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FOR THE PAST TEN TO FIFTEEN YEARS the cataloging profession all over the world has been intensely concerned with rules for enumerative cataloging, the listing of publications in such a way that those who are seeking them may find them as surely and as efficiently as possible. The prime impetus for this universal concern was the work done by Seymour Lubetzky as part of the enterprise for the revision of the A.L.A. Cataloging Rules of 1949. His analysis of these rules and his design for a cataloging code, embodied in his Cataloging Rules and Principles, and the drafts of his Code of Cataloging Rules, were catalytic in their effect on experts outside as well as inside the United States and sparked the convocation of an International Conference on Cataloguing Principles in 1961. At this meeting delegations from fifty-three countries and twelve international organizations were able to come to agreement with remarkably little dissent on an extensive “Statement of Principles.” This statement, referred to hereafter as the Paris Principles, was taken, with relatively little modification, as the basis for the development of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules by the governing bodies for the project, the committees of the American, British, and Canadian Library Associations and the Library of Congress.

It is clear that a predominating feature of the recent ferment of activity in this field of cataloging has been the effort to determine valid principles that should underlie rules for entry. National codes of rules based on such principles should not only result in catalogs that serve their purpose effectively locally but also provide a basis for undertaking international bibliographical and cataloging projects and for the nationals of one country to use catalogs in other countries with minimal difficulty.

It is the purpose of this article to show that the provisions dealing with choice of main entry in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules and in the Paris Principles exhibit considerable interplay of mutually inconsistent principles and that there is no single principle that is generally acceptable as an adequate solution to all the problems. That this should be so may come as less of a surprise to those who have not been closely...
involved in the theory of cataloging rules when they learn that A. H. Chaplin, who composed the original draft for the Paris Principles, says that "the document entitled Statement of Principles which was produced by that conference was not, I think I can safely say, a statement of general principles of catalog construction at all; it was rather a set of general rules blending various traditions and designed to provide a basis for international uniformity in cataloguing."6

In any discussion of principles of choice of main entry it is useful to have clearly in mind that the need for any entry to be chosen as a main entry depends on the fact that there are many situations in which that entry will be the only approach to the work in question. We are so used to multiple entry catalogs that we tend to forget the bibliographical situations in which there is only single access; for example, most union catalogs, many bibliographies, order lists, accessions lists, and catalog entries that cite a book as a subject or as a related work. In all bibliographical activities there is a general need for a standard mode of identifying a work. Were it not for these considerations, we could construct satisfactory multiple entry catalogs without having to concern ourselves at all with the problem of having to designate any particular entry as the main entry. We can properly appraise some of the issues that will be dealt with further on only if we bear in mind that the main entry may sometimes have to serve as the sole entry.

When we come to examine the rules for choice of main entry in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules we shall find that four different attributes of bibliographical entities, one a primary attribute and three secondary attributes, may at one time or another be used as main entry. They are (1) title, (2) author, (3) category, and (4) name most strongly associated with the work. Any one of these attributes has some potentiality as a general system or principle of main entry. One is followed in the rules with such a degree of consistency that it may be regarded as the basic principle on which the rules are structured. This principle is, of course, the author principle. The term "author principle" is, however, a shorthand way of referring to a principle that is more complex than the term would indicate. Its real meaning would be more apparent if it were called the "author and title principle." The "and title" addition is significant in two regards. First, it is generally accepted as part of the principle that works whose author or principal author is unknown or whose authorship is indeterminate are to be entered under title. Conversely, entry of such works under title is not considered to involve any contrary principle. Second, it is generally understood, but almost never expressed, that the entry under the author is to be followed by the title, either as given on the title page or in a form selected by the cataloger to represent all editions, translations, etc., of the work, regardless of the various titles these publications bear. I shall use the term "author principle" in the generally accepted sense defined above.

Why is it that the author principle is the one we use as our basic principle? On the face of it, it is an indirect and roundabout way to list
books. Persons and corporate bodies are naturally listed by their names. Why should books not be listed by their names, i.e., their titles? If it be objected that many titles are identical, it may be countered that many names of persons are identical. In any event, identical titles may be readily differentiated by their authors' names just as entries under an author's name must be completed by specification of the title. If it be objected that a work may appear under different titles or under titles in different languages, it may be countered that authors may write under different names or under different forms of the name. In either case the same remedy is available—a uniform heading, with necessary references from the variants. If it be objected that the exact form of title may not be remembered or that citations to it may be inexact, it may be countered that authors' names may be forgotten entirely or remembered inexacty.

The pinch on the title principle is a little tighter here, however. There are many titles that are rather discursive and that do not serve very effectively as names of the works to which they apply. Although in some cases relief may be provided by the selection of certain elements of the title to serve as a conventional uniform entry for the work, in others the provision of adequate assistance to readers who know the title imprecisely would severely tax any system of references. It must be confessed the title principle does not function too well when titles are of this character but it is also true that under the author principle there are many works of corporate authorship that are decidedly difficult for readers to find under the author entry. And how effective is entry under author for works that are published anonymously?

On the basis of the considerations that have been set forth so far, it would appear that there are some cases in which single entry listings of works under the indirect attribute of authorship would be the more effective, providing the author's name is known; in all other cases direct entry under title would be more effective, whether the author's name is known or not. The case for the adoption of either one or the other of the two principles as a basic principle for the entry of all works does not yet seem to be conclusive.

Historically we know that early bibliographies were normally arranged by title. In Oriental bibliography this method has extended into modern times—in some cases it extends into the present. In Western tradition, however, entry under author has long since superseded the earlier tradition of entry under title and is now accepted as perfectly natural. The course of history, however, shows that in fact it is not the "natural" mode of entry.

I contend that our decided preference for the author principle has not resulted so much from its intrinsic merits as a system for listing particular bibliographical entities as from its great extrinsic merit of providing the collocation of the works of each author as a by-product. Author entry not only provides a reasonably effective system of fulfilling the basic objective of listing individual works but it is a single entry system that also fulfills a very desirable secondary objective, the display of the intellectual
products of each author. Its dominance as a principle of main entry is thus less a matter of its virtue as an abstract principle as it is a matter of its pragmatic utility. I have dwelt upon this matter at some length because it relates to a point I wish to make at the end of this inquiry.

How consistently has the author principle been applied in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules? Insofar as works of single personal authorship are concerned, there are no out-and-out exceptions unless one were to make the case that works that are considered to be sacred scriptures and that have been written down by an identified person should be entered under the writer. The rule in question, 274, requires entry under title, neither human nor divine authorship having been accepted in this case. It is in the realm of works of multiple authorship, collections of independent works by different authors, and works of corporate or indeterminate authorship that various counter-principles come into play.

The provision in rule 4 for entry under editor of certain works produced under editorial direction might appear to involve the principle of entry under the name most strongly associated with the work but in the thinking of the editor and of the Catalog Code Revision Committee it is an extension of the authorship principle to cover the primary responsibility for the existence of the work in the sense of the initial conception, the motivating force, and the control over its development, without which the work would not have come into being. Although he is ordinarily designated on the book as "editor," entry under this person is to be without designation because his role in the production of the work is far more fundamental than that of a technical editor.

Rule 5, the rule for collections, however, specifies entry under the compiler when he is named on the title page and further specifies the addition of the designation comp., even when he is termed "editor" on the title page. This designation of function is for the purpose of making clear that the person is not the author, even under the extension of the author principle that was made in rule 4. Here indeed is a case of the principle of entry under name most strongly associated with the work. The responsibility of selecting the works that are published in the collection is an important responsibility but it is in no wise an authorship responsibility since the intellectual responsibility of the various works that comprise the collection is totally independent of person who selected them for publication.

Rule 6B, for serials issued under the authority of corporate bodies, exhibits, in addition to the author principle, two counter-principles. The title principle is followed for a serial that is a serially published bibliography, index, directory, biographical dictionary, almanac, or yearbook even if the work is the product of the corporate activity of the body, providing the body is not named in any way in the title. The principle of name most strongly associated with the work is followed for serials with titles that contain the name or abbreviation of the name of the corporate body even if the authorship of the content of the work is diffuse.

* 392 *
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There are two other instances in which the title principle has been followed in preference to the author principle. One is in rule 25D, for interstate agreements, which provides that entry is to be under title even if the agreement is between only two jurisdictions. Under the rule for shared authorship a work by two authors should be entered under the one first named. The strong likelihood of the publication of an interstate agreement by each of the parties, with the publishing party named first in each case, motivated the preference for title entry for such works. The other instance of the title principle is in rule 28, for theological creeds, confessions of faith, etc. Entry under title is specified if the creed, etc., has a conventional title and has been accepted by more than one denominational body, even if it was formulated by a particular corporate body.

It is in the sections of special rules for certain legal and religious publications that the category principle holds sway. Although many rules make use of it, it is used only in what might be regarded as a vestigial form. The fully developed form of the category principle is, of course, the classified catalog in which all works are entered under the category, ordinarily expressed by a symbol, that is most specifically appropriate to the subject content or the form, in accordance with a highly developed, systematic scheme of organization, usually hierarchical in structure. A less full-blown manifestation is the grouping of works according to broad classes of subject matter or form, such as “religion,” “art,” “novels,” “serials,” etc. The category principle may also appear as a counter-principle in alphabetical catalogs. For example, one finds in the main alphabet of the British Museum catalog such entries as “Ephe- merides” under which category are listed many works such as “Letts’s Sunday book-markers for Bibles, prayers, and church services” and “The literary and scientific almanack, for 1845.” Although a restricted use of category headings is authorized under the Paris principles (principle 11.6), no category headings, as such, are used in the Anglo-American rules.

The form in which the category principle does appear in these rules is in the interposition of category specifications between the title and the heading proper, the latter being formed either under the author principle or under the principle of name most strongly associated the work. It should be pointed out that the Catalog Code Revision Committee opposed the interposition of any categories between heading and title except for “Treaties, etc.” (rule 25), which is modified for single treaties by specifications that identify the particular treaty, and categories under headings for personal authors such as “Works,” “Selected works,” “Selections,” “Correspondence,” “Essays,” “Plays,” “Poems,” “Prose works,” “Sonnets,” and “Speeches” (rule 107). The committee also felt that whenever a category is specified it should be interposed in the same position as a uniform title, not as a subheading. Neither of these views of the committee could be maintained in the face of the authorization of category groupings for certain legal documents by the Paris principles.
(principle 9.5), the pressure of research libraries to prevent the necessity for change in extensive files in which categories had been used as subheadings for many years, and the strong support mustered by the American Association of Law Libraries and the American Theological Library Association for the perpetuation of the category subheadings that had been authorized under earlier rules. As a result the new rules retain the principal established category subheadings, although a number of categories that were formerly used and for which no powerful champions arose were eliminated.

The entry of many legal works involves these combinations of principles: in most cases, author and category, in some, name most strongly associated with the work and category. Thus, laws are to be entered under the name of the jurisdiction governed by them, even if another jurisdiction is the promulgator of the law, and the heading for the jurisdiction is to be followed by the appropriate category as a subheading, e.g., Laws, statutes, etc., Ordinances, local laws, etc., or Laws, by-laws, etc. (rule 20).

The rule for constitutions and charters, rule 22, occasionally involves the principle of name most strongly associated with the work because all constitutions and charters of jurisdictions are to be entered under the jurisdiction governed, although some are promulgated by a different jurisdiction. The heading for the jurisdiction is followed in these cases by the appropriate subheading, Constitution or Charter, which is more readily rationalized as a conventional title than as a category. Its position as a subheading instead of as a title is a concession to past practice and the cost of changing existing entries.

In the case of court rules, rule 23, a new category subheading, Court rules, has been added at the behest of the American Association of Law Libraries. This category subheading is preceded by the name of the jurisdiction to which the court governed by the rules belongs. This jurisdiction heading cannot be rationalized according to the author principle excepting when the rules are the product of legislative enactment, in which case it would appear that the category Laws, statutes, etc. would be appropriate. In most cases, however, court rules are made by the supreme court of the jurisdiction, by the court governed by the rules, or by a special body authorized to make them. Nor can the jurisdiction heading be rationalized according to the principle of name most strongly associated with the works, since that would be the name of the court governed by the rules. The headings specified under this rule appear to be subject headings in a distorted form.

Rule 25A1, for bilateral and trilateral treaties, involves a combination of the author principle and the category principle. This rule specifies the subheading Treaties, etc. following the heading for one of the parties to the treaty. The category heading is to be followed by further specifications which identify the particular treaty. For this reason the subheading has been rationalized as a conventional title but in my view this rationalization does not hold water. U. S. documents that are
entered under this subheading, for example, are mainly not treaties in
the proper sense but exchanges of notes, executive agreements, and the
like, which come under the etc. part of the subheading. The latter must
be regarded as a category subheading despite the fact that further specifica-
tions in the subheading individualize the particular document being
cataloged.

The rule for court cases, 26C, provides excellent illustrations of the
principle of name most strongly associated with the work. The pro-
cedings of criminal trials, courts-martial, impeachments, and the like
are entered under the defendant's name with the designation defendant.
Civil suits are entered under the name of the person or body bringing
the suit. This name is the one that customarily appears first in citations
(e.g., Smith vs. Jones). When it comes to appeals, entry is under the
party who brought the suit in the first instance. This is to insure that the
proceedings of an appeal action will be entered under the same name as
the proceedings of the first instance. A designation appropriate to both
the action in the first instance and to the appeal action is added to this
name.

The final example of a counter-principle of entry is in the rule for
liturgical works, 29, where the category subheading, Liturgy and ritual,
is prescribed following the name of the denominational church that
sanctions the particular work. In subrule 29C we come across another
heading that can only be rationalized as a subject heading in distorted
form. This is the heading "Jews. Liturgy and ritual," which is pre-
scribed for Jewish liturgical works.

In this review of the instances of principles in the Anglo-American
Cataloging Rules that run counter to the author principle, I have not
meant to imply that the rules as a whole have been necessarily weakened
thereby although in some of the cases I think this is so. Rather my pur-
pose has been to indicate that, even when not under the constraints of cir-
cumstance, those who have had the responsibility for the rules felt that
there are publications which cannot be effectively cataloged under the au-
thor principle and which can be cataloged more effectively under some
other principle. Earlier in this article I went to some length to explore why
we have come to use the author principle as our basic principle in de-
termining main entry. I concluded with the thesis that we do so not be-
cause it is in some way the natural or the correct principle but because
long experience has shown that it is the principle that yields the greatest
advantages in constructing alphabetical lists of bibliographical entities.
This brings me to some observations on the word "principle." I have
used this word throughout simply because it is the term in ordinary use
for the matters that have been discussed. In my thinking, however, the
term is unfortunate because it carries the connotations of truth as op-
posed to error, of right as opposed to wrong. The "principles" we have
been discussing are more accurately systems of bibliographical listing.
Each system yields different results, with different combinations of ad-
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vantages and disadvantages. The real matters of principle that are involved are that we should construct a catalog that will be as effective an instrument of communication between the readers and the book collection as is possible; that to be fully effective the catalog must be systematically constructed; that insofar as possible a single system should be used; that this system should be in reasonable consonance with the general traditions of bibliographical and other systems of listings with which readers are familiar; and that to the extent the chosen system yields entries that are ineffective or meaningless, effective entries according to some other rational system should be used. These are, I think, propositions of demonstrable truth; propositions that may properly be termed as principles.

REFERENCES

3. The most complete draft was published by the American Library Association in 1960. It was supplemented by Additions, revisions, and changes, in 1961.

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

As announced in the Summer issue of LRTS, the present issue marks the completion of the Festschrift to our late Editor, Esther J. Piercy. Once again, limitations of space have forced the holding of a few articles which were intended for the memorial number. These contributions will appear in the Winter, 1968, issue and will be identified by an editorial note.

Certain changes in the editorial staff and the structure of the Resources and Technical Services Division of ALA are worthy of note. As mentioned earlier, Dr. Paul S. Dunkin, Professor of Library Service, Rutgers—The State University of New Jersey, has assumed the editorship of LRTS. C. Donald Cook replaces Dr. Dunkin as Assistant Editor for the Cataloging and Classification Section, while Elizabeth F. Norton has been designated as Assistant Editor for the Serials Section (replacing William H. Huff). David Turiel, Advertising Assistant, has resigned; his duties have been, at least temporarily, combined with those of the Managing Editor.

