In the wake of inflation, the devaluation of the dollar against foreign currencies and a persistent decline of federal and state support, an increasing number of the nation's research libraries have, over the past decade, sought outside funding to supplement their operational and acquisitions budgets. In that time, a small body of literature on the subject has accumulated, most of it practical or descriptive in nature, and some of it useful. Since the tenets of library fund raising for special collections essentially are the same ones employed in fund raising for research libraries generally, this body of literature can serve as a basic introduction for special collections librarians who are thinking of mounting a fund raising effort. In what follows I have attempted to outline some of the more important general principles of library fund raising that have application for special collections. The ensuing remarks may appear self-evident but that is as it should be, since there is very little mystery to fund raising. Rather, it is a matter of common sense combined with persistence and not a little audacity.

COORDINATION OF EFFORT

External fund raising has been an integral part of the administration of most special collections departments for many years. In particular, special collections librarians have endeavored to convince donors of collections to accompany their gifts with endowments designed to augment, catalogue, and publicize the gift.
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In addition, special collections personnel often have been involved in raising money for capital projects intended to provide new or improved quarters for the materials in their care. It has been only in the relatively recent past, however, that libraries in general, and, to some extent, special collections departments, have turned to large-scale, diverse, and virtually continual fund raising efforts to augment their acquisitions and operating budgets.

Because there is a finite pool of funding sources available to any institution, coordination of effort is a key element in successful fund raising. This coordination is necessary both within the library and between the library and its parent institution, as, for example, the university and its development office. For special collections, coordination of fund raising presents both opportunities and difficulties. Frequently, special collections can profit from the parent library's fund raising efforts if the needs of special collections can be integrated into the overall appeal. This integration is especially true in raising external money for such visible needs as capital projects, acquisitions endowments, or automation requirements such as online catalogues or microcomputers. The principal challenge centers upon the effort that may be required to insinuate special collections into the parent library's list of most important desiderata. If successful, further difficulties may arise in negotiating a fund raising effort that adequately satisfies the needs of special collections without overwhelming the other components of the parent library's appeal. Finally, if special collections is to be included in a coordinated fund raising effort, special collections personnel should expect to become deeply involved in carrying out the program, regardless of whether the primary responsibility for fund raising rests in the library or with the university development office. Despite the resulting time and labor for special collections personnel, direct involvement has its benefits, in particular in that it ensures that special collections interests are sufficiently addressed as the fund raising program goes forward.

When planning or implementing a fund raising effort, coordination with the university development office is equally crucial to coordination within the library system. Universities discourage or prohibit substantial fund raising efforts that are not approved by the institution's central administration. Further, most universities insist that all fund raising be coordinated with, and usually governed by, the central development office, the reason being the university's need to monitor funding priorities and to oversee and control donor solicitation. Consequently, fund raising efforts intended to benefit special collections usually involve the development office, either directly or indirectly. To bypass coordination with the development office will almost certainly lead to strained relations and may produce obstacles serious enough to compromise the success of the library's fund raising effort.

Once established, coordination between the library and the development of-
vice must be monitored continually by the library. Without almost daily contact, the library is likely to discover that, with the best of intentions, the development office has submitted grant applications that are inaccurate in terms of library needs, or that it has accepted contributions accompanied by conditions which may be unacceptable to the library. It is a perilous policy to entrust the entire responsibility for fund raising to the development office, and no matter how irksome and time consuming it may be, constant communication pays off in the long run.

While the foregoing observations apply to most academically situated special collections, it should be noted that in a relatively few universities the special collections unit is traditionally self-supported, usually through a long-established body of major donors. These individuals often provide continuing support, through annual giving and/or endowments, for both acquisitions and such operating expenses as staff, publications, conservation and exhibition programs. Occasionally, even large and very expensive projects, for example new or renovated quarters for special collections, will be funded by such a group. Nurturing a circumscribed group of donors, no matter how generous, is an arduous task, and relying almost exclusively upon them for special collections' support can be hazardous on many counts. From the standpoint of fund raising, self-supported special collections may find it difficult to be accepted as a participant in a library-wide campaign. Worse yet, there is the danger that in a library- or institution-wide campaign, attempts may be made to "poach" upon the special collections' roster of donors. Therefore, it behooves the head of self-supported special collections units to guard zealously long-time donors while exploring ways to incorporate special collections into opportunities provided by cooperation with the parent library or institution. And, even though self-supporting, it is wise for these special collections to coordinate any plans for fund raising with the central library administration, since the university librarian will expect to be apprised of fund raising efforts to be undertaken by any campus library unit.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MODELS FOR FUND RAISING**

