, Oak Knoll Press ; HES & De Graaf  
29 Publishers ; Kotinos Publications, New Castle, Del. : 't-Goy-Houten, Netherlands : Athens,  
30 Greece.
- 31 Vogel, G. (2017), "German researchers resign from Elsevier journals in push for nationwide open  
32 access", *Science | AAAS*, 13 October, available at:  
33 [http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/10/german-researchers-resign-elsevier-journals-push-  
34 nationwide-open-access](http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/10/german-researchers-resign-elsevier-journals-push-nationwide-open-access) (accessed 23 October 2017).
- 35 Vogel, G. and Kupferschmid, K. (2017), "A bold open-access push in Germany could change the  
36 future of academic publishing", *Science | AAAS*, 23 August, available at:  
37 [http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/08/bold-open-access-push-germany-could-change-  
38 future-academic-publishing](http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/08/bold-open-access-push-germany-could-change-future-academic-publishing) (accessed 23 October 2017).
- 39 Weber, D.C. (1976), "A Century of Cooperative Programs Among Academic Libraries", *College &*  
40 *Research Libraries*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 205–221.
- 41 "What's in JSTOR". [n.d.]. About JSTOR <<https://about.jstor.org/whats-in-jstor/>> [accessed 1  
42 November 2017]
- 43 Wilkinson, Endymion Porter. 2013. *Chinese History: A New Manual*, Harvard-Yenching Institute  
44 Monograph Series, 84, 2nd rev. ed (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center)
- 45 Witty, F. J. (1958), "The Pinakes of Callimachus", *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*,  
46 28.2: 132–36
- 47 Wong, S.C. (2016), "Collaboration on print decisions to release capacity for diverse forms of study",  
48 available at: [https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/oclc/events/2016/APRC2016/Collaboration-  
49 on-print-decisions-to-release-capacity-Dr-Shirley-Chiu-wing-Wong.pdf](https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/oclc/events/2016/APRC2016/Collaboration-on-print-decisions-to-release-capacity-Dr-Shirley-Chiu-wing-Wong.pdf). (accessed 30 July 2018).
- 50 "World University Rankings 2018". (2017), *Times Higher Education (THE)*, 18 August, available at:  
51 [https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2018/world-ranking  
52 \(accessed 6 November 2017\).](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2018/world-ranking)
- 53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 “WorldShare Interlibrary Loan facts and statistics”. (2017). , available at:  
4 <https://www.oclc.org/en/worldshare-ill/statistics.html> (accessed 28 October 2017).  
5 Wormann, C.D. (1968), “Aspects of International Library Co-operation: Historical and  
6 Contemporary”, *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 338–351.  
7 Wright, A. (2014), *Cataloging the World: Paul Otlet and the Birth of the Information Age*, Oxford  
8 University Press, Oxford ; New York.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Library Management