The Copying Methods Section of RTSD has been renamed the Reproduction of Library Materials Section. Its Assistant Editor, Allen B. Veaner, continues to serve the Section under its new name.
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MAY 9th, 1883, was rather warm for early May in New York City, and a not inconsiderable amount of heat was being generated in Lafayette Place, at the meeting of the Trustees of the Astor Library. Here a Special Committee was submitting its report on the catalog.¹ It was an eventful day in other respects. There was trouble in Dodge City, and the imposition of martial law was being recommended to the Governor by a group of Kansas City attorneys. Distillers of Kentucky whiskey were concerned about over-production. In Paris, a report was being delivered to a committee of the Chamber of Deputies on the Tonquin Expedition; some 4,000 Annamite, or Chinese troops were attacking HaNoi, but had been repulsed by the French. Captain Kergaradec, the French Envoy to Annam, carried a letter from the President of France to the King of Annam stating that the inability of the King to maintain the security of Tonquin compelled France to establish herself, and inviting the King to recognize the protectorate of that nation. Bringing the place-names of this latter news item up to date with contemporary spelling, Tonkin and Viet Nam, the news has an all too contemporary ring. Sic passim.

Some five weeks earlier the document which was responsible for creating the heat of May 9th had been completed by the special Committee on the Catalogue composed of three of the Astor Library Trustees: President Alexander Hamilton, Henry Drisler and Thomas Masters Markoe. The immediate stimulus to the preparation of their formal report was one of a long series of reports by Charles Alexander Nelson, the Compiler of the Catalogue, on the status of the work, on the propriety of printing separately the first volume of the new Astor Library Catalogue, and on the time required for printing the volume.

Many of the Trustees had been members of the Board during earlier years when Joseph Green Cogswell, the first Superintendent of the library, had produced its first comprehensive book catalog.² Cogswell, working virtually unaided, had produced this catalog in a remarkably short time. Between the latter part of 1856 and the end of 1857 the first two volumes, covering the letters A to L, had been printed. Work was suspended for a year because of the gift of some $9,200 which enabled Cogswell to acquire an additional 10,000 volumes, but the third volume,
letters M-P, was completed in 1859. Following a buying trip to Europe in 1860, he completed the fourth and final volume in the fall of 1861.

The decision to produce a new printed book catalog, to include the acquisitions of the twenty year period between 1860 and 1880, was reached by the Trustees on March 10, 1880 with the resolution to authorize the Superintendent, Robbins Little, to “employ the present working force of the Library in preparing a catalogue both of subjects and authors of the accessions to the Library since 1860.”

Mr. Little evidently foresaw difficulties in attempting to produce a catalog of some 80,000 additions with his limited staff, for the Trustee Minutes of October 6, 1880 record “a suggestion from the Superintendent in relation to a new Catalogue” which was referred to a Special Committee. This group on November 10th recommended authorizing the employment of “two competent persons at a monthly salary to be fixed by the Finance Committee to commence at once the preparation of the . . . Catalogue.” By December the two men were employed at salaries of $75 and $65 per month, the latter sum being the stipend of Charles Nelson who was subsequently designated the Compiler.

Trustee concern about progress on the Catalogue became evident as early as the following spring of 1881, when at the May meeting the Trustee President was authorized to “procure at his discretion such additional assistance and apparatus as may be needed to hasten the completion of the supplemental catalogue.”

Over a year and a half passed in relative serenity. A letter of October 11, 1882 from the Superintendent and a subsequent communication from Mr. Nelson, both on the status of the new catalog, were noted in the Trustee Minutes of November 16 and December 2, 1882. But it was Nelson’s communication presented at the March 7, 1883 meeting which prompted the Trustee Committee to conduct a searching examination of the catalog project, and to bring in their strong condemnation of the lack of progress and of the method of compilation.

It is fullness and form of name which the Special Trustee Committee examines with questioning, concern and dismay, and with numerous references to principles of cataloging which had been enunciated by Cogswell in years past. The Committee expresses its impatience by recording that they “are of opinion and so report that the progress thus far is not satisfactory and that through inadvertence or a misunderstanding of the wishes of the Board, the manner of conducting the work has been too elaborate, involving an amount of time and money without an adequate object.”

Their assumption had been that Nelson’s Catalogue would follow the Cogswell pattern and provide information “to answer the two questions put by Dr. Cogswell in his prefatory notice to the Supplementary Index of his 1857-1861 Catalogue, viz. ‘Has the Library a certain Book? and What has it on a certain subject?’” The Board, Messrs. Markoe, Drisler, and Hamilton confirm, “wish to avoid, no doubt, so far as possible what Dr. Cogswell terms ‘bibliographical quiddling’”—an instance of this ap-
pears in the report of the Compiler of the Catalogue: Champollion's name is familiar to all who know anything about Egyptian Antiquities, but whether his first names were 'Jean Jacques' as many suppose, or 'Jacques Joseph' as they really were seems a waste of time to ascertain; there being no danger of confounding him with any other Author."

The Committee continued by stating, "The full names of Authors, where substantial results were to be obtained, are no doubt desirable in reference to Dr. Cogswell's two questions above stated, but merely such accuracy, as an end, and not as a means, is not as the Committee understand within the wishes or intentions of the Board. The Compiler of the Catalogue estimated that the time required to give the full names of authors is perhaps a quarter of the whole time employed: a certain discretion should no doubt be observed where there may happen to be two authors of note of the same name, but as a rule one Christian name with one initial added to the family name would answer all useful requirements. . . ."

The Committee was, in fact, working toward an exposition of the "no conflict" principle and it is interesting to note that in the following eighty-four years no other Champollion, J.-J. or otherwise, has been entered in the catalogs of The New York Public Library, in which the Astor collections now stand.

The Astor Library Trustees were a patient body of men, and as another year passed one finds the Minutes of March 12 and April 9, 1884, recording the periodic statements from Mr. Nelson on the progress made in preparation of the new Catalogue. By October, 1885, however, patience had worn thin and another Committee was established to investigate and report. Their December 9th findings required the Compiler to report monthly on the number of pages of copy ready for the printer, and they stated that "the Instructions and explanations of the Committee have been so full and clear that there will be no excuse hereafter for not carrying out fully the wishes and intentions of the Board. Already many of the cards have been reduced and unnecessary work thrown out—which should materially reduce the cost and time."

The Nelson Catalogue finally came off the press in four volumes, published from 1886-1888. In a Minute of October 10, 1888, the President reported to the Trustees that the remainder of the force that had been employed on the Catalogue had been discharged on August 1st, the Catalogue having been completed.

Differing opinions were expressed over the years about the quality of the Cogswell and Nelson Catalogues, and the difficulties of using the combination of card catalogs and book catalogs which the Astor maintained. Library Journal took issue editorially with Cogswell's phrase "bibliographical quiddling," calling it "unfortunate" and remarking, "It betrayed a dangerous state of mind for a cataloguer." The Cogswell and Nelson catalog entries have, nevertheless, maintained some utility during the past one hundred years. The Astor book collections were united with others following the 1895 consolidation which formed The New
York Public Library. Many of the Astor titles are still represented in the public and official catalogs at Fifth Avenue and 42nd Street by cards prepared by pasting entries cut from these Catalogues onto standard catalog cards.

The problem of how a cataloger is to identify an author, in terms of the fullness with which his forenames and other identifying information are given, has been debated for well over a century. The Astor Library Committees on the Catalogue which were concerned with this question were preceded by some thirty-five years by a much more exhaustive and formal enquiry into the state of a cataloging project, those portions of the Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Constitution and Government of the British Museum which deal with its Catalogue. This document, published in 1850, records the findings and testimony covering a broad range of the British Museum activities and management problems. But the delay in publication of the printed catalog, the manner of its compilation, the rules of cataloging, and again form and fullness of name entries, all occupy a substantial part of the Report.

Panizzi, as responsible supervisor in the Department of Printed Books, had been directed by a letter of December 17, 1838 and a Minute of the Trustees of July 13, 1839, to complete the catalog of the institution and see it through the press. Although the original plan was to produce a complete catalog by the end of 1844, Panizzi realized that this was an impossible task and did not hesitate to confirm his earlier opinion in testimony before the Earl of Ellesmere, Viscount Canning, the Bishop of Norwich, and others conducting the hearings some seven years after the original charge.

In the course of the hearings Panizzi ably defended the 91 rules for cataloging, and explained his reasons for expanding them from the earlier 73 rules. He was brilliant in defense of the necessity for the application of rules founded on principles, an essential requirement for the production of a catalog which would do justice to the institution and its collections. The Commissioners were generous in inviting many users of the Museum to testify on the uncataloged backlogs and on the faults of the catalogs, either presumed or real, to present their ideas on how works should be entered, and to theorize on rules and principles of cataloging. It was no serious challenge to Panizzi's intellect to demolish much of this testimony simply on the grounds of its inaccuracy, its inconsistency, or its impracticality.

He was not alone, moreover, in recognizing the need for rules. Concerning form of author entry, when Professor Augustus de Morgan was asked "What degree of importance do you attach to the form of the author's name which is adopted in the catalogue?" he replied, "I attach much importance to there being a rule—a great deal more importance than to the fact of what rule it is."

The question of a search for full name information was explored by W. P. Dickson in an article in The Library. Catalogers need this infor-
mation, he insisted, and (the Astor Library Trustees' earlier remarks on the same point to the contrary) said, "Why should our French friends . . . not let us know explicitly whether 'J.-B.' and 'J.-J.' represent 'Jean-Baptiste' and 'Jean-Jacques,' or something else?" Mr. Dickson would have liked to legislate full name information in publishing, but, recognizing that this would be coercive and not tolerable, settled for a suggestion that the Library Association appeal to authors through news media to identify themselves fully when they publish.

R. K. Dent, however, writing in the same periodical in 1897 on "The new Cataloguer and Some of his Ways" bemoaned the latter's insistence on "the biographical facts of every man's life, be he subject or author—" and his recording "for instance, that Joshua was the successor to Moses and died B.C. 1420 . . . and that Isaac Pitman invented phonetic shorthand." Fullness of name was further explored in an anonymous article in the same periodical, wherein the author stated, "From a bibliographical point of view it may be desirable to establish an author's identity as completely as in the case of 'Lorne, John George Edward Henry Douglas Sutherland Campbell, Marquis of.' We do not see the practical need of such an enumeration of names. We note a tendency to add biographical particulars to author-entries."

To this same question librarians on our side of the Atlantic continued to address themselves during the latter quarter of the century. Through several years of this era, Library Journal regularly ran a brief information listing of "Full Names," identifying the author by parenthetically adding the title of the recently published work in which his full name did not appear. Some of these full name notations were supplied by the Harvard College Library. In an 1883 issue, reprinting commentary from the February 1 issue of Nation, the periodical reported, "For folks who have to do with books, accuracy and completeness in giving of proper names are quite indispensable. Yet even the mother of Jakob Grimm might have smiled had she seen his name expanded to Jakob Ludwig Karl Grimm, as it is in some library catalogues. And a personal acquaintance of the Muscovite linguist, Rudolph Westphal, ventures the assertion that even Westphal himself has forgotten the other names which conscientious librarians have inserted in pencil on his title-pages. But coming years may produce other Grimms, with Jakob among their Christian names, so that no less degree of fullness would prove distinctive."

The question of fullness of forenames and the use of forenames not used by the author provoked M. I. Crandall, writing in Library Journal, to cite the example of Friedrich Max Müller. He observed that the question was not one of whether the entry form should be Müller, Max or Müller, Friedrich Max, but rather that it should be Max-Müller, Friedrich, and asked whether, in debating the use of a "long or short handled 'frying pan,' we had unwittingly fallen 'into the fire'?"

In the Condensed Rules for an Author and Title Catalog prepared by the Coöperation Committee of ALA, and published in the proceedings
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of the 1883 Buffalo Conference, full personal names were called for: “In
the heading of titles, the names of authors are to be given in full, and in
their vernacular form. . . .” This rule virtually duplicated Bodleian
rule 31, “In the headings of titles the names of authors are to be given
in full, and in their vernacular form. . . .” Both are in agreement with
the contemporary British Museum rule XVI which provided that fore-
names were “to follow the surname, and all to be written out in full, as
far as they are known.”

Speaking at the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair Conference of the ALA,
William Coolidge Lane said, “There are three points . . . which I should
like to have discussed this morning. First, full names of authors. Most
librarians try to get the fullest possible name. The difficulty comes prin-
cipally in the case of French and German names, where authors have a
good many additional names which they do not use. I have come to feel
very strongly that we make a great mistake in trying to hunt up these
unused names. . . . The practice should be to put the author’s name on
your cards as nearly as possible in the form in which he used it on the
title-page, with initial letters filled out when you can find what they
stand for.” In subsequent discussion, Dr. Norrenberg (Germany) re-
ported, “One of our rules is to give only the name used by the author
himself and not to give full names.”

In 1903 Theresa Hitchler summarized comparable rules in ten cata-
logging codes. Eight codes specified use of author’s name in full. Only
Perkins and Cutter offered a different approach. Perkins’ rules for au-
thor entry, designed for cataloging in the San Francisco Public Libraries,
provided that “Fore-names are usually written not in full, but by ini-
tials only,” and “Use initials for fore-names as a general thing. Use how-
ever full fore-names, or anything else if necessary, to distinguish Browns
and Smiths. . . .” Cutter, with as ever a practical approach to the prob-
lem, wrote a rule stating that authors whose family name is the same
should be distinguished by giving forenames in full, or by initials. For
the card catalog, as opposed to the printed book catalog for which his
rules were originally drafted, he recommended use of forenames in full,
but his intention here was that the cataloger use as the significant part of
the entry element those forenames used by the author. Any additional
unused forenames were to be added, parenthetically, and omitted in the
filing arrangement; forenames “used by the author in a diminutive or
otherwise varied form should be given in that form.”

Through the first half of the twentieth century the pattern of adopt-
ing for author entry the fullest form known persisted and predominated
in the cataloging codes. The only major concession to the characteristics
of books as they were printed, and to the habits of authors and publishers
(and to the way in which the names of authors would be likely to become
known and cited) was the proviso that unused forenames of the author
might be omitted in the established form of the author’s name. Thus the
Anglo-American rules of 1908 specified full name in the vernacular
form, and the ALA Cataloging Rules of 1949 maintained this same rule.
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A significant step away from the full name identification of the author took place at The New York Public Library in 1943. Published rules for cataloging in the Reference Department made the following statement of principle, and stipulations for practice: "Author. It is the purpose of the rules covering the establishing of the names of authors, either personal or corporate, to bring together at the same point in the catalogue the various works of an individual author. While it is necessary to distinguish each individual from all others, it is not necessary to give complete names and dates if the name is otherwise unique in the catalogue. . . . Names of contemporary persons not found on L. C. cards may be accepted from the book itself if found there in a complete and vernacular form. Older names or those for which initials only are found in the book may be sought in the most likely reference books. No special search should be made for dates after the full name has been found except in case of a conflict in names."15

A rapid turn of the tide came with the publication of Processing Department Memorandum No. 60, April 20, 1949, by the Library of Congress. Although this has been characterized as an administrative decision with respect to application of the ALA rules, rather than a rule change per se, it most assuredly had the practical effect of a modification in the rule for establishing personal name entries in the catalog. Its now familiar major provision was that an author's name was to be established in the form given in the work being cataloged, provided that form did not conflict with previously established names of other authors; its practical result was a substantial reduction in the provision of full forename identification in author entries.

Four years later Lubetzky analyzed the problem in his critique of the ALA rules.16 The first objective of the catalog, to enable a user to locate a specific book of which he knows the author, is best served by a rule requiring the entry of an author's name in that form found in his published works. The second objective, that of revealing the works of an author, together with editions and translations, at one place in the catalog is best attained by the adoption of one single form of the author's name without any necessary relationship to the varying forms in which his name may appear in his works. There can be no complete resolution of this problem, as Lubetzky points out, and as Cutter had recognized in 1891.17 In the 1960 draft for a new edition of cataloging rules, Lubetzky recognized both objectives by the rule that "A person identified by forename and surname is entered under the surname, followed by the forename or forenames in the language and form used by him. Forenames represented by initials are spelled out when necessary to distinguished among different persons with the same surname and initials, or when desirable to avoid an ambiguity."18 Dunkin, in his footnote commentary to this rule, called it "a refreshing and thoroughly practical approach."