There is no particular pattern for external academic library fund raising. The organizational model normally is determined by established local traditions of fund raising, by staff availability, and by the type of fund raising program to be undertaken. A 1978 survey of twelve academic research libraries described by the situation as follows:

Half of the libraries visited have designated an individual on their staff who is concerned with fund raising. Two of the six are full time staff members whose sole responsibility is fund raising. The other four include an Assistant Director
for Special Collections who is paid one-third by the Development Office; a half-
time Assistant to the Director; a faculty member who works three-quarter time;
and a full-time position concerned with copyright, legal suits and governmental
relations as well as fund raising.

Ten years on, there would still appear to be no generally accepted pattern for
staffing library fund raising efforts. In contrast to the above survey, however,
some universities are assigning central development office staff to library fund
raising, either full or part time. While this assignment can be of great benefit to
the library, development office staff often have no library background; this lack
of background in turn means that library staff, often including special collections librarians, must devote considerable time to educating development offi-
cers and participating directly in the cultivation of potential donors. Such direct
coordination and participation is perhaps the key; no matter how much support
and cooperation the library has from the central development office, the staff of
the library must be directly and continually involved in the fund raising effort if
it is to succeed.

FUND RAISING STRATEGIES

Once administrative approval has been obtained for external fund raising and
once questions of coordination, staffing and division of responsibility have been
resolved, attention can be turned to the mechanics of raising money. Among the
important matters requiring careful consideration are budget relief, donor iden-
tification, cultivation and solicitation techniques, and securing seed money.

Budget Relief—Institutional budget relief is often built into fund raising cam-
paigns, including those for libraries, and it is important to negotiate matters re-
lated to budget relief at the beginning of the planning process. Librarians are
accustomed to a percentage of grant money being siphoned away from an inten-
tended project to pay institutional indirect costs, but the same principle often
applies to other forms of fund raising as well. For example, if the fund raising
effort is intended to raise money for endowment, the university may well reduce
its annual appropriation by a percentage based on new endowment income.
Similarly for capital projects, a percentage is often retained by the institution to
endow a building maintenance fund. Since it is unlikely that 100 percent of the
money brought in through a fund raising effort will be applied to the project for
which support is being sought, the library administration is well advised to de-
termine how fund raising will be affected by budget relief. The usual outcome of
negotiating budget relief is that the amount of the total goal is inflated to the
extent that the project can be adequately funded while simultaneously adding to
the university’s coffers.
Seed money—One of the fundamental axioms of fund raising is that it is best to begin a campaign with some of the money, preferably 10 percent or better, already in hand. This allows the campaign to start with the illusion, if not the reality, of being well underway. If the seed money is in the form of a challenge, it has the added advantage of igniting and sustaining a fire beneath the fund raising staff. Depending upon the nature of the funding program, grants can often serve as seed money. For example, the Challenge Grant Program of the National Endowment for the Humanities has been especially useful in providing up to $750,000, and even more, for such diverse projects as new or renovated buildings for special collections; the establishment of acquisitions endowments for both general and special collections; automation; and staff, including both curatorial and conservation staff for special collections materials. Other, non-challenge granting agencies and foundations, ranging from the Title II-C program of the Higher Education Act, to the Pew Memorial Trust, to locally oriented public and private foundations can also provide helpful amounts of seed money.

A second potential source of seed money is the university itself. The administration may well find that “priming the pump” in order to highlight the campaign is a worthwhile investment, and it is a rare university that does not have a presidential discretionary fund of other unspecified funds that are set aside either for emergencies or unusual opportunities. A third potential source of seed money is the alumni/ae. If even a small handful of alumni/ae contribute a substantial amount toward the campaign’s kickoff, and allow their generosity to be used for publicizing the campaign, considerable enthusiasm can be quickly generated amongst other alumni/ae. However it is initiated, this “bandwagon” effect among the alumni/ae is one of the most potent forces for raising money within the academic environment, and it is a force that should be assiduously cultivated by the fund raising staff.

