

These revised sections were mailed out during the summer of 1929. Returns came back slowly, but by mid-October most of them were in hand. It was evident from the most casual inspection of their replies that the experts disagreed violently. Changing only the names of the subject and the institution, it is quite truthful to say that a professor of psychology at Colgate might report that he had spent many hours going over the tentative list; that it seemed to him in every way a sound and admirable production and that with only the few minor changes which he indicated herewith it would serve its purpose excellently. The following mail might bring a letter from a professor of psychology at Oberlin saying that the same psychology list which had been submitted to him was terrible. He had had to scrap it entirely, and although he was conscious of the defects of his inclosed list (a thoroughly new and reclassified production) it was nevertheless a far better job than the miserable thing which had come to him. Perhaps the most extreme case of disagreement was in the case of the zoölogy section. The original tentative list went out with the approval of the Swarthmore department. It contained 267 titles. Some of the checkers found little to question in it. Two agreed only that it was too generous a provision of books. One wrote, "I have checked those books which it would be desirable to have accessible to the student though I realize that no undergraduate student (unless a prodigy) would be likely to consult any large proportion of them." Of the 267 titles he selected 68 and rejected 199. He added a few titles. Another reviser wrote in the same vein. He selected 43 titles and rejected 224. He, too, suggested a few additional titles. The selections of these two revisers agreed on only 17 of the original 267 titles. There was no agreement on the suggested additions. This, as I have said, is the worst instance of disagreement, but it is suggestive of what occurred in nearly every subject. The disparities were so great that an additional check was decided upon. The cards were rearranged another time and each section of each list divided into three parts; the first containing those books on which there seemed to be a very general agreement as to inclusion; the second (a much smaller section) showing those which had appeared on the tentative lists and which had been generally rejected by the extra-mural group of checkers; and a third lengthy section which included the doubtful titles--those which had been questioned by perhaps two revisers and those which had been suggested for addition by a single reviser. The material was typed again in this form and sent out to a dozen or more librarians of college libraries with a statement of the purpose of the list and a request to indicate whether any of the titles in the first section did not deserve inclusion, whether any of the titles in the second section deserved to be restored and a request to express their judgment about the inclusion of the titles listed in the third part. This revised set of lists was distributed during the winter season of 1929-30. By the spring of 1930 marked copies were back, and in the light of the advice received from the Swarthmore faculty, the extra-mural group of college teachers, and the group of college librarians the compiler began to make the final