One form of what Cogswell in 1857 termed "bibliographical quiddling," the inclination to make of personal name author entries in the catalog a form of biographical dictionary, would thus seem to be dis-
appearing. What will undoubtedly prove to have given the most impetus to its elimination is the Statement of Principles adopted at the Paris International Conference on Cataloguing Principles of October 1961. Fifty-eight of sixty-three participants (including the American and British) voted for the principle that “The main entry for every edition of a work ascertained to be by a single personal author should be made under the author’s name,” and “The uniform heading should be the name by which the author is most frequently identified in editions of his works, in the fullest form commonly appearing there.”

The new Anglo-American Cataloging Rules regrettably give merely a nod to this principle in the basic rule for entry of persons, i.e., “The form of name of an author . . . is ordinarily determined from the way it appears in his works issued in his language,” for the principle is compromised by subsequent provisions that one use the fullest form, rather than the predominant form, when the forms of name vary in fullness in the author’s works, and that one should “always spell out a first forename represented by an initial if the surname is a common one.” I leave to discriminating catalogers the decision as to what constitutes a “common” surname.

REFERENCES

1. Astor Library. Minutes. Manuscript Minutes of the Board of Trustees, March 10, 1880 et seq.
13. Ibid., 18, no. 9:74-75. Sept., 1893.
HENRY CHARLES LENNOX ANDERSON was once a librarian internationally known at the turn of the century for his 101 rules for cataloging, and for a list of subject headings contemporary with the first known list, that published by the Library Bureau for the ALA Publishing Section in 1895.

Certainly anyone writing down from memory a list of the great names in librarianship, and particularly in subject cataloging, in the last quarter of the 19th century, would be likely to write down Cutter and Dewey, and perhaps Billings, and then to hesitate. An informed Englishman might write down the name of Fortescue, who established the Subject Indexes of the British Museum Library, but if a public librarian he would be more likely to put down Brown and Jast, whose victory in what has been called the Battle of the Catalogues, about 1895, ensured the triumph of the classified catalog which still continues in British public libraries and British teaching. But how many of any country, even Australia, would get down in his list to Anderson (though Julia Pettee more than mentions him in her Subject Headings, the History and Theory of the Alphabetical Subject Approach to Books)?

Miss Pettee said that his list of subject headings compares favourably with the ALA list, and that as far as she was aware, “except for our own standard American lists, no other extensive list in English has been published.” In 1935 Charles Martel told the writer that the list was used in the first years of the present Congress card catalog; his 101 rules were often mentioned along with other now little known codes such as Linderfelt’s Eclectic; and he had claims to at least local fame as a librarian. But as far as fame matters it was his misfortune to be born on a ship going to Australia, not away from it. Had it been going from Sydney across the Pacific to America, or from Perth across the Indian Ocean to England, or to Scotland from which his parents were emigrating, and had he still become a librarian, his fame might have been different. But then he might not have become a librarian, any more than for example, Vickery in this generation, and born in Australia, might have become one had he not been taken to England, and any more than the writer might have become one had his parents not emigrated from England and found educational opportunity for him in Australia. Circumstances determine
many careers as much as choice, and few if any of the great in librarianship would have gone into it except for chequered careers, chequered for example by economic depression.

Born at sea in 1853, the son of a police inspector, H. C. L. Anderson was one of four brothers; one of them, Robert Murray McCheyne, became City Treasurer and Town Clerk in Sydney, then went into commerce, and was knighted in 1917 for administrative services in the then Great War; another was a country doctor, another a Presbyterian clergyman, and a nephew, a botanist, became director of the State Herbarium. HCL, as he was known for short, matriculated in the University of Sydney on a bursary from Sydney Grammar School, graduated with honours in natural science and agriculture, and then took his master's degree with distinction in literature. New South Wales was still one of the six unfederated colonies in Australia, and except for allegiance to the Crown independent of Great Britain, and after teaching in his old school he entered its civil service in 1882. After serving in the Department of Public Instruction and having had a major part in reorganizing its curricula and examinations, he was made Director of a new Department of Agriculture early in the nineties. But then there was a disastrous depression, perhaps more disastrous than that of the eighteen-forties, or that of the nineteen-thirties.

State services were severely cut, and the new department was cut to a budget of only £10,000 and retrenchment went well up the line. But R. C. Walker, first librarian from 1869 to 1893 of what was called the Free Public Library, Sydney, retired, and Anderson was made his successor. Later the library was renamed the Public Library of New South Wales, but it was always a colonial and later a state provided institution, and a reference and research library with some lending services; it has never been a municipal, shire or county library, or a library of the legislature. As its librarian Anderson might well have just waited for the depression to lift and for his old job; or, like so many scholars or administrators put in charge of libraries in their forties, he might have left technicalities to subordinates. But he did not.

In a couple of years he had mastered librarianship as it was, in its greatest formative period. He read the literature and studied the outstanding problems of cataloging, not only by studying the codes, especially Cutter's but also by studying catalogs, such as the British Museum's, Crestadoro's Manchester Catalogues and index-catalogues, and Cutter's own Boston Athenaeum catalog. In those days of printed pages and published catalogs it was easier to make a comparative study of catalogs from everywhere than it is now to study the unique card catalogs in the libraries of adjacent states. Walker's classification and cataloging had been good for what were in effect pre-Cutter, pre-Dewey days, because while Cutter and the dictionary catalog were well enough known outside America in the eighties Dewey was not until the nineties. H. B. Wheatley's How to Catalogue a Library (London, 1889), an excellent state-of-the-art book, takes in Cutter and the dictionary catalog quite well,
and even refers to Australia, but does not mention Dewey and treats the classified catalog as a thing of the past.

Anderson saw that improvement was possible, and put himself in the forefront in Australia. DC had been introduced in a controversial situation into the lending branch of the Public Library of Victoria, Anderson introduced it into what is now the General Reference Department of the Public Library of New South Wales, with divided dictionary catalog. One part was called the Catalogue, the other the Subject Index. In this division in a printed page catalog, and in the names, he was influenced by the British Museum. But his subject index was not on the lines of the BM's and was greatly praised by Fortescue of the BM who had apparently been forced to make his Subject Index alphabetico-classed, as it has more or less remained, though he wanted to make it alphabetico-specific, and still hoped to do so.

In 1896 Anderson published, with his new catalogs, *A Guide to the Catalogues of the Reference Library of the Public Library of New South Wales*. This was dated 1895 and included a list of headings used in the Subject Index. Communication was slow then across the Pacific, and it was only at the second London Library Conference in 1897 that he was able to say that he had lately received a list from America and that had he received it two years earlier he might have saved himself many hours of hard work (*Proceedings*, 1898, p. 95). The list he received was of course the ALA's in its first edition of 1895. In 1897 he published a second edition of his *Guide*, with his cataloging rules, author, title, and subject, eventually one hundred and one in number. In these he explicitly preferred specific to class entry, allow phrase inversion to bring like subjects together, subdivision of such subjects as birds by country, and upward as well as downward references. All that he owed to Cutter is clear, and he acknowledged his debt to him, but he varied his theory and practice on important points, and anticipated some developments.

There was a fourth and last edition of the *Guide* with the rules and the list in 1902, New South Wales then being a state of the Commonwealth of Australia, with five others, but still sovereign as it still is in educational matters including libraries. About this time economic conditions were improving again, and though still nominally state librarian he took over the direction of the state Immigration and Tourist Bureau. Archival research has still to be done on this, but apparently the government wanted to promote immigration by the establishment of secondary industries, and he had persuaded it of the value of technical literature and bibliographical research. One project which he carried out was a union catalog of technical periodicals in Sydney libraries, and later he became a director of an intelligence department, and Government Statistician in whose department these developments had been encouraged.

The Immigration and Tourist Bureau became only a tourist bureau, as immigration became a federal function. In the meantime, in 1906 Anderson was able to resume the directorship of a reconstituted department of agriculture; an archivist, Bladen, succeeded him as state librarian, and
there was regression on the library side until Ifould succeeded Bladen. Ifould picked up the Anderson line again, and in 1918 established a still continuing research service of great value to industry.

Ifould also re-established training for librarianship or at least civil service examinations in it. Anderson had conducted what seem to have been the first classes in librarianship in Australia, with examinations. These were opened to outsiders with, as he said, the purpose of recruiting educated people, men or women. And as better female students applied than male, they did better, and he appointed them, so that after what might be called an interregnum the Public Library of New South Wales became the leading library in the employment of women, for about twenty years. He also showed initiative in providing services for country or rural students, beyond travelling libraries for local institute or association libraries in which some other states had led New South Wales. And he took a leading part in establishing the first Australian, and Australasian Library Association; it nominally included New Zealand. Unfortunately this proved premature, though proceedings of conferences and a journal were published.

On the administration of agriculture he left still visible marks, in the first agricultural college and in the first departmental journal and other publications for farmers, and in other ways. He was always a Scot and became a Life Vice President of the Local Highland Society, was secretary of a fund to erect the inevitable statue of Burns, standing in front of a plough, and was chairman of the New Settlers League which promoted immigration. And finally he was associated with the State Library again as one of its Trustees, shortly before his death in his seventieth year in March 1924.

In his short period of service as a librarian from 1893 to 1906, from his fortieth to his fifty-third year, he planned a new library building and was the first Australian librarian to secure an overseas reputation, with his cataloging code and his subject headings list. His achievements showed that had he been a librarian in Great Britain or America he might have had more influence, and even now he reckoned among the great, and with a reputation known even to his fellow Australians. But it is difficult for a colonial to have, and to hold an international reputation, as the story of the fame of such a universal figure as Benjamin Franklin may show. Of Anderson in Australian librarianship it can be said that he was a man before his time, that the time was not ripe. There was some regression after him, but it can still be said of him that he was one of those who ripened the times.
"An Incubus and a Hindrance"

Lucile M. Morsch

In June, 1902, shortly after the Library of Congress had initiated the distribution of its printed catalog cards, the Library Journal editorialized that one good result of the use of these cards "has been to lessen the power of the fetish of uniformity," and continued,

The willingness to use printed cards so far as possible and to accept variations from individual methods of cataloging, is a sign that red tape formalism is giving way to a broader and more practical point of view. Uniformity is a very good thing in catalogs as in many other lines of work; but when it sacrifices essentials to details, the product to the machinery, it becomes an incubus and a hindrance. The Library of Congress has been untiring in its efforts to adapt this central card system to many and varying requirements, and librarians have shown a gratifying willingness to waive personal preferences for the common advantage. With this desire manifest on either side, the future of the enterprise is a most encouraging one.

The Library of Congress has continued in these untiring efforts throughout the subsequent 65 years, but equally untiring have been the efforts of catalogers in other libraries to insure that the printed cards would represent a standard acceptable to them. During this entire period these catalogers have worked through the American Library Association with the staff of the Library of Congress on the development of cataloging rules to make uniformity possible. The use of printed cards provided by a central agency had increased rather than lessened the demand for uniformity almost as soon as variations in such details as printing, typing, or manuscript had been accepted. Now, with the completion of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, the time is appropriate for a review of this cooperative effort, because in recent years it has appeared that, rather than uniformity of any kind, it was either the ALA or the Library of Congress, depending upon the point of view of the critic, that was considered an incubus and a hindrance.

The ALA's prodding of the Library of Congress to play a key role in some form of cooperative or centralized cataloging began at its first conference. The proceedings of that meeting, held in Philadelphia in 1876, report a discussion of a cooperative cataloging project that would "let the libraries combine to pay one man a salary for doing it" and of "the practicability of having these titles printed at the Congressional Library." Ainsworth Spofford, the Librarian of Congress, was reported to be in favor of something of the kind, but the Library, then housed in the Capi-
tol, was too crowded and had too limited a staff to offer any assistance. Nevertheless, a committee, instructed at this meeting to report a plan for cooperative cataloging, issued a preliminary report within a few months in which it carried the suggestion a step further by asking "Is it practicable for the Library of Congress to catalogue for the whole country?"

Twenty years later, on December 1 and 2, 1896, representatives of the American Library Association accepted an invitation from the joint Congressional committee on the Library of Congress to testify at a hearing on the future of the Library, and a proprietary interest in the Library on the part of the Association was born. This was first shown by the ALA's Executive Board when, following a suggestion of the Hon. L. E. Quigg of the Congressional committee, it unanimously adopted the following resolution at its January 1897 meeting:

Resolved, That it is desirable that the American Library Association be re-incorporated as soon as practicable under the laws of the United States with headquarters in Washington.

Resolved, That the act of incorporation should, if practicable, include a provision that the council or a committee of the council of the American Library Association shall act as a board of visitors to the Library of Congress...

A special meeting of the Association was held on February 6 to act upon this resolution, but in their wisdom the members assembled referred the proposal to the annual meeting to be held in June. There, after a minimum of discussion, "consideration was indefinitely postponed."

It is likely that this climate of opinion was not without influence upon the developments at the Library of Congress during that year. John Russell Young succeeded Spofford as Librarian of Congress on July 1, 1897, and two months later, on September 1, he appointed James Christian Meinich Hanson, then head cataloger of the University of Wisconsin Library, to be the first Superintendent of the Catalogue Department. Charles Martel, of the Newberry Library, became Hanson's assistant a few months later, and the broad and non-parochial view of its cataloging that has characterized the Library of Congress ever since was assured. "The possible future relation of the Library of Congress to the other libraries of the country," Hanson was to report later,

had made it seem of prime importance that the principles governing the catalogs and classification, wherever it should not involve too great a sacrifice to the library, should be influenced largely by a consideration of those governing the majority of other American libraries. Therefore, in undertaking the new catalog, in May, 1898, the rules followed were in the main Cutter's rules and the rules of the A.L.A., supplemented by occasional emendations.

The intimate cooperation between the American Library Association and the Library of Congress with respect to cataloging began in December, 1900, when the Association appointed an advisory committee on cataloging with J. C. M. Hanson as its chairman. The committee's first task was "to recommend the best typography and form for printed cards,
and to suggest changes in the existing A.L.A. Rules for the purposes of co-operative cataloging.” The following July, at the Waukesha conference, Herbert Putnam announced that the Library was ready to make available copies of the cards which it was printing for its own use. To distribute these cards to other libraries, however, with “a reasonable probability of success,” he considered it essential to work through “some body that should represent judgment and experience, in such co-operative work, and be in touch with the interests at large of the Library Association. That body,” he added, “is furnished by the Publishing Board.”

The experience to which he was referring had been gained by the ALA Publishing Board since June, 1896, when, as the Publishing Section, it had taken over the Library Bureau’s three-year old service of issuing printed catalog cards for “current standard books.” By September, Putnam had found it possible to supply cards directly to any subscribing library. His October 1901 circular announcing the service was accompanied by a brief notice from the ALA Publishing Board, which said that “this board is happily relieved . . .”

The cooperation of the Association and the Library in the development of cataloging rules was not diminished by this decision. Informal instructions were issued to the Catalog Rules Committee by the chairman of the Publishing Board calling for “a code of rules which should be in accord with the system governing the compilation of catalog entries at the Library of Congress.”

There was give and take from the start: Putnam announced that “in adopting a form of entry we have modified our form to one that commends itself to the committee on catalog entries of the American Library Association,” and the Library Journal commented, “There should be special appreciation of the prompt willingness on the part of the authorities of the national library to conform its practice to the requirements of libraries in general, as formulated by the American Library Association.”

In 1907 the preliminary code of 1902 was superseded by a “joint code” which resulted from the combined efforts of the ALA committee and a British committee, and this, too, was printed by the Library in a preliminary form. The rules were printed “as manuscript,” in order that the ALA might have the opportunity to consider and pass on them at its annual conference in May. In his report for the year ending June 30, 1907, Hanson explained that the Library of Congress had been “obliged to make a number of concessions in order to bring its own rules into ap-
proximate agreement with those of the American Library Association." This suggests that the almost point-for-point accord of 1902 could no longer be claimed.