Identifying individual donors—Except for long-time library supporters, identifying individual library donors is an inexact undertaking. For academic libraries, there are usually three possibilities: alumni/ae, parents, and “friends,” those individuals without ties to the institution but who have an interest in the institution, its library or in bookish matters generally. Because it is impossible to winnow through the entire alumni/ae and parent pools, it is useful to establish some ground rules for identifying a manageable number of promising new donors. Mercenary though it may seem, the first such rule should be to identify at least a small number of potentially large donors. The grassroots approach may swell donor ranks but it seldom brings in substantial amounts of money; and it is generally conceded among development officers that an effort equal to that invested in cultivating “leadership” prospects (especially in time) is required for grassroots cultivation, but with considerably less results. Similarly, mass solici-
tations by mail bring in relatively small amounts of donations and may even produce the negative effect of the “pre-emptive” smaller gift from a donor with far greater potential.

How, then, to identify a core group of potential “leadership” donors? The most effective method is to have access to the records of potential donors’ previous giving to the institution with an eye to searching for similarities between earlier giving and the library’s current fund raising goals. Related clues that can be gleaned from development office records are alumni/ae undergraduate majors or graduate specializations, student activities, occupation, current and former job titles, and avocational interests. Even addresses can be an indication of giving potential. In many university development offices, donor information is maintained in computerized form, and it is a simple matter to compile a list of donors that meet certain specifications. It can be very useful to have a list of alumni/ae and parents who are publishing executives, writers, editors, and the like, especially if they live on Park Avenue between 60th and 80th Streets.

While it is therefore possible to construct a list of potential donors based on the plausibility of matching donor background and interest to the library’s fund raising goals, contributions, including very large ones, often arrive from unanticipated sources. Donors often have interests of which the library and the development office may be unaware, and it is not at all uncommon for a long-time donor to a given university goal, for example sports or scholarships, to give to the library if the library is given a high institutional priority. Quite often a donor who wishes to support a given academic discipline will be willing to make his/her contribution via a gift to the library. It is also true that the interest or allegiance of many donors is to the university itself, not to any one component thereof, and these donors often wait to be advised by the university where funding is most needed. Needless to say, it is difficult to identify or gain access to these “unspecified” donors, without the cooperation of the central development office which especially prizes such individuals because of their flexibility in giving.

Corporate and Foundation Donors—Corporate and foundation giving constitutes a sizable proportion of donations made to academic institutions. Only a relatively small proportion of total gifts and grants from these sources, however, benefits libraries because the emphasis of most corporations and foundations is upon laboratory research, curricular development, financial aid, or areas such as medicine which are perceived to have a greater direct benefit to the public. Even so, there are a handful of national and a considerable number of local corporations and foundations that include libraries among their potential beneficiaries. Although it is perhaps an exaggerated example, and one to be envied, one has only to look at the roster of corporations and foundations that have made very large contributions to the New York Public Library in recent years (including its various special collections) to observe how successful an aggressive fund
raising campaign aimed at foundations and the business world can be. The com-
petition is fierce to be sure, but it is not difficult to identify potential sources or
corporate and foundation giving. There are several published guides that pro-
vide information on areas of giving interest to corporations and foundations,
their location, instructions for application, even the academic affiliations of the
principals responsible for deciding awards; idiosyncratic information is also in-
cluded, such as geographic restrictions on where contributions can be made,
whether sectarian institutions may apply, and whether contributions may be
used for endowment (most do not support endowment). In addition, many uni-
versity development offices also maintain a library of corporate and foundation
annual reports which can provide highly useful information to the library fund
raiser.

The unit of the university’s central development office that has responsibility
for corporations and foundations also can smooth the way for library fund rais-
ing in ways other than providing information. Often the corporations and foun-
dations office will have inside knowledge as to the unpublished preferences and
peculiarities of a potential funding source. Frequently the staff will know, and
make intercession for the library with, either alumni/ae who sit on the boards of
a given funding source or the office staff who handle incoming proposals. Fur-
ther, the corporations and foundations staff can help in composing proposals
that are tailored to the requirements of a specific funding source. Of consid-
erable potential importance to the library is the role that the corporations and
foundations office can play in integrating a library component, usually for ac-
quisitions funds, into a proposal whose main purpose is to support a research
project or a new curricular endeavor. The library, not to mention special collec-
tions, is usually unaware of changing research and curricular developments and
is often unprepared to meet the needs generated by newly funded academic en-
deavors. With the assistance of the corporations and foundations office, the li-
brary and its special collections can learn of new areas of faculty interest and can
sometimes successfully insinuate itself into a funding proposal.