No doubt these concessions have served to retard its own work and have at times been the cause of some confusion in its records. On the other hand the fact that the rules now governing its catalogs have been accepted by the two associations which include the great majority of libraries in the United Kingdom and the United States, represents in itself a great advance in cooperation and uniformity of methods, and will have an influence in its future relations to libraries and students, at home and abroad, the importance of which can hardly be overestimated. It is felt therefore that the Library has been fully justified in its policy of making liberal changes in rules and practice whenever such changes served to further a general agreement.12

Although the ALA Council approved the rules in May, 1907, and the British association had approved the report of its committee already in September, 1906, the negotiations with the Library Association were not concluded until September, 1907, when Hanson, delegated by the ALA to attend the LA's annual meeting in Glasgow, held consultations with its Catalogue Rules Revision Committee. In considering the role of the Library of Congress in the development of these rules, it is important to note that Hanson was not only chairman of the American committee and editor of the first American edition of the rules, but that when he attended the meeting in Glasgow he was authorized "to settle definitely the various questions about which there was still some difference of opinion or uncertainty." During the following year he devoted a considerable part of his time to the preparation of copy and to seeing the rules through the press. They appeared in August, 1908.

Until 1930, these rules were interpreted and expanded by the Library of Congress, as its use of them required, without the participation or explicit approval of the ALA. Supplementary rules, on cards, were printed as early as April, 1909, and supplied to all card subscribers, but when a new series of these was begun during the 1911/12 fiscal year, they were described as additional rules which "relate to points which are peculiar to cataloging in the Library of Congress or points as to which our practice is still in the experimental stage."13 They were to be distributed only within the Library and to the libraries that were supplying it with copy for printing. During these years the number of such libraries increased greatly, and so did the need for a revision of the code which was suggested in 1930 by the ALA Committee on Cataloging and Classification. Again the Association turned to the Library of Congress for leadership, and appointed Charles Martel, chief of its Catalog Division, to the chairmanship of the Catalog Code Revision Committee, a subcommittee of the Committee on Cataloging and Classification. Six years later, when a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation made possible the employment of an executive secretary, Nella Jane Martin of the Catalog Division was appointed to the post. With a staff of assistants and the cooperation of the Catalog Division, she also served as general editor and brought to com-
pletion the preliminary American second edition published in 1941. Sub-
stantial contributions to this edition were made by nine chairmen of sub-
committees and editors of sections of the code who were not on the staff of
the Library of Congress, but it was clearly intended to provide rules that
would be applied by the national library and by all other libraries in
their preparation of copy for printing in the cooperative cataloging
program.

Nonetheless, the preliminary edition was severely criticized. Alice
Charlton, reviewing the publication in the Library Quarterly, said:

It is generally admitted that the Library of Congress should and does play the
most important part of any library in our common aim of standardized cata-
Ioging. When, however, whole sections and many paragraphs of its rules are in-
corporated almost without change in the American Library Association cata-
log rules, it seems to me that catalogers and administrators everywhere should
scrutinize this preliminary edition very closely for the effect that its adoption
would have on their own procedure and their own budget.14

Charlton's advice was embraced both within and outside the Library of
Congress with results that are sufficiently recent that they need not be set
forth here. It should be noted, however, that when the ALA published its
rules for author and title entries in 1949, it had the assurance that they
would represent Library of Congress practice, and when the Library in
the same year published the Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Li-
brary of Congress, they bore not only a nihil obstat but the explicit seal
of approval "Adopted by the American Library Association." As a conse-
quence, neither the Association nor the Library was thereafter free to ex-
pand or modify any detail of its cataloging rules without the specific ap-
proval of the other.

There can be no doubt that this procedure has been cumbersome and
costly. The pages of the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress re-
veal the slow progress of the development and approval by committee of
rules for entry and rules for description since their publication in 1949.
The preparation of the new Anglo-American Cataloging Rules involved
so many individuals that, according to Wyllis E. Wright, the chairman
of the Catalog Code Revision Committee, "in its later stages over two
hundred copies of the drafts were being distributed for study and com-
ments." None of these drafts was prepared by a member of the committee,
however, as had been the case when the preliminary American second edi-
tion was being edited, and it is safe to say that the influence of the Library
of Congress, to whom the ALA had again turned for the "editor," was
even greater than before. Throughout the years of preparation there was
a tacit understanding, periodically brought to mind by Wright, that the
new rules had to be satisfactory to the Library.

There can also be no doubt that the wide consideration and pro-
longed discussion of the rules served to improve them. In the future, how-
ever, the library profession and bibliographical world may well be re-
quired to accept the Library's decisions with respect to new and revised
cataloging rules as it did from 1908 to 1930. The need for the subvention
from the Carnegie Corporation in the thirties and much greater financial support from the Council on Library Resources in the fifties and sixties is proof of the cost of nationwide, to say nothing of international, participation in the development of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. The Library's new "shared cataloging" program has added further complications. This expanded service cannot be delayed for decisions on new rules; the Library must have the authority and must take the responsibility to develop them as required to provide catalog entries promptly. Furthermore, there is reason to expect that the lessened need for original cataloging in other research libraries will be reflected in a decreasing number of catalogers outside the national library competent to advise it on theoretical questions.

An ALA advisory committee, however, could be very useful both to the Library and to the beneficiaries of its cataloging services. This committee would have the benefit of hindsight acquired through the use of Library of Congress catalogs and printed cards, and could urge that unsatisfactory decisions be rescinded. This new kind of cooperation between the Association and the Library could be as important as that which has been in effect since the beginning of the century.
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6. These were the "Condensed Rules for an Author and Title Catalog," to be found in Library Journal, 8:251-54. Sept.-Oct., 1889.
Bibliographical Control of Reprints

FELIX REICHMANN, Assistant Director
Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York

IN THE PUBLISHERS' TERMINOLOGY o.p. signifies that a given title is no longer in stock, either bound or unbound, and that a new edition would have to be prepared to make the book available again. For the acquisitions librarian an o.p. report has no longer the distinct message: "Search in the secondhand book market." An o.p. may be available from other producers as a paperback, a micro-reproduction, an electrostatic copy, or a hardcover reprint. This new situation was dramatically expressed by the inclusion of University Microfilms' catalog OP Books in the Publishers' Trade List Annual in 1959. An o.p. book available from a publisher seems to be a contradiction in terms! But the logical error lies only in the obsolete terminology. The librarian, however—as we well know—must be willing and able to provide a positive response to all social and technological changes.

I. Paperbacks

This terminology is generally accepted although it places, wrongly, the emphasis on the paper cover. But the binding is not the essential part of this form of publication. Most French books are issued in paper cover and they are obviously not paperbacks in the accepted sense. The characteristics of the inexpensive reprints are:

Low prices, made possible by large editions and cheaper production costs using high speed presses and merchandising through many additional outlets not connected with the regular book trade; the latter, however, is generally limited to England and the United States. Although the latest history of American publishing is justified in speaking of "the paperback explosion," Schick pointed out correctly, "at no time did paperbacks entirely disappear among our publications."

Inexpensive re-publications of salable books are inherent in the competitive structure of the book industry. One of the earliest examples is given by the Roman book trade in the first centuries of our era, by substituting parchment (a free commodity) for papyrus (a state monopoly). Disregarding the piratical reprints which ignored the rights of author and original publisher, we shall concentrate on developments

* This article was finished on April 1, 1967 and thus includes only bibliographies and reprints issued before that date.
which have bearing on our acquisitions work. One of the oldest and
still flourishing paperback series is the German Universalbibliothek
(Reklam, 1867). The original price was about one nickel; roughly
10,000 titles, well selected mainly from German literature and philos-
ophy, were sold in about 400 million copies in the hundred years of its
existence. The Tauchnitz edition of English and American Authors
(in English) which was founded in 1841, has distributed about 6000
titles in ca. ten million copies. It is still an important source for the
supply of nineteenth century English and American authors. During
the last years a great number of paperback series have been published
in Germany: Deutsche Taschenbücher and collections issued by well
known publishers as S. Fischer, Rowohlt, and many more. All these
publications are sold exclusively through the book trade. A similar dis-
tribution pattern is followed in France. Of the thirty million copies sold
of the best French paperback series Livre de Poches, about 90 percent
are bookstore sales.

The English and American publishers, however, were interested in
using additional merchandising outlets. Thus, from the start the Rail-
way Library, a series of non-copyright reprints in small type on inex-
pensive paper were mostly sold in railway stations at one shilling each. The
first modern paperback series was the Penguin books, founded by
Sir Allen Cane in 1935. In America, the Pocketbooks (1939) were
among the pioneers in this new publishing venture. The United States
has an insufficient number of bookstores, especially outside the larger
cities, to permit the merchandising of large editions. Thus about
100,000 additional outlets had to be established in drugstores, super-
markets, bus stations, hotel lobbies, etc. The percentage of non-fiction
titles has increased rapidly during the last fifteen years and the trade
distinguishes now “mass-paperbacks” (ca. 60 cents) from “trade-paper-
backs” ($2 and more). Many well established publishers have brought
out their own line of paperbacks, for instance, most university presses,
with the effect that “the new Circe in publishing” has become socially
and academically fully acceptable. Paperbacks are now published prac-
tically in every country and have met everywhere with the approval of
the book-buying public. Latin America has a number of paperback
series. The distribution is shared by the regular book trade and by
kiosks on the street which sell newspapers, magazines, and paperbacks.
The best known Latin American paperback series are: Biblioteca del
estudiante universitario; Colección “Sepan cuantos”; Nossos clássicos;
Serie del siglo y medio.

Library administrators too finally opened, if not their hearts at least
their stacks to the newcomer, though they often impose on the paper-
back the traditional library book apparel. Librarians do like their books
bound (there is good reason for it) and therefore frequently the paper-
backs are bound, if not in buckram then at least in hardcover. Many
jobbers advertise the service of “bound paperbacks!” to libraries. Paper-
backs are sold in every campus bookstore and in a few cases in the
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lobbies of public libraries. The purchase of books has educational significance, moreover, it reduces the pressure on the reserve desk.

Sales had been levelling off for 1965, as the attraction of novelty had disappeared and they had become a customary sight in the bookish landscape. Prices have increased about 20 percent in the last five years and some trade paperbacks can no longer be considered inexpensive in the traditional sense of the word. The industry is geared to overcome the slowing market and announced for 1966 “imaginative thinking, non-traditional areas with products in formats and prices not customary in the standard racks.” As a result the year 1966 was one of the best in the industry’s 28 years of existence; 42,500 paperbacks are listed in the 1967 edition of Paperbound Books in Print against 36,600 in the 1966 edition. About 310 million copies were sold last year.

II. Microreproduction and Electrostatic Copies

During the last twenty years an ever increasing number of publications has been placed on the market in micro reproduction and in electrostatic copies. They include monographs, newspapers, and serials. Some large collections of titles are offered under an ad hoc formulated series entry. In addition to the traditional microfilm reproduction, microprint, microcard and microfiche are marketed; many monographs are available in Xerox-copies from University Microfilms in Ann Arbor and from Bell & Howell Corporation, Microphoto Division in Cleveland (Duopage). The acquisitions librarian is thus confronted with a tantalizing number of possible sources of supply; bibliographical control is scanty and disbursed over a variety of lists, catalogs and bibliographies.

It is even more difficult to ascertain foreign sources. Many countries have large microfilm processors but it is a most irksome task to verify a given publication. Micro reproductions are not entered in national bibliographies and not listed in many readily available reference tools. In most cases only a lengthy and time consuming correspondence can establish the existence of a microfilm.

Some of the largest foreign microfilm producers are:

Micro Methods, Ltd. in England
Association pour la Conservation et la Reproduction Photographique de la Presse, in France
Yushodo Microfilm Publications Ltd., in Japan

Some of the larger ad hoc series in microform are:

Microfilm
British and Continental Rhetoric and Elocution (University Microfilms)
English Books, 1475-1700 (University Microfilms)
English Literary Periodicals, 17th, 18th and 19th century (University Microfilms)

Microprint
Early American Imprints to 1800 (Readex Microprint)
Gt. Britain, House of Commons, Sessional Paper (Readex Microprint)
The modern reprint was made possible through important developments in the printing industry. The reprinting of books without new type setting (the anastatic reprint) was done already in the nineteenth century, made feasible by the application of Senefelder’s lithographic technique. With the use of photography and fast presses a comparatively inexpensive reprinting process became practical. After the First World War a number of scientific periodicals as Liebig’s Annalen were reprinted and sundry publishers announced anastatic re-issues of some of their older monographs. During the Second World War the office of the Alien Property Custodian authorized the reprinting of German periodicals and books by J. W. Edwards. After the War the demand for scholarly material rapidly exceeded the supply and made new efforts in reprinting necessary.

The older libraries continually increased their book budgets, many new institutions were founded, the teaching staff multiplied and the enrolment doubled, tripled, and quadrupled—with no levelling off in sight. Multiple copies of books and periodicals were needed to satisfy this urgent demand, but the material was not available. The secondhand book trade did not have enough copies; moreover, it was almost beyond its control to merchandise its stock successfully and efficiently. The secondhand book trade has always been a most difficult commercial enterprise and could be managed only by an idealist who did not mind working incredibly long hours, frequently for an incredibly low income. Although his profit from a single transaction is a very large one, his overall earnings are small. The post-war inflation, sharply rising living costs, high rents, printing expenses, and postal fees, etc., played havoc with his merchandising techniques. The large firms and those with the business acumen to specialize could more or less weather the storm, but what once had been the backbone of the trade—the small general secondhand bookstore—suffered grievously.

American librarians were understandably unhappy with the rather
laborious technique in acquiring o.p. material. Already in the early 1930's the American Library Association tried to create a modus operandi between the booktrade and libraries. In 1938 with the help of a $10,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation the first o.p. Book Committee was created. As committees have a tendency to increase in numbers and to decrease in efficiency, the Association finally wound up with fifteen separate o.p. committees. This number was too much even for a professional organization which generally thrives on the profusion of its committees.

In 1955 the ALA Board on Library Materials consolidated the activities of all these committees in the Reprint Expediting Service. Under the leadership of Joseph Brewer, John Fall, and Jerome A. Willcox, with Aaron L. Fessler and subsequently Sam P. Williams, acting as reprint expediters, the committee fulfilled its obligations in exemplary fashion. The dramatic changes in reprint publishing justified the committee to declare that its primary goal, the encouragement of reprints, had been fulfilled. In 1965 the committee was dissolved and the responsibility for bibliographical control of reprints was transferred to the Oceana Publishing House.

From the late 1940's on, reprint publishing had developed rapidly, and in a breathtaking Blitzkrieg it spread all over the globe. Today there is hardly a country which does not have a number of most respectable reprint publishers. Some 250 firms and new names are being added almost weekly. In addition to the scores of American houses which, at least at the moment, are leading the world production both in quantity and quality, one can name: Scientia in Aalen, to whom we owe the republication of many historical monographs; Olms in Hildesheim; the Akademische Verlagsanstalt in Graz; the two leading Italian houses, Forni in Bologna and Bottega d'Erasmo in Torino; Slatkine in Geneva, and many, many more. The Dutch publishers have been able to establish an almost perfect cooperation; their success could well be an inspiration for the entire industry.

Walter J. Johnson was probably the first firm to embark on this new publishing venture wholeheartedly and with enough capital. It is noteworthy that the two giants in the field, Johnson and Kraus, were, and still are, internationally-known secondhand bookdealers. In addition to their large stock in secondhand books and periodicals, the combined output in republications of the two firms is over 20,000 volumes. Mr. Johnson had the added advantage that reprinting is with him an almost congenital affliction. His father's firm (Fook in Leipzig) had issued since 1889 a small but important reprint series (Ostwalds Klassiker der exakten Naturwissenschaften) and had published anastatic reprints of scientific journals in the early 1920's. The dividing line between reprint houses and regular publishers is a very thin one. Many well-established publishers are reprinting their older publications (de Gruyter, Weidemann, etc.). Mr. Johnson is a scientific publisher in his own right; the Akademische Verlagsanstalt has a most interesting and active publishing
program; Scientia and Burt Franklin have issued noteworthy scholarly publications, etc.