Government Grants—Public funds, especially federal grants, are the most fa-
miliar and most readily identifiable source of funds available to libraries. The
various programs of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Depart-
ment of Education and the National Historical Records and Publications Com-
mission are familiar to most library administrations and to most special collec-
tions units as well. Many states and municipalities have granting agencies
similar to those of the federal government, although the grants tend to be smaller
and often display a preference for public outreach projects. Special collections
have over the years been major beneficiaries of public grants, since many of the
programs require project proposals to demonstrate the importance and unusual
nature of the collections which will be aided by the grant. And there are no ma-
JOR AREAS OF FUND RAISING INTEREST TO RESEARCH LIBRARIES OR THEIR SPECIAL COLLECTIONS THAT ARE INELIGIBLE FOR PUBLIC GRANT SUPPORT. LIBRARY BUILDING PROJECTS, ENDOWMENT, ACQUISITIONS, PROCESSING AND CATALOGUING, PRESERVATION, EXHIBITIONS, PUBLICATIONS, AND SCHOLARLY PROGRAMS ALL ROUTINELY RECEIVE SUPPORT FROM PUBLIC FUNDING SOURCES, ALTHOUGH APPLICANTS SHOULD BE AWARE OF SHIFTING FOCI OF AGENCY INTEREST. FOR EXAMPLE, THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S TITLE II-C PROGRAM HAS RECENTLY TRANSFERRED ITS EMPHASIS FROM BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL TO THE RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION OF CATALOGUE RECORDS INTO MACHINE READABLE DATA. WHILE THERE IS STRONG COMPETITION FOR PUBLIC FUNDS, THE APPLICATION PROCESS IS INEVITABLY TEDIOUS, AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE GRANT USUALLY CUMBERSOME, PUBLIC GRANTS CAN BE AMONG THE LARGEST AND MOST RELIABLE CONTRIBUTORS TO A LIBRARY'S FUND RAISING EFFORT, AND ON BALANCE ARE WELL WORTH THE TROUBLE.

CULTIVATION/SOLICITATION TECHNIQUES—WHEN A GROUP OF POTENTIAL INDIVIDUAL OR CORPORATE DONORS HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED, THEY MUST BE PROPERLY "CULTIVATED," TO USE A COMMON DEVELOPMENT TERM. IT IS AT THIS POINT THAT SPECIAL EVENTS, MAILINGS, CAMPUS VISITS AND PERSONAL CONTACT BEGIN TO BEAR FRUIT; BUT THE TYPE AND EXTENT OF THE CULTIVATION TECHNIQUES TO BE EMPLOYED SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY THE NATURE OF THE FUND RAISING GOAL, THE POOL OF POTENTIAL DONORS, AND INSTITUTIONAL CUSTOM. IT IS IMPORTANT ALSO TO HAVE A REALISTIC UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT CULTIVATION CAN AND CANNOT ACCOMPLISH. IN AND OF THEMSELVES, GLOSSY BROCHURES, ELEGANT DINNERS AND SPECIAL EVENTS DO NOT USUALLY RESULT IN A SPONTANEOUS RETURN IN THE FORM OF SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS, AND THE LIBRARIAN WHO EXPECTS TO CONCLUDE A SUCCESSFUL FUND RAISING EFFORT THROUGH SUCH SUBTLE MEANS IS DOOMED TO DISAPPOINTMENT. INDEED, MANY UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICES DISCOURAGE THE USE OF ELABORATE, LARGE-SCALE CULTIVATION TECHNIQUES ON THE PREMISE THAT THE RESULTS DO NOT JUSTIFY THE EFFORT AND EXPENSE WHICH CAN BE BETTER APPLIED DIRECTLY TO MORE FOCUSED SOLICITATION.

LIMITATIONS ASIDE, SOME FORM OF CULTIVATION IS ESSENTIAL IN ORDER TO PUBLICIZE THE FUND RAISING EFFORT. THE KEY IS TO ASSESS CAREFULLY WHAT SORT AND HOW MUCH CULTIVATION IS MOST APPROPRIATE FOR THE SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE CAMPAIGN. A CLEAR, CONCISE CASE STATEMENT, WHICH NEED NOT BE EXPENSIVELY PRINTED, IS A NECESSARY TOOL, BOTH FOR PURPOSES OF REFERENCE BY DEVELOPMENT STAFF AND FOR USE WHEN THE "ASK" IS MADE OF A POTENTIAL DONOR. THE CASE STATEMENT CAN BE EXPANDED IF A MORE ELABORATE BROCHURE IS DESIRABLE, FOR EXAMPLE TO ILLUSTRATE NAMING "OPPORTUNITIES" IN A NEW OR RENOVATED BUILDING, AND IT CAN BE USED AS THE BASIS FOR PROPOSALS TO FOUNDATIONS AND PUBLIC AGENCIES. CULTIVATION EVENTS AND CAMPUS VISITS CAN SERVE TO DIRECTLY ACQUAINT POTENTIAL DONORS WITH THE FUND RAISING OBJECTIVE; BUT AGAIN, IT IS NECESSARY TO FOLLOW UP QUICKLY WITH A DIRECT SOLICITATION. AN EVENT OR VISIT THAT HAS NO CLEARLY STATED PURPOSE MAY CONFUSE OR EVEN OFFEND A POTENTIAL DONOR WHILE A DELAYED FOLLOW-UP, OR NONE AT ALL, WILL LIKELY PRODUCE NOTHING BEYOND GENERAL GOOD WILL.

WITH ALL THE PLANNING, EFFORT AND EXPENSE THAT IS INVESTED IN THE PRELIMINARY
aspects of fund raising, it follows that great care should be taken when devising the best approach for making the actual solicitation. Who, how, even where the solicitation is made are all matters for deliberate and thoughtful strategy. For very large “asks,” those in the mid-six figures and up, most universities utilize the persuasive powers of the senior administration, very often the president. In such cases involving the library, it falls to the relevant staff to prepare the solicitor and occasionally to accompany him/her when the solicitation is made. Volunteers, for example well-known alumni/ae, also often make very effective solicitors of important potential donors, but here again the library must prepare and often accompany them as they solicit on the library’s behalf.

If the fund raising effort is being centrally administered through the development office, most of the solicitation may devolve upon the development staff. While this procedure may relieve the library staff of the responsibility for direct solicitation by placing it in the hands of those who are accustomed to ask for money, it also removes the most critical component of the fund raising effort from the library’s control. Though this solicitation model has much to recommend it from the library’s point of view, it underscores the need for a considerable degree of coordination and cooperation between the library and the development office, for without such cooperation the library has no regular vehicle to monitor the solicitation process.

Even when the library fund raising effort is being centrally administered through the central development office, circumstances may indicate librarians themselves to be the most suitable solicitors of certain potential contributors. Because of their relatively greater experience in appealing to donors, this prospect is not as likely to traumatize special collections librarians as it is their colleagues elsewhere in the library, but it should be remembered that asking for money differs somewhat from asking for books or manuscripts. There is not necessarily an intellectual or social bond based upon a common interest in books and collecting, which means that the solicitation must either “sell” itself on its own merits or appeal to other impulses, such as institutional loyalty.

When asking for money, the common wisdom is that the direct approach is more effective than subtle hints, the assumption being that potential donors are sophisticated, busy people and that they know, or ought to be told in advance, that they are going to be solicited. As I have already noted, for substantial requests, a face-to-face solicitation is almost always preferable to letter or telephone solicitations which are primarily used in soliciting for annual giving rather than large individual donations. The site of the solicitation is often crucial, since the solicitor does not want to be interrupted nor does he/she want the prey to be distracted, or worse, to escape. Therefore, social gatherings, restaurants, or other public locales are ill-advised. If the solicitation is to be made on-campus, the preferable site is, depending upon the circumstances, the office of
the president, provost, head of development, or head of the library. Many development officers believe that the ideal location for soliciting is the quarry's own den. Soliciting in the donor's office or home places the donor in the position of host, thereby making a negative response somewhat more difficult and significantly reducing the chances for flight. The presentation of the request should be as eloquent as the situation permits, but brevity and conciseness are usually more effective than long, detailed disquisitions that may confuse the issue or invite diversionary tactics. Finally, but of the first importance, ask the donor for a specific amount of money; do not leave the amount to the donor. Reticence in this regard may garner $10,000 from a $1,000,000 prospect. While requests should be realistic, most development officers are strongly of the opinion that donors are flattered, not offended, if the solicitor thinks he/she is capable of a substantial contribution, and the result may be a very happy one. If the donor cannot meet the solicitor's expectations, however, it is up to the solicitor to try and arrive at a figure that is acceptable to the donor, preferably on the spot. Should this not be possible, the adroit solicitor will, before withdrawing, alert the donor that there will be a follow-up call in the near future. In short, once the "ask" is made, potential donors should be pursued (though gently and with finesse) either until they contribute or until they make it clear that they will not contribute.

FOLLOWING THROUGH

Much of the success, or failure, of a fund raising campaign is determined by how well the development office and/or the library follows through on administrative details. Keeping accurate records of incoming cash, monitoring pledge payment schedules, properly assigning account numbers so as to ensure that gifts do not stray from their intended purpose, and the prompt and accurate acknowledgement of gifts, are all matters of major importance. Regardless of how meticulous attention to record keeping may be, discrepancies between the library's records and those of the development office are virtually inevitable. Therefore, periodically during a fund raising effort, and particularly at its conclusion, the library and the development office should compare their records.