Reprints are generally issued on durable paper and in good bindings. Invariably contact with the original publisher is established regardless of whether copyright obligations still exist. Editions vary between 200 and 1000 copies; however, editions up to 3000 and more have occurred sporadically. Reprints too can become o.p. and some of my publisher friends have told me that they had to issue a second edition and in very few instances even a third or fourth reprint. On the whole the reprint publisher is proud and satisfied if the sale more or less tallyes with the size of his original edition. The major part, almost 90 percent, of the edition is sold directly to libraries. Customers are not only academic institutions, but also public libraries, high schools, and industries. This merchandising picture may well change somewhat in the near future. The secondhand book trade has found out that it just does not pay to be angry with re-publishers and to take an occasional pot-shot at them by pointing out that at times a secondhand copy of the original edition is cheaper than the reprint. Many dealers now stock reprints and issue valuable reprint catalogs which are widely used and have undoubtedly increased sales. When the publishers realize that the antiquarian book dealer is no longer a spiteful enemy but a valuable ally in merchandising, the trade discount, which at the moment is hardly more than a courtesy, will be increased. A smooth and mutually beneficial cooperation between producer and retailer is essential for a healthy trade.

It has been pointed out that reprint publishing is a young industry and therefore a few shortcomings are understandable. There is no doubt that at the moment it suffers from a number of growing pains. From the point of view of the customer and this, of course, includes the retail trade, the two most glaring flaws are:

(1) Incomplete, false and (I hate to say it) misleading bibliographical descriptions. In case of older imprints (before 1800) the entry given is sometimes so bad that it can take hours of bibliographical search and quite some ingenuity to establish the correct title. For more recent books the title is listed as an independent monograph. Upon receipt it is discovered that the book is part of a larger work. Often the series is omitted and neither publisher nor date of the original or of the reprint can be ascertained without the assistance of a bibliographical Sherlock Holmes.

(2) Some announcements of reprints are bibliographical "castles in Spain" and at the very best figments of wishful thinking. Plans are silently dropped and the trusting customer is kept waiting ad calendas graecas. It is a legitimate precaution for a publisher to test the market before investing a considerable amount of money in a new production; but this includes the obligation to announce publicly his final decision.
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I gladly acknowledge that only a tiny fraction of reprints violates bibliographical accuracy; the number of publications announced but never delivered is larger. But one bad egg spoils the appetite and leaves a bad taste in one's mouth; moreover, nobody enjoys having been a sucker.

The reprint publishers are fully aware of these occasional shortcomings. Burt Franklin has suggested that the library receive a credit of 10 percent of the sales price if unused funds have lapsed because the ordered title was not delivered before the end of the fiscal year. This recommendation would not solve the problem. Most libraries have other methods of avoiding budgetary losses; but the annoyance of having the outstanding order file full of dead wood, time spent on cancellation and re-filing of a new order, and most of all the pre-emption of a title by an unfulfilled promise and thus preventing another publisher from producing a desired book, cannot be translated into percentages. Moreover, the habitual sinner will not pay up and his credit note would have little practical value.

Some publishers are concerned with the intellectual quality of the output. Instead of a straight facsimile reprint, they feel the book should have important additional material as introduction, revised bibliography, footnotes, and index. They believe that too much attention had been given to the quantitative output of reprints instead of “publishing more scholarly and improved re-issues.” Unfortunately such an action would raise editorial and printing costs and therefore the price of the book; it would at least partly abandon the new concept “reprint” and revert to the old pattern of a new edition. It is undoubtedly true, as these critics mention, that some reprint decisions seem to be unjustified from any point of view. According to my opinion this is only a minor nuisance as nobody is compelled to buy such a title.

Most publishers are of the opinion that an international association of reprint publishers would go a long way toward improving the situation. Also bibliographical control of reprints could be strengthened by such an association. A considerable number of reprint bibliographies are available, but many publishers are not aware of all the tools of the trade. The title most frequently mentioned was Bibliotheca Anastatica, next in frequency was the Ostwald, third and fourth rank were held by the Reprintothek and the Reprint Expediting Service Bulletin. Many firms rely principally on their own elaborate card files, but as one of my business associates ruefully wrote to me: “From month to month the upkeep of the files becomes more difficult, more time consuming and more expensive.” No doubt, it is a waste of energy and of money to maintain these card files in scores of places.

The bibliographical situation is matched by the disputed legal position of the reprint. Most countries do not give protection to the reprint, but still like to insist on copyright obligations. The American copyright Office states:

The copyright in a new version covers only the additions, changes, or other
new material appearing for the first time in the work. There is no way to restore copyright protection for a work in the public domain, such as including it in a new version. Likewise, protection for a copyrighted work cannot be lengthened by republishing the work with new matter.

The Copyright Office has no authority to register claims to copyright in mere reprints. In order to be copyrightable, a new version must either be so different in substance from the original as to be regarded as a "new work" or it must contain an appreciable amount of new material. This new material must also be original and copyrightable in itself.

There will be, of course, the question, what is an appreciable amount? The American publisher can send an announcement to Publishers' Weekly, have his catalog included in the Publishers' Trade List Annual and all the titles will appear in Books in Print, but he is under no obligation to do so. He can send a copy to the Library of Congress; a printed catalog card will then be issued and automatically included in the NUC cumulation. This is a very efficient and not too expensive advertisement, but nobody can force him to do it.

The British National Bibliography takes the following attitude:

Reprints are not included in the British National Bibliography unless they are deposited at the Copyright Receipt Office of the British Museum because a publisher wishes to reaffirm his continuing interest in the copyright of the text. There is no exact definition of when a reprint becomes a new edition. Reprints are not required to be deposited under the Copyright Act 1911, so consequently the number that are recorded in the British National Bibliography is few. Paperback reprints of works previously appearing in hard back editions are deposited at the British Museum on their first appearance (being regarded as new editions) but at present only those of a non-fiction content are listed in the B. N. B. Copyright deposit is requested if the original publication was not published in England.

Practically all Dutch reprints are listed in Brinkman, but this is done on a voluntary basis. There is no legal deposit for books in the Netherlands. The Federal Republic of Germany is preparing a law which will force the publisher to deposit a copy of every new publication in the Deutsche Bibliothek. Advertisement in the Börsenblatt and listing in the Wöchentliches Verzeichnis depends on the incentive and good will of the publisher. According to my observation, most German publishers take good care to have their publications thus announced. In the German Democratic Republic all reprints are included in the national bibliography. The Austrian national bibliography includes all reprints published in Austria; however, copyright protection and obligations are doubtful. In France, inclusion in the Bibliographie de la France depends solely on the initiative of the publisher. There is no copyright protection, but there is some obligation as one copy of every book published in France is subject to the dépôt légal. Reprints without changes have to be submitted in three copies. They are not announced in the Bibliographie de la France and not kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Anastatic reprints (most probably our antiquarian reprints) fol-
low the same regulations; however, the Bibliothèque Nationale will keep those titles in which they are interested. Reprint series like Livre de Poches, which are not considered reprints but new editions, are therefore included in the Bibliographie de la France and kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Italian reprints are included in the Bibliografia Italiana “whenever they are of some importance” and one copy must be deposited (new publications require 5 depository copies). In Spain, inclusion in the national bibliography is voluntary, no copyright protection is given, but two copies must be deposited. In most countries the legal definition of reprints is hotly debated by lawyers, but the courts have not rendered a final judgment.

The observation of American library practice in the purchase of o.p. books and reprints does not show our profession from its most efficient and knowledgeable side. The two main reasons for these shortcomings are budgetary limitations and lack of staff as the first priority is allotted to the purchase of new publications; but none of us can be completely absolved from the severe reproach that we have an insufficient knowledge of the book trade and a fragmentary comprehension of our own bibliographical tools. Mrs. Heppell’s judgment: “o.p. buying remains a catch-as-catch-can business” is severe but in many cases justified. The answers to a short questionnaire sent to 60 scholarly libraries and returned by 54 (90 percent) agree on the whole with the results of Mrs. Heppell’s survey.

First Question: How many catalogs from reprint publishers do you keep on hand? Out of 54 answers, 18 (33 percent) reported all catalogs, 36 (67 percent) either indefinite like “selected publishers, many, a large number,” or give figures which varied from the minimum of 6 to the maximum of 150. It seems that the majority of libraries has an adequate supply of reprint catalogs on hand.

Second Question: In what department or office are they kept? The majority answered: Acquisitions Department. In 9 institutions (17 percent) it was divided between Acquisitions and Serials, 5 (9 percent) mentioned the subject bibliographers, 3 (6 percent) located it in the office of the Assistant Director in charge of Technical Services; 1 institution divided it between the Director of Technical Services and the Director of Readers’ Services, and 1 institution placed all the catalogs in the office of the Director of the libraries.

Third Question: What other tools besides publishers’ catalogs do you use for identifying reprints? Please list. Nine institutions (17 percent) said, none. Of bibliographies listed, Ostwald was mentioned 22 times, Reprint Expediting Service Bulletin 16 times, Reprintothek 15 times, Bibliotheca Anastatica 13 times, OP catalog 8 times, Books in Print 5 times, Publishers’ Weekly 4 times, Reprints in Series 4 times, national bibliographies 4 times, Duopage 3 times, Joint Catalogue of Dutch Reprint Publishers 3 times, Microform Masters 2 times, Paperbacks in Print 2 times, Reprint Information 2 times, Cyrillic Publications and Leipzig Bücherkatalog once each.

From the catalogs of reprint retail dealers, Rosenthal was quoted 5 times, Stechert 3 times, and Blackwell, Dawson, and Canner once each. I am con-
vinced that most if not all of these academic libraries have bought all the reprint bibliographies and have them safely in their stacks. However, it seems that the acquisitions personnel do not have them at hand for use and I am afraid in many cases are not aware of the tools available.

Fourth Question: Do you automatically check your out-of-print desiderata lists against publishers' reprint catalogs as they are received? Eight institutions (15 percent) said "yes" but limited this affirmative answer by the clause in one case against the guide to reprints only, in another case for American titles only. Three institutions (6 percent) said "yes" for serials; 14 (26 percent) reported "sporadically" but the vast majority, 29 (53 percent) said "no." One, however, added the clause: "Unfortunately no time, and no staff. We would like to do it."

Fifth Question: Do you check reprint catalogs before asking a second hand book dealer to supply an out of print title? Twenty-one libraries (39 percent) said "yes," 19 (35 percent) replied "occasionally," a few remarked "for serials only." Fourteen (26 percent) replied categorically no; some added: "with regret." Another felt this would be the duty of the secondhand bookdealer.

Sixth Question: Do you carefully check all reprint catalogs in order to fill in lacunae in your collections? Twenty-one institutions (39 percent) said no. There are still a number of libraries who feel that book selection is a faculty obligation. The majority added "regretfully" and hoped that the situation will change in the near future. Twenty-four institutions (44 percent) said occasionally, generally with limitation to serials. Many added they would like to do more, but they simply don't have time. Nine institutions (17 percent) answered yes without a clause.

Seventh Question: Do you subscribe to reprints in advance of publication? Twenty-seven (50 percent) answered yes, 20 (37 percent) were affirmative, but added "reluctantly"; however, 7 (13 percent) said decidedly no.

Eighth Question: If so, how do you follow up such orders? Twenty-five libraries (46 percent) claim "sporadically" like other items in the outstanding order file; 12 (22 percent) at stated intervals, either bi-annually or yearly; 5 (9 percent) only if requested by faculty; 3 (6 percent) had no claiming; 4 (8 percent) had claiming under automated control; and 5 (9 percent) did not answer.

There can be no doubt that the whole situation demands a drastic cleaning up. In order to start a discussion, the following suggestions are submitted.

1. An International Association of Reprint Publishers which would formulate a code of honor stipulating among other requirements:
   a. All publications must be submitted to the national bibliographies; in the U.S.A. a copy must be given to the Library of Congress for card production.
   b. Reprints which have been announced must be published within a stated period unless a cancellation of the plans is officially issued within six months after the first announcement.
   c. Failure to issue such a statement or to publish the title as promised will make the firm subject to an official censure and by repetition will lead to an expulsion from the Association.
(d) Member firms are entitled to print the emblem of the Association on their announcements and on the verso of the title pages. The consumer who trusts the announcement of a non-member firm is conscious that he does it at his own risk.

(2) An international copyright convention to establish a legal definition of reprints identical for all countries.

(3) An international master file of all reprints both published and announced. The location of the file would be with a large national library like the Library of Congress or the British Museum, with an international organization such as Unesco in Paris, or at the headquarters of the Association. The institution chosen would assume the responsibility of informing the Association of the failure of any of its members to adhere to the accepted code. It would have computer facilities at its disposal enabling it not only to issue regular cumulations, supplements, and special lists, e.g. subject or language lists, but also to supply current information immediately through modern communication methods. It would consider the future possibility of furnishing data on magnetic tapes to subscribing members.

Such a vision, however, presumes the availability of computers anywhere, an international compatibility of computer languages and a brilliant success of the Library of Congress MARC Program which would teach us an economical method in the production and distribution of tapes.

Automation and the best computer methods must be preceded by the will for a broad international cooperation. Publishers, retail trade and libraries working together in harmony and sincerity will be able to find a solution which is beneficial to all of us.
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It is my foremost and pleasant duty to acknowledge with thanks and gratitude the invaluable help given by my friend and colleague at Cornell, Miss Josephine Tharpe, University Bibliographer. Miss Tharpe checked the bibliographies, proof-read the list of publishers and wrote most of the annotations in the bibliography. I appreciate the assistance of the Cornell University Library Reference Department, especially Mrs. Virginia Reid who called my attention to a number of microfilm bibliographies. I also would like to express my thanks to the score of reprint publishers who answered my many queries with care and patience, e.g. Burt Franklin, Johnson, Kraus, etc. Mr. Daniel Melcher and his associates at Bowker were helpful as always.

4. The sale of new Tauchnitz volumes to the United Kingdom and the United States is illegal.
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6. The first volume of this series was André Maurois, *Ariel*. No better indication of the literary quality this series maintained can be given than by quoting its first volume.

7. Most European countries have one bookstore for 3,400 inhabitants; the American figure in 1956 was 18,000. See: R. E. Baker, *Books for All: A Study of International Book Trade* (Paris, Unesco, 1956).


13. The highest price listed 1966 was $5.70.


owner of the giant corporation is also well known as one of the most prominent Rare Book Dealers.

22. In 1966 the production was Johnson: 1487 vols.; Kraus: 2364 vols.
24. The regular publisher is happy if he has to reissue a title again and again. The reprint publisher would regrettably acknowledge that he had badly underestimated the sale potentialities.


28. These statements are based on personal correspondence with many publishers. For complete entries of the bibliographies see Appendix.


APPENDIX

Bibliographies

National Bibliographies include most paperbacks and a great number of hard-cover reprints. They do not list micro-reproductions and electrostatic reprints.

A. Paperbacks


Lists reprints of English language books and English translations currently available in series. Limited primarily to American publishers.
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Paperbacks in Print. New York, Bowker, 1955- Published monthly with cumulative issues in February, June, and October. Cumulative issues provide a title index, an author index and a subject index. Each monthly issue includes a subject listing of paperbound books scheduled for publication in the month ahead together with an author-editor index and a "Cumulating Title Index" recording those paperbacks published in the interim months between the appearance of the cumulative issues.


B. Microforms and Electrostatic Copies


American Studies Association. Committee on Microfilm Bibliography, Bibliography of American Culture, 1493-1875. Compiled and ed. by David R. Wimer. Ann Arbor, University Microfilms, 1957. A selective but broad list of American books and pamphlets published before 1876. Included are over 5000 items filmed by University Microfilms in the American Culture Series plus 1500 titles not scheduled for filming as they have been reprinted since 1900.


Catalog.
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New cumulative catalogs of Duopage publications will be issued shortly.


A finding-list of microfilms of 2,939 titles selected from various Medina bibliographies and filmed by Brown University to increase the resources of the John Carter Brown Library.


List of Hungarian microfilms.


Pt. 1: Cumulative catalogue of microfilms of the Canadian Library Association; Pt. 2: Canadian newspapers microfilmed by the Canadian Library Association and other producers.


This first listing of University of Chicago doctoral dissertations available on positive microfilm is kept up to date by a Supplementary List, number 1 of which bears the date, January 15, 1959. Beginning with List Number 4, January 14, 1952, master's as well as doctoral dissertations are included; beginning with Number 16, March 1959, miscellaneous long run serials on film are listed; and, beginning with Number 22, September 1963, theses of the Chicago Teachers College are included. List Number 13 is the first to indicate the availability of Xerox as well as film copies of these.


A detailed guide designed to help researchers use the microfilm of papers relating to New Mexico land grants. These papers from the U. S. Bureau of Land Management in Santa Fe were filmed in 1955 by the University of New Mexico Library.


A selected list, alphabetically arranged, of materials on microfilm or other microform, offered for sale by 14 commercial firms and institutions in the United States.

Dissertation Abstracts, v. 1- 1938- (Ann Arbor, University Microfilms, 1938- )

As Microfilm Abstracts, 1938-1951, abstracted a limited number of doctoral dissertations and other monographs available in complete form on microfilm. Title changed in 1952 to reflect the enlarged program of listing and abstracting the doctoral dissertations of most of the major universities in the United States.
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Beginning with Vol. 27, No. 1, July, 1966, issued in two sections: A-Humanities and Social Sciences; B-The Sciences and Engineering. Dissertations listed are available on microfilm or as enlarged xerographic prints.


A cumulative list of books, journals, and other materials available on microfilm and other microforms from United States publishers. Theses and dissertations not listed. The 1967 cumulative lists material from 50 publishers.


A cumulative list of books, journals, and other materials available on microfilm and other microforms from United States publishers. Theses and dissertations not listed. The 1967 cumulative lists material from 50 publishers.


The Center plans to microfilm all American Jewish newspapers and periodicals through 1925, in whatever language they appeared and wherever they may have been published in the United States. For the period after 1925, the Center aims to be selective. The original list and the first supplement are a record of the titles filmed.

A detailed listing of newspaper holdings on microfilm (95 percent from Illinois) all of which are available through interlibrary loan. Lists of later acquisitions to be printed in Illinois Libraries.


Publisher's catalog listing materials available.

This list is the result of activities carried on over a three year period by the Library-Documentation Section of the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme in building up an extensive collection of periodicals and serials in the social sciences and humanities. The intention is to bring the list up to date annually by reporting both new reproductions and price modifications.

Originally a cumulative catalog of microcards, microfilm, and microfiche published not only by Microcard Editions, Inc. but also by other organizations. Beginning in 1964 with No. 5 lists only all works published by or available from Microcard Editions, Inc., on microcard, microfiche, and microfilm, but includes a list of other publishers issuing material on microcard and microfiche. Latest list No. 7, 1966. 44 p.
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A catalog of a commercial firm listing newspapers of eight Southwestern states and miscellaneous historical material available on microfilm.


A short-lived attempt by the International Documentation Center to list every two months manuscripts, books, and periodicals available on microfiche, microcards or microfilm whenever and wherever recorded and to act as a clearing house for orders of all the materials listed. The International Documentation Center has moved to Switzerland and is now called Inter-documentation Company, Zug.


Publisher's catalog listing materials available in various forms of micro text.


Title changed in 1966 from Micronews to reflect the entry of the publisher into the field of producing full size reprints as well as materials in microform. Limited to descriptions of the company's own publication program and the techniques and equipment used. Not a catalog of publications.


A complete listing of all newspapers on microfilm in the University of Oregon Library. Most of the newspapers held are Oregon titles.


"... Emphasis upon unpublished research materials, particularly doctor dissertations and masters' theses, and upon scholarly books now out of print."


Lists of Russian books and periodicals in the fields of the social sciences currently available in offset or microform reproduction. Social sciences is used in the broadest sense including languages, literature, arts, theater, etc.


Lists some 25,000 titles held on microfilm by 197 institutions, reported through June 1949. Newspapers are listed with full information except when the newspaper is included in *Newspapers on Microfilm*. Indicates location of negative and positive microfilms and of the originals when available.

---


Supersedes Supplements for 1949/52 and 1952/55 and includes films reported by 215 libraries in the United States and Canada, 1949-59. Newspapers and dissertations included in *Dissertation Abstracts* are omitted as well as certain other categories of material indicated in the introduction.
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Publisher's catalog of material available.

Poole, Mary Elizabeth. *Index to Readex Microprint Editions of JPRS Reports* (Joint Publications Research Service) New York, Readex Microprint Corporation [1964]

Correlates JPRS report numbers with the entry number in the *Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications*, which are essential for locating the microprint editions of the Reports in the Readex Microprint collection of U. S. government publications. Includes also a list of JPRS reports not listed in the *Monthly Catalog*, October 1958-December 1963.


Alphabetical and chronological lists, with editorial comments, of the collection filmed Apr. to June 1949, at the Bibliothèque Nationale for the Library of Congress.

Singapore (City) University. Library. *Microfilm Holdings in the Field of Southeast Asia Studies* (non-scientific), 1965. [Singapore, 1963?]


Files of papers, periodicals, books and pamphlets as well as manuscript material.


"This catalog lists the negative microfilms of journals in German, French, English, and Russian from which positive copies can be made at the request of interested individuals or libraries."


A list of negative microfilms of Tennessee newspapers, county records, county tax lists, and miscellaneous material such as unpublished county histories, genealogical data, unpublished theses, etc.


Primarily a guide to the Microcard editions of almost 7,000 French plays published by Falls City Microcards, Louisville, Kentucky. It is hoped that cumulated editions can be issued every five years.


---

A Union List of Publications in Opaque Microforms.


Not a union list in the usual sense (no library locations are given) but rather an alphabetical list by main entry of materials (7600 entries) available from 26 American and European publishers; with an index.


Lists titles for which master negatives exist and identifies those which are designated Master Preservation Negatives. Includes foreign and domestic books, pamphlets, serials, newspapers, and foreign doctoral dissertations. Excludes technical reports, typescript translations, foreign and domestic archival manuscript collections, and U. S. doctoral dissertations and master's theses. Latest cumulation is dated 1966. 251 p.

---


A list of selected Negro newspapers on microfilm, the result of a project to microfilm Negro newspapers sponsored by the Committee on Negro Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies. The Library of Congress serves as a
depository for the negatives of files filmed and can supply positive copies of the film, on order.


List is divided into the following groups: (1) union lists of microforms, (2) catalogs and guides to microform collections of individual libraries, (3) lists and bibliographies by manufacturer or producer, (4) list of microforms based on existing bibliographies, (5) selected subject bibliographies of microforms, (6) some major projects of microform reproduction, (7) general lists of material available in microform, (8) publications of manufacturers reproducing out-of-print publications by enlargement from microfilms to natural size.

Newspapers on Microfilm.


The 5th edition (1963) contains approximately 16,000 entries, representing about 4,000 foreign and more than 12,000 domestic newspapers. Locations are given for both negative and positive copies. Lists microfilms of Russian newspapers through the year 1957. 305 p.


Lists 23 completed microfilm publications, pamphlets describing them, microfilm publications in preparation, and microfilm publications similar to, but not a part of the Commission’s program.

University Microfilms, Ann Arbor. *British and Continental Rhetoric and Elocution*.

A guide to the source materials on British and continental rhetoric and elocution produced on microfilm by University Microfilms in cooperation with the Speech Association of America.

*Microfilm Catalog*. Ann Arbor, Michigan [1965?]

A guide to the periodicals, newspapers, and books, available from University Microfilms together with descriptions of special projects and equipment. Catalogs listing titles filmed from STC and Wing are also published separately.


Publisher’s list of periodicals indicating availability of both current volumes and backfiles. Periodicals not limited to English language, although majority listed are in this language. Separate listings for Chinese and Russian language titles.

*OP* (last 1965, 2 supplements) 422 p.

From now on semi-annual supplements. Working on computerization of entries so they can publish cumulative index once a year. Separate catalogs by subject; so far: History and Political Sciences, Fine Arts and Architecture, Science and Technology. OP Russian Language books, March 1965. 39 p. OP books not reported to Publishers’ Weekly, but catalog will be included in Publishers’ Trade List Annual.


Beginning in 1950 the Microfilm Center of the National Library in Warsaw has been collecting musical manuscripts and prints of Polish music sources (including letters and reviews). The above catalogue represents this collection of microfilms, which had been obtained from both Polish and foreign libraries.


C. Hardcover Reprints (Antiquarian Reprints)


*Volume 11, Number 4, Fall 1967*
Lists monographs and serials already reprinted or announced for reprinting. A title is recorded only once. Each volume consists of six fascicules and an index. The index covers only Fascicules 1-5, since, beginning with volume II, the sixth fascicule is devoted entirely to an alphabetical listing of periodicals. Coverage is broad. Publications of over 200 publishers listed in Volume III (1966).


Lists reprints of English language books and English translations currently available in series. Limited primarily to American publishers.


An annual cumulative guide to books, periodicals, and other materials available in hard-bound reprint form from publishers in the United States. This first edition includes 69 publishers. 88 p.


Lists reprints of nine Dutch publishers under eleven broad subject headings. A new edition will be issued shortly.


Includes both West German and Central German titles. Author, title, and subject index.


An extensive index of books from Central German publishers.


Library edition of the Barsortimentskatalog, one of the oldest and most complete of this selective bibliography. Lists the holdings of a large German jobber. For full description see: Totok-Weitzel, Handbuch.


This list is the result of activities carried on over a three year period by the Library-Documentation Section of the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme in building up an extensive collection of periodicals and serials in the social sciences and humanities. The intention is to bring the list up to date annually by reporting both new reproductions and price modifications.

Oceana Publications, Inc. has announced that they will publish in 1967 Reprints in Print: serials, where for the first time all reprints of out-of-print serials and monographs in series actually in print and available will be listed in one place. It is planned to issue new editions biennially. In the interim, the listings in The Reprint Bulletin will serve as supplements.


Intended as a record of “books in print” for the reprint trade. Lists reprint editions of books, periodicals, and other serial publications from more than a hundred European and American publishers, but is far from complete. A second volume is announced for fall 1967.

Lists Russian books and periodicals in the fields of the social sciences currently available in offset or microform reproduction. Social sciences is used in the broadest sense including languages, literature, arts, theater, etc.


A collection of American publishers' catalogs listing books in print. Bound together alphabetically by name of firm. Separately published indexes are:


Formerly the *Reprint Expediting Service Bulletin.* Regular features are (1) a bibliography of reprints, (2) news and views on reprinting, (3) librarians' lists of out-of-print titles. Reprints listed are primarily those of American publishers.

*Reprint Information;* Hauszeitung des Antiquariats Dr. Martin Sändig, Wiesbaden.

Reihe A: Geisteswissenschaften, Bd. 1- (Latest issue: 8, Spring 1967).

Reihe B: Naturwissenschaften, Bd. 1- (latest issue: 2, January 1966).


Title changed in 1966 from *Micronews* to reflect the entry of the publisher into the field of producing full size reprints as well as materials in microform. Limited to descriptions of the company's own publication program and the techniques and equipment used. Not a catalog of publications.

*Reprintothek,* 1966- Riedensburg, Verlag der Reprintothek, 1966-.

A listing on cards of reprints of books and periodicals (1) available, (2) announced for subscription or in preparation, (3) already out-of-print, with (4) addresses of publishers. The first edition contained a basic catalog of 100 reference cards and 12 monthly supplements of about 250 title cards each. The second edition, announced for publication in January 1967, will consist of about 4,500 reference cards and will be limited to 1,000 copies. Again there will be 12 monthly supplements. Plans exist for future editions.

Other important bibliographical tools are (1) the catalogs of the different Reprint-publishers; (2) lists issued by dealers who have shown great interest in the merchandising of reprints as: Blackwell's (Oxford), J. S. Canner (Boston), William Dawson & Sons (London), Bernard M. Rosenthal, Inc. (New York), Stechert-Hafner (New York).

**BACK ISSUES OF LRTS NEEDED**

An unusually heavy demand for certain issues of *LRTS* has exhausted the supply available. Any members of RTSD who no longer need their copies of the following numbers are asked to send the issues to RTSD at ALA Headquarters (50 E. Huron, Chicago, Illinois 60611)

The issues needed are:

- v.9, no.1 (Winter, 1965)  
- v.9, no.1 (Winter, 1966)  
- v.10, no.2 (Spring, 1966)  
- v.11, no.1 (Winter, 1967)  
- v.11, no.2 (Spring, 1967)  
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MY TEXT IS TAKEN FROM A POEM which appeared in the New Yorker some time ago. It was composed by a certain Stevie Smith and taken down by his mother. But it sounds a bit like a progress report from a technical services head who has been asked by the head librarian to put the technical services back on a current basis. The lines are these and are to be read in a tone of plaintive reproach:

I was much further out than you thought
And not waving but drowning.

Technical service costs fall easily into three categories: library materials, equipment and supplies, and staff. Wiser and more effective spending is being sought in all three categories. Supplies and equipment are the concern of the Library Technology Program. Its regular reporting in the Library Technology Reports makes the results of its investigations easily accessible, and requires only that librarians take the time and trouble to keep in touch with its findings.

Library materials—books, periodicals, binding, microfilm, recordings, wood samples, and what not?—are yielding some measure of control and predictability to the Library Materials Price Indexes. What the indexes show is a steady increase in the cost of all library materials.

Not only are titles costing more year by year, but more of them are available for purchase. During the decade from 1956 to 1966, new titles and new editions published annually in the United States increased from 12,538 to 30,050, an increase of 140 percent. An approximation of world book production was estimated by UNESCO at 964,000 titles in 1960, the figure rising to 408,000 in 1964, an increase of 12 percent in the four-year period.

The cumulative effect of these several phenomena is the harsh economic fact: a minimum increase of 10 percent must be made annually in the book funds if a given level of purchasing is to be maintained. For example, in 1966 the number of books published in the U. S. increased 5 percent and in Britain, 10 percent; U. S. book prices increased 4 percent (10 percent in 1965!), periodical subscriptions increased 7 percent, and serial services, 8 percent. No figures are available for out-of-print and
antiquarian books, but we know prices are increasing much faster than the prices of current materials, as more libraries compete for such materials and the materials become more scarce on the market. Since this maintenance increase is compounded, a 10 percent annual increase means that a book fund of $500,000 in 1967 should be $1,295,000 to do the same job ten years later, and a fund of $1,000,000 this year foreshadows the need for $2,593,742 in 1977! Furthermore, these incredible increases make no provision for additional areas of interest, new fields of knowledge, or an increase in number of patrons.

There is no foreseeable lessening of the annual increase in publication. Expected increases in population, number of college graduates, job opportunities for scientists and technicians, and amount of leisure time all point to an expanding market which will encourage publication of more and more titles.

Increased publication, particularly in science and technology, has prompted the growth of a large number of abstracting, indexing, bibliographical, and translation publications. These are expensive publications and much in demand by library patrons. Furthermore, library budgets have not yet felt the full impact of the cost of the newer media—films, phonorecords, photo-reproductions, talking books, tapes and wires.

The problem of obtaining more book funds to meet greater demands on them is at least half solved if the librarian can supply statistics to show just what can be accomplished with available funds, what additional funds must be found to do the same job each succeeding year, and what is necessary to give expanded service.

Office of Education figures show that in public libraries about one-fifth of the operating expenses are used for library materials, and in academic libraries about one-third. Where does the rest go? In the Office of Education academic library figures for 1961-62, 61 percent of the operating budget is assigned to salaries and student wages. Nearly two-thirds, then, goes for staff.

Now this matter of staff is a somewhat more complex problem than library materials. And a much more interesting one, partly because it is an area in which efficiency can result in substantial savings. Institutional and governmental regulations and local market conditions may allow little margin for savings in the purchase of equipment, supplies, and library materials; salaries and wages continue to increase; but the utilization of staff still offers rewards both in greater productivity and in greater staff satisfaction.