In the follow-through process, donor relations is equal in importance to good record keeping. As the beneficiary of fund raising the library is the continuing point of contact with donors, and it is an obligation of the library to follow through with donors even if the development office has assumed primary responsibility for donor cultivation and solicitation. It is incumbent upon the library to thank the donor and to acknowledge and honor donor wishes that accompany a contribution. If the library does not wish to become entangled in the
strings that may be attached to a donation, then the donation should be declined. Even eminently reasonable donors may inquire after their room plaque or their bookplate, or they may request a list of books purchased with an endowment they established. The library should be prepared to anticipate and to respond to such requests in a manner that will convince the donor that his/her gift is appreciated, remembered, and serving a good purpose. And woe betide a library that is slipshod in these matters, because an irate donor who is legitimately aggrieved can cause acute embarrassment that may hamper future fund raising efforts.

Perhaps the simplest method of expressing gratitude to a donor in continuing fashion is to extend complimentary membership in the Friends of the Library. Mailings and invitations to Friends events can serve to strengthen the bond established through the initial gift and may well result in additional donations. At best, both the library and the Friends organization benefit indefinitely from their association with an expanded pool of donors; but at the very least, Friends membership will continue to bring the library to the attention of former donors in a routine way that will preclude donor complaints about being forgotten once the check is deposited.

As more colleges and university libraries pursue outside funding, the spoils increasingly will go to those institutions which are best prepared for the rigors of fund raising. Those libraries that assume a leading role in the fund raising process, in balancing tenacity, creativity and resilience with good organization, in coordination of effort within the institution, and in consistently careful management of controllable variables, will reap the greater rewards. Those libraries that do not participate directly and continuously in the process will run the risk of falling behind in the fund raising sweepstakes.

NOTES


3. The most frequently consulted and the most useful of these guides are The Foundation Directory, compiled and published by the Foundation Center (New York); the Taft Foundation Reporter; and the Taft Corporate Giving Directory, both compiled by The Taft Group (Washington, D.C.). New editions of all three directories appear frequently.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discovery of the Pacific and Australia</th>
<th>Mapping of the Stars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laplace: Voyage autour du monde ... Tom 1</td>
<td>Galileo: Sidereus Nuncius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 1833</td>
<td>Venice 1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 85297 001 4</td>
<td>185297 019 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Australian Discovery, Vol. 1</td>
<td>Bayer: Uranometria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney 1865</td>
<td>Augsburg 1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 85297 002 2</td>
<td>185297 021 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson: The present state of Australia</td>
<td>Diggs: A prognostication everlasting ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London 1830</td>
<td>London 1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 85297 003 0</td>
<td>185297 022 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 1837</td>
<td>1745–50 (never published)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 85297 004 9</td>
<td>185297 023 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessou: Voyage autour du monde ... Tom 1</td>
<td>Cellarius: Atlas Coelestis ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 1838</td>
<td>Amsterdam 1708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 85297 006 5</td>
<td>1 85297 024 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price for all 5 volumes</td>
<td>Price for all 5 volumes $1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Antiquities</th>
<th>Books of the Monarchs of England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brees: Railway practice, First Series</td>
<td>James I: De Triplici Nodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London 1837</td>
<td>London 1607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 85297 013 8</td>
<td>1 85297 007 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. &amp; E. Malézieux: Travaux publics des États-Uni ...</td>
<td>Torpolaeus: Diciles coelometricae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 1873</td>
<td>London 1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 85297 014 6</td>
<td>1 85297 008 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muirhead: Life of James Watt</td>
<td>Tucarco: Trois dialogues de l'exercice de sauter ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London 1858</td>
<td>Paris 1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 85297 016 2</td>
<td>1 85297 009 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moseley: The mechanical principles of engineering and architecture</td>
<td>The Second Folio of Shakespeare owned by Charles I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London 1843</td>
<td>London 1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 85297 017 0</td>
<td>1 85297 011 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humber: A practical treatise of cast and wrought iron bridges ...</td>
<td>Bacon: Advancement of learning owned by Charles I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London 1857</td>
<td>Oxford 1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 85297 018 9</td>
<td>1 85297 012 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price for all 5 volumes $500</td>
<td>Price for all 5 volumes $750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>