The history of libraries in this country over the past hundred years is full of reports of efforts toward more effective use of library staff and discussions of the related topics of statistics, cost accounting, work measurement, performance budgets, and standards. But in spite of both individual and cooperative efforts to find a common statistical language for reporting, we have not yet reached this necessary first goal.

Reasons for this continuing failure were listed by Esther Piercy in the Fall, 1962 issue of this journal, in a statement typical of her sound com-
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monsense—respected, valued, and now sorely missed. In a single page, by way of introducing three relevant articles, she summed up the dilemmas of the librarians vis-a-vis cost and time studies: the reasons some do not keep figures, ranging from ignorance through fear to work pressures, the ways in which figures may be misused, and the troublesome semantic problem of confused terminology. In spite of all these difficulties and in spite of her strong prejudice against the how-we-do-it article, she invited more such reports, recognizing them as a way to make a start toward solving a large and important problem.

Our attitude toward standards has changed gradually. When the present college library standards were drawn up, the committee working on them discussed the possibility of drawing up university library standards. Doubts of such a possibility were strong, based on the opinion that university libraries varied so greatly in size, programs, etc., that standards broad enough to cover all kinds would be too vague and meaningless to be useful. Yet a meeting called by the ACRL Standards Committee during the 1967 ALA Midwinter Conference to consider the desirability and feasibility of establishing standards for university libraries found grounds for encouragement. One pressure in this direction may have been the fact that standards represented the most serious lack encountered by those preparing the “National Inventory of Library Needs” for the ALA Detroit Conference in 1966. How can needs be determined, if there are no standards against which to measure available library service and facilities?

Possibilities of automation have given a fresh impetus toward cost considerations. Much, much more cost information will be needed as we move toward more machine applications. To build up a balanced program between manual and automated procedures and between service and reasonable costs will require more knowledge of our present costs than most of us have.

Good library administration has generally been built on sound organization and effective procedures. The element lacking has been controls for measuring its effectiveness. Library services are qualitative, and their most important results are intangible. The resistance of many librarians toward proposals to collect quantitative data and use them to develop standards upon which to judge qualitative services seems to be giving way before the evident need for such standards. Of course, it is impossible to set absolute standards in terms of library goals. We must compromise on standards which are really norms or averages of good library practice.

Technical services, then, in common with other library units, need the regular production of statistics and the standards which can be developed from them. We need both external and internal figures. The presently available figures and statistical programs under discussion do not break down figures in ways adaptable to technical service needs. How shall we get them?

Elizabeth Rodell pointed to the solution when she said: “We should
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be able to buy a pad of statistical forms to be used by individual libraries to yield internal statistics which will be externally comparable, just as libraries can now buy standardized forms to use in interlibrary loans." Simple? If standardized statistical reporting forms could be developed, they would offer a practical way of collecting meaningful and comparable statistics. Annual reporting on such forms would provide the means of accumulation of comparable data and offer a defensible foundation upon which to build standards.

The proposal, then, is to develop forms for the measurable aspects of the technical services in libraries differentiated by type of library. For each type there should be two forms: one for the regular collecting and reporting of statistics for both internal and external use, and the other a detailed form for work measurement and cost accounting use, which would be used only occasionally. Both forms should be completely compatible, and the forms for the various types of libraries should be as uniform as consistent with obtaining useful data.

It is crucial that the forms be compatible with statistics now gathered nationally and with any changes made in the national library statistics program following the 1966 National Conference on Library Statistics. It is not necessary that the National Center for Educational Statistics want to collect the forms for technical services, but it would be desirable that the figures collected by the Center be compatible with the more detailed figures which the forms would offer. The present foment in the area of library statistical measures and reporting is heartening to see. The important role that Frank Schick has played in it and the many others who have contributed is made clear in Mr. Schick's review in the Library Quarterly (37:134-35. January, 1967) of Library Statistics, the handbook produced by the ALA Statistics Coordinating Project.

Who should undertake the difficult task of developing these forms? Not a librarian working alone. Not a committee of librarians. Rather, a trained research team, advised by seasoned technical service librarians.

from the LAD Statistics Committee for Technical Services, which has been working on internal reporting of statistics.

If such forms were available, how could librarians be persuaded to use them? First of all, they could be publicized through library journals, annual conference programs, at the Division's conference hospitality center, through the Division's regional groups, and through library schools. An agreement should be reached as to the agency which would collect the two forms—the external one annually, and the internal one on a special project basis. Periodically the data provided by the forms should be treated statistically, the results reported, and the forms made available for further use by scholars and students.

Once we have the solid basis of regularly reported, comparable statistics for the technical services, we shall be ready to develop standards for the separate procedures (e.g., how many periodical issues should a checker be able to add per hour?) and for whole areas (e.g., how much would it cost in staff salaries to spend $50,000 annually to develop a Chinese collection?). We shall be ready to compare two procedures in terms of cost. We shall be able to place the output of our own operations against the output of others and search for meaningful answers to the questions which such a comparison raises. As we move toward automation, we shall be able to compare the new costs with the old and make an informed decision as to whether the greater service offered by the machines is worth the difference in cost.

I would like to see the report forms include figures which would enable the RTSD Technical Services Cost Ratio Committee to test a concept which it has developed for measuring the total cost of technical services. The concept is called TSCOR, which stands for Technical Services Cost Ratio.

TSCOR is a ratio made up of the total cost of technical service salaries divided by the amount spent for library materials during a given period of time. When one number is divided by another, the denominator of the answer is always one, so that the figure obtained by dividing this ratio to put it in decimal form is the amount which it costs in staff salaries to spend one dollar for library materials. For example, if Library A spends $800,000 for library materials in a given year and $576,000 for technical service staff salaries, Library A's TSCOR (pronounced "score") is 0.72 (salaries divided by library materials expenditures). Thus, it costs Library A 72 cents to spend a dollar for library materials, including staff salaries involved in ordering the materials, both separates and serials, receiving them, cataloging them, binding them, and making them ready to put on the shelves for the patron. Book selection salaries are omitted, since the assignment of the selection function varies so widely in different libraries and is often shared by many of the staff in both public and technical services.

The use of such a ratio as TSCOR to measure technical service costs has two advantages:

1. A single ratio based on the total technical service costs avoids con-
sideration of the wide variation in library practice in assigning functions to different administrative units of the library, e.g., pre-order bibliographic searching may be assigned to the Catalog rather than the Order Department; technical services may be divided into Acquisition, Catalog, and Serials Departments or into the traditional Order and Catalog Departments.

(2) Such a ratio has a built-in escalator: as book costs go up or down, staff costs will tend to vary in the same direction. Thus, expressing the relationship in terms of a ratio will tend to neutralize fluctuations in the economy.

TSCOR is easily applicable in a single library. The functions and activities of all persons on the staff can be divided into three categories: administration, technical services, and public services. The salaries of those who work in technical services, or such portions of their salaries as correspond to the portion of their time which is spent in technical services, are summed up. This figure for any year is then divided by the total amount spent the same year for library materials. The result is the library's TSCOR and represents the amount it costs in staff salaries to spend one dollar for library materials, including the whole process from the ordering of the book until it is ready to be placed on the shelves for the patron to use.

Used in one library, TSCOR can serve as a means of comparing operations from year to year. It can also be used to answer such questions as: "How much additional staff will the library need, if we set up an African studies program and spend $20,000 a year for library resources?" Of course, such a question is rarely thought of by the non-librarian. If it is not asked, TSCOR can be used by the library to suggest that staff will be needed for a new program and just how much staff would be reasonable.

With the exercise of care, TSCOR can be used as one measure of comparison between two or more libraries. Care is necessary to be sure that the same elements of cost are included in the libraries compared. If one of the libraries is adding to its backlog each year, the staff cost total should be increased in the amount estimated as necessary to hire enough additional staff to avoid adding to arrearages.

In developing a questionnaire by which to obtain information to compute a given library's TSCOR, the Cost Ratio Committee tried a preliminary draft in a number of university and public libraries. The resulting TSCORs from ten university libraries were gratifyingly well-behaved, forming a fine curve which showed that the larger the library the more expensive it is to spend a dollar for library materials. Three of the libraries with more than three million volumes each, had TSCORs ranging from 81 cents to one dollar. One medium-sized library with between two and three million volumes had a score of 68 cents. And the remaining libraries—with book collections ranging from two million volumes to half a million—had TSCORs of from 57 to 45 cents. The lowest TSCOR—45 cents—belonged to a library with 705,000 volumes.
and no cataloging backlog. The score of 50 cents—the next lowest—belonged to a library of just over one million volumes with well-advanced mechanization of operations.

This consistent relationship between the ratio and the size of the collection—the larger the book collection, the higher the cost of adding to it—did not hold for a sampling of public libraries. The results obtained from twelve large public libraries showed a correlation between TSCOR and size of book funds, and it was an inverse relationship, that is, the larger the book fund, the smaller the ratio, or the larger the book fund, the less expensive it seemed to be to add each volume to the collection. The answers received from eight smaller public libraries showed no pattern of relationship among the factors considered.

All of these results, which came out of an informal and untried questionnaire, are quite tentative and are only suggestive. They do suggest that the TSCOR concept is meaningful in fairly large operations where the very size of the two figures tends to discount the minor variations.

TSCOR is a rather simple-minded concept. It may hide more than it reveals. I hope someday that driving through a small town somewhere I'll see chalked on a fence, TSCOR is CRUDE! I shall know then both that TSCOR is recognized and known and that its limitations are understood.

Technical services sometimes seem to be the most difficult of areas to justify to those who must produce funds for library operations, whether the chief administrative officers of educational institutions or public library boards. Acquiring, cataloging, and preparing are really the most actual and factual of library operations and should be the easiest to justify and explain. Perhaps it is the pressure of too much to do that keeps technical service librarians from gathering and interpreting the facts which would convince. Instead, they often answer questions about staff needs in vague generalities with a show of defensive impatience if they are pressed for more detail. Non-library administrators and legislators, as they observe the technical service rituals in full sway, must sometimes feel with Robert Frost, who said to a poet whose poems he could not understand, "If this is your secret, keep it."

If we are to better our situations, we must know the facts ourselves and be able to justify them to others. Today there is a greater measure of belief in the usefulness and even necessity for good library service on the part of government. The insertion by librarians of Title IIC into the Higher Education Act, the section which has moved libraries so much closer to centralized cataloging, was an inspiring thing. It shows what the librarians of this country can accomplish, if they are convinced themselves of what is needed. Technical service librarians must be able to show in factual terms what their services cost. They must first be able to prove the figures to themselves, then they can convince those with funding responsibility.
Agricultural/Biological Vocabulary

Esther Piercy wrote in her *Commonsense Cataloging*:

Subject work is most important and most difficult, calling for a wide background of information and knowledge and also for judgment. It cannot be done thoughtlessly or slapdash or turned over to a typist. It requires careful study of methods and principles, complete comprehension of the information contained in the introductory material of the list employed, careful study of each publication, and thoughtful consideration of the work in relation to the library’s collection, clientele, and goals.

With the mountains of published literature growing ever higher, with the lines of demarcation between subject disciplines disappearing at an ever increasing rate of speed, with the size of the scientific and professional community expanding rapidly, and with the acceleration of advances in science and technology, it is even more urgent now than in the past to satisfy promptly the information needs of the academic, research and industrial worlds for the common good. The subject approach to information is one of the major methods for this purpose.

Users

Meeting the needs of the user is the prime objective of all information systems, regardless of whether the system is a card catalog, an index to a book, a published bibliography, or a computer system. How best to fulfill this need when the approach is by subject has been of major concern to the National Agricultural Library for many years.

Each user’s subject approach to an information system is based on that user’s education, experience and interests. Terms chosen for use in an information system must satisfy the requirements of the majority of users of that system, and at the same time, must provide leads to the proper terms for other users of the system. Advantages accrue if the user can make direct inquiries from the system without being forced to go through an intermediary who must translate his request for the system. But at times, an intermediary is necessary, regardless of whether the information is sought from a card catalog or a computer system.
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Because of the different approaches taken by different sets of inquirers, and because user studies have yet to be successful in providing the answer to what is the "best" approach for any group of inquirers, it has become evident that no one set of terms can fulfill the requirements of all information systems. Chemical subject headings as they are used in a public library catalog are seldom, if ever, suitable for use in the information system of a specialized chemical library because they are usually too general; terms used as subject headings in a medical library, because they are usually too specific, are not necessarily appropriate or useful in a public library.

Standardization

Since this is the case, it has become of crucial importance to develop standardized subject terms in the major subject disciplines to provide a common language through which information can be sought and obtained. It is equally important to achieve, in so far as possible, compatibility or convertibility among the standardized lists of terms developed for each subject discipline. At no point in time, can the standardized lists be called complete for there will always be need for changes due to the growth and evolution of society. In all cases, the lists of terms or vocabularies must be controlled however, if they are to be used as a standard, and if they are to be either compatible with or convertible to other vocabularies.

Implementation of Title IIC of the Higher Education Act of 1965 by the Library of Congress is already providing more cataloging information, more quickly, to the libraries of the nation than has previously been available. The Machine Readable Cataloging Project (MARC) of the Library of Congress is attempting to find answers to multiple problems of storing cataloging information in computers, sharing this information, and providing a variety of services from the store. Because of these developments, and because all libraries which wish to benefit from these activities should be able to do so, standardization, compatibility or convertibility have become increasingly important. About a year ago, Marjorie Hyslop pointed out: "No matter what the vocabulary, two general problems are involved in sharing terminology: 1) the concepts peculiar to a particular discipline and 2) agreement on the terms themselves. . . . Agreement on selection of terms is both an interdisciplinary and a cross-disciplinary problem."2

National Agricultural Library Vocabulary

Recognizing the problems involved, and fully aware of the urgent need for one standardized vocabulary for the agricultural/biological subject disciplines, the National Agricultural Library set out to try to provide that vocabulary. Scientists and librarians from all parts of the world had been requesting the Library's subject authority list for many years, and after funds for publication were made available by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1961, the Library published its Subject Heading List3 as a
Preliminary Edition in 1963. It was labeled “Preliminary” because no time could be spent on revision and updating of the subject headings which had been growing in the Subject Heading Authority File since the dictionary catalog of the Library was started in the late 1800's. Further, it was hoped, as stated in the Preface to the Subject Heading List “to determine the feasibility of producing a combined revised list of subject headings [cataloging subject headings and Bibliography of Agriculture index terms] to serve the needs of agricultural card catalog and published bibliographies, whether produced manually or by machine.”

It was in 1962 that the United States Department of Agriculture established its Task Force ABLE (Agricultural Biological Literature Exploitation) to make a systems study of the National Agricultural Library and its users. As part of the systems study, a comparative study of terms used in the Library's public catalog and in the Bibliography of Agriculture was made. On the basis of this study, the Task Force included the following recommendations in its report:

Develop and issue a subject policy and guidelines to serve as a basis for preparing a definitive thesaurus of agricultural terms.

Prepare, edit, and issue the first edition of the thesaurus.

Plan in detail organization structure for keeping the thesaurus up to date and issuing revised editions.

The report went on to call for regularly appropriated funds to provide for continuing concentration on subject analysis. As the base for the new thesaurus, Task Force ABLE recommended that the Library's Subject Heading List and the index terms used in the Bibliography of Agriculture should be merged.

This report gave impetus to previous Library requests for funds to establish within the Library an Agricultural Vocabulary Project, and in November, 1964, the Project was established. The staff was composed of a part-time coordinator, one librarian from the Division of Indexing and Documentation, one from the Division of Catalog and Records, and a typist. The Project's goal was, and is, to develop and keep up-to-date a standard agricultural/biological vocabulary, suitable for use in cataloging or indexing published literature and unpublished research, in manual or automated systems.

The work was planned in three phases. In the first phase, a list of general terms, including chemical names, but excluding chemical formulae, taxonomic terms, proper names and geographic names, was to be produced. In phase two, subheadings and references for the general terms, to show emphasis or relationship, were to be standardized. The third phase provides for either adoption of existing authoritative lists of specialized terms excluded from the list of general terms, such as lists of geographic names and taxonomic terms, or the development of new lists.

According to the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, the definitions of a thesaurus are:
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1. a dictionary, encyclopedia, or other comprehensive reference book, esp. a dictionary of synonyms or antonyms.

2. a storehouse, repository, or treasury.

3. Computer Technol. an index to information stored in a computer, consisting of a comprehensive list of subjects concerning which information may be retrieved by using the proper key terms.

The last definition is the one of immediate concern. This definition was not comprehensive enough, nor was any other, for purposes of the Agricultural/Biological Vocabulary. Therefore, the term “thesaurus” has been defined for the vocabulary as “a structured arrangement of terms in several levels, which in conjunction with an alphabetical listing, represents the subject content of a body of literature. The structured arrangement is intended to show the relationships of the terms in an hierarchical order, at the same time conveying broad subject concepts.”

As recommended by Task Force ABLE, the first step taken by the Agricultural Vocabulary Project was to merge and edit the terms from the Subject Heading List with those from the annual subject indices, 1961-1965, of the Bibliography of Agriculture. Concurrent with this step, work began on preparing the Agricultural/Biological Subject Category List. This list is similar in structure to the COSATI Subject Category List, issued by the Federal Council for Science and Technology in 1964. Since it was felt that a thesaurus type of vocabulary would serve the needs best, a category list was essential. The Agricultural/Biological Subject Category List is composed of 15 major fields, such as Animal Science, Chemistry, and Plant Science. Each of the major fields is divided into a number of groups, for example, Veterinary Medicine is within the field of Animal Science, Biochemistry is within Chemistry, and Botany is within Plant Science. The next step was to assign a field and group identification to each term in the vocabulary. No term was assigned to more than one field and group.

While this work was in progress, pressure was growing stronger each day within the Department of Agriculture to have the Library-produced vocabulary used for all information storage and retrieval systems within the Department, in order to have a common language used by all systems. Pressure was even stronger to have the Library publish the vocabulary just as quickly as possible, particularly for use by the Department’s Current Research Information System (CRIS). CRIS was established to supply to Department management officials, and others, financial, geographic, and scientific information about agricultural research in progress. CRIS will include reports not only on research going on in the Department but also at the State experiment stations in the fifty States and Puerto Rico, and at a few other related institutions including foreign ones. The urgency for development and publication of the vocabulary placed the Library in the position of wanting desperately to meet the need, but of having insufficient funds and staff to do so. It is due to the
complete cooperation of various Department agencies* and of four of the
land-grant universities that the first edition of the *Agricultural/Biological
Vocabulary* will be in print this Fall.

For a three and a half month period, while the vocabulary terms were
being assigned field and group locations, one librarian each from Mas-
sachusetts Institute of Technology (Eileen Kibrick), Pennsylvania State
University (Catherine Carter), Purdue University (Henry Murphy), and
the University of Wyoming (Georgia Coffin), was loaned to the Project to
assist in this work. The Library is deeply indebted to these individuals
and to their universities. As groups of terms were categorized, they were
sent to the Library's automation staff for feed-in to the computer. Late
in September, 1966, a red-letter day arrived when complete vocabulary
printouts, in sets of two volumes, were received. In one volume, the
terms were arranged by subject field and group; in the other, they were
arranged alphabetically.

From the very beginning of the project, the Library was sensitive to
the need for professional competence in the various subject disciplines to
review the terms and to offer suggestions for terms, cross-references, and
for changes in the subject category list. Agencies of the Department of
Agriculture responded quickly to this need. Professional staff members
were named by the agencies to carry out the review. To these individuals
and agencies, the Library is grateful.

The day before the complete computer printouts of the vocabu-
lary were received, Jeanne Holmes, Acting Coordinator of the Agri-
cultural Vocabulary Project, began to conduct a two-day indoctrina-
tion session for the people from the Department agencies, using sample print-
outs. For this purpose, a *Manual for Development of the Agricultural/
Biological Vocabulary* had been prepared. The manual included an in-
troduction to the project, a list of reference tools applicable to each sub-
ject discipline included in the vocabulary, general instructions con-
cerned mostly with how the agency people should mark the vocabulary
printouts which would be sent to them, and finally, the vocabulary rules
and conventions. With the need for compatibility or convertibility in
mind, the manual followed closely the conventions of the April 1966
*Manual for Building a Technical Thesaurus* prepared by Project LEX
of the Office of Naval Research, in cooperation with other government
and non-government agencies. The *Manual for Development of the
Agricultural/Biological Vocabulary* turned out to be an indispensable
tool.

Because of the urgent need for the vocabulary, a deadline of January
15, 1967, was set for return of the reviewed terms to the project staff. The
agency people handled their parts of the vocabulary in different ways.
Some worked on the terms by themselves; others consulted with co-
workers when questions arose; and, some set up formal groups within

---

* "Agencies" in the context of this paper is defined as major units of the Depart-
ment of Agriculture, such as the Agricultural Research Service, Forest Service and Eco-
nomic Research Service.
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their agencies or across agency lines to review specific groups of terms within the assigned fields. The project staff kept themselves available for consultation with the agency staff members whenever the need arose. The deadline for return was met, although in some cases the agency people felt that there had not been enough time to do the job they would have liked to do.

While the staff members from the agencies were reviewing the terms in their subject fields, the project staff was busy reviewing the more general fields which had not been assigned to the agencies. Upon receipt from the agencies of terms in a particular field, the project staff began final review of those terms. Concurrently, as they completed their review of a group of terms, they sent corrections, additions and deletions to the automation staff for feed-in to the computer. April 27, 1967, was set as the cut-off date for changes as far as the first edition of the agricultural/biological vocabulary was concerned. Just as the professional staff from the agencies felt there was not enough time for the job to be done, the project staff had to cut corners too. There was not enough time to review all candidate terms, problems had to be set aside to be considered later, and the revision of the categorized list, except for minor changes, will have to be done in the future. However, it is heartening to report that all terms which will be listed in the published vocabulary have been reviewed, and that the cross-reference structure will be included.

A particularly interesting development is taking place in regard to veterinary medical terms. Three Department veterinarians shared responsibility for reviewing veterinary medical terms for the vocabulary. Because the National Library of Medicine is expanding its Medical Subject Headings, and because that library is also interested in veterinary medical terminology, an attempt is being made to develop and agree on common terminology that will be used for cataloging and indexing in the National Library of Medicine and the National Agricultural Library. The National Library of Medicine has established a panel for this purpose. The panel is composed of the three Department of Agriculture veterinarians who reviewed the terms for the Agricultural/Biological Vocabulary, two veterinarians from the Department of the Army, one from the University of California, Davis, and one representing the American Veterinary Medical Association. Members of the vocabulary staffs of both libraries work closely with the panel. In the panel's work, terms approved for use in the Agricultural/Biological Vocabulary are used as the authoritative terms whenever possible. The first edition of the Agricultural/Biological Vocabulary will not have the full benefit of the work of the panel since that work is still in progress. However, as agreement is reached, it is expected that the terms approved by the panel will become the standard for both the National Library of Medicine and the National Agricultural Library. If this effort proves successful, and there is every reason to believe it should, it leads to hope for standardization of terminology for information storage and retrieval purposes across a broad spectrum of subject disciplines.
The first edition of the *Agricultural/Biological Vocabulary* will be published in two parts. The first part of the work will be in categorized arrangement by subject field and group; the second part will be in alphabetical arrangement. Since each term is assigned to only one field and group, and the same term may be applicable to several subject fields, it will be necessary to consult the alphabetical list to determine whether a particular term is included.

The first edition is not the final edition. As noted earlier, no vocabulary of a living society can be a final vocabulary. It is planned that supplements will be issued to the first edition to make changes and to make available the specialized directories which are still to be adopted or developed. After several years of use by Department of Agriculture agencies, as well as by organizations outside of the Department, and as suggestions for improvements of the vocabulary are received, evaluated, and incorporated, it is planned that a revised edition will be issued which will be kept up-to-date thereafter. It is also planned to revise the *Agricultural/Biological Subject Category List* for Library use. Since each subject discipline has its own best approach from a category viewpoint, it will be incumbent upon the user agencies to determine whether the Library’s category list is suitable for their systems, or whether they should develop a categorization better suited to their particular system. In either case, this should not invalidate the use of the approved terms within all systems.

**Questions**

The availability of the *Agricultural/Biological Vocabulary* to other libraries and to the scientific community raises a number of interesting questions. First, and foremost of course, is the question of whether it will satisfy the needs of the users. Will it be useful in library catalogs, and also in computer information storage and retrieval systems? Can it be made compatible with or convertible to other standard vocabularies, such as those of the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, and the Department of Defense Project LEX? Will it provide direct entry for the user of the information system?

On the other side of the coin is the question of whether the *Agricultural/Biological Vocabulary* will be accepted in part or as a whole as authoritative substitution for or adjuncts to other standard vocabularies. Highly specialized vocabularies are being developed in many subject disciplines. Will the Library of Congress find it feasible to capitalize on the expertise represented in these vocabularies? Will this information be made available to other libraries through its cataloging information system, regardless of whether that system is the production and sale of catalog cards as it is today, whether it is a highly sophisticated computer system, or whether it is a combination of the two?

As Miss Piercy wrote in reference to cataloging: “Subject work is most important and most difficult. . . .”¹ It is also “most important and most difficult” to develop suitable standardized terminology to satisfy
current and future requirements for information. The National Agricultural Library, with cooperation from many others, is trying to develop such terminology to meet the needs of the agricultural/biological community. Only time and reactions of the users of that vocabulary will prove how successful this venture is.
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STANDARDS FOR BIBLIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
IN COMPUTER PROCESSING

Data which may serve as the basis for standardizing the preparation of bibliographic records for computer processing is contained in the final report of the Special Project on Data Elements for the Subcommittee on Machine Input Records (SC-2) of the Sectional Committee on Library Work and Documentation (Z-89) of the United States of America Standards Institute.

The report, The Identification of Data Elements in Bibliographic Records, was prepared by Miss Ann T. Curran, formerly of the Harvard Medical Library, and the project director, Mrs. Henriette D. Avram, Assistant Coordinator in the Information Systems Office at the Library of Congress. The work was assisted by grants from the National Science Foundation and the Council on Library Resources, Inc.

Basic to the implementation of any national or regional network for the exchange of bibliographic data, "is the necessity to agree on standards for the identification, representation, and recording of information," according to the report. The report itself is not setting a standard nor is it even intended to present recommendations for a standard, the authors state; it is only intended to be a working tool for the Subcommittee.

Inquiries about the 62-page, processed report, of which only a limited number of copies were prepared, should be directed to Dr. Jerrold Orne at the University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514.

Library Resources & Technical Services
Book Catalogs: Quo Animo?
Members of the Black Gold Cooperative Library System Reply

INTRODUCTION

The book catalog program of the Black Gold Cooperative Library System in California was described succinctly and vividly in 1966 by Mrs. Catherine S. Chadwick, director, Ventura County and City Library, one of the member libraries. As a pioneering cooperative cataloging experiment the book catalog of the system illustrates the sublimation of some traditional aspects of local autonomy by the seven public libraries participating. Its continuing refinement confirms the timeliness and wisdom of the program.

The Black Gold System, like many others involved in centralized cataloging, has been probed and—perhaps—plagued by inquiries, among them that of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study and, more recently, the views of the member libraries have been incorporated with those of 90 libraries representing the membership of 15 centralized programs. Because the Black Gold System was the only one of the 15 programs using a book catalog, ten additional questions were addressed to its members only.

The findings which follow reflect the views of the librarians of six of the seven member libraries who responded generously and thoughtfully to the questions. Some references are made also to one question addressed to members of the 15 programs.

Interest in a Book Catalog: Views of 90 Libraries

Though questions on the general inquiry were structured primarily for the card catalog format because of its known use, one question referred specifically to the book catalog:

Would you be interested in having a book catalog for the use of the member libraries sharing the centralized services with your library?

* The seven libraries and the abbreviations representing their holdings in the book catalogs are: Dean Hobbs Blanchard Memorial Library, Santa Paula (BSP); Lompoc Public Library (L); San Luis Obispo City Library (SL); San Luis Obispo County Free Library (SLP); Santa Barbara Public Library (SB); Santa Maria Public Library (SM); Ventura County and City Library (V).
The responses were: yes 36*  no 27  no response 33

The reasons cited for an interest in the book catalog by the 36 member libraries emphasized (1) its service in avoidance of duplication and for consultation; (2) its extension of the scope of the local collection through interlibrary loan; (3) its saving in time allocated to typing and filing. One member now using a card catalog added: “It simply is no longer logical to operate without a book catalog which is technically possible as well as obviously preferable to a solitary central card catalog.” Another pragmatically proposed that “with qualifications, the greatest use to our situation would be a book catalog of non-fiction adult [materials] covering about one-half of the state . . . in a state centralized purchasing and processing [program].”

Two members of one center noted that their State Library was already planning a book catalog of the holdings of all libraries in the State and that such a plan was preferable to the limitation set by the question. A member of another center stated a preference for a book catalog representing the holdings of the major libraries of all types in the entire state (or region).

Negatively, some expressed a lack of interest in the holdings of other users of their center. One added that the libraries were too much alike and buying patterns too similar for a book catalog to be of value. Moreover, in contrast to those already extending their perspective to a state level were those who challenged thus:

I have yet to be convinced that the public could use a book catalog.

Book catalogs are the vogue now and are useful, but our staff not oriented to their use. Regardless they and the public gravitate to the card catalog.

I can’t see that is would be possible for printing and distribution to keep up with frequent need for constant revision.

I am not so sure that a book catalog of all the library’s holdings would be of much value. I certainly would consider a book catalog if it were economically feasible.

While of the 90 libraries more acknowledged an interest than did those who rejected the idea, the reluctance of more than one-third (33) to respond at all signals the need for continuing relevant study of both book and card catalog formats. More significant than any expressed doubt, was the passivism about the card catalog which, after its long use, tends in itself to be pejorative. Whatever it may imply, it does not reflect by any means a confidence in and a preference for the format.

Views of Black Gold Member Libraries

The views of the Black Gold member libraries relate to the follow-

* Of the 36 responses, only three were from members of the Black Gold Cooperative Library System. Thus, 33 responses were from those member libraries using the card catalog format.
ing topics: (1) preference for the book catalog, (2) use of book and card formats, (3) appraisals of staff attitudes, (4) response of the library's public, (5) records maintained in member libraries, (6) time lapse prior to inclusion of citation, (7) location symbols in book catalogs, (8) characteristics of the book catalog, (9) guidelines.

Preference for the book catalog—Of the six members responding, only three indicated that they preferred the book catalog format. Four persuasive factors in their acceptance were identified as: (1) familiarity with the book catalog of the Los Angeles County Library; (2) availability of State funds; (3) timeliness of technology which has made it financially feasible to up-date the book catalog format; (4) evolution of indexing techniques for library collections.

Use of book and card formats—Because the card catalog of each member library was not—could not be—replaced instantly by the book catalog when it appeared, each library has been required to use jointly both formats. Time estimates made by the members for total conversion to the book format ranged from five years to "until we have sufficient funds to complete" the task. Meanwhile, it appears that little new is being added to local card catalogs other than documents and some ephemeral materials. One member anticipated that the card catalog would be reduced to a minimum as replacements, new editions, etc., were added to the book catalog. All stated a preference for one format only but one noted that such attainment immediately would be too costly.

Appraisals of staff attitudes—The frank appraisals of staff attitudes toward the book catalog suggest the initial difficulties to be encountered in similar programs, for example:

Acceptance, with some frustration resulting from inaccuracies and time lags.

Negative on the whole but changing fast.

Utter confusion at first, but continued use, greater efficiency and broader coverage have by now created an appreciation of its possibilities.

Generally accepted. Some are enthusiastic when system wide use is understood.

One member responded in more detail: "The principle of a union catalog has met with a favorable response in most cases. I have noticed that reluctance to use the book catalog is by those who resist change in any procedure"; but added: "The pioneer aspect of this project, relying on trial and error, has necessitated many changes in policies and procedures as we went along. This has created difficulties in communication and with training programs."

Response of the library's public—The response of the library's public, as observed by each member, indicated an appreciation of the greater selection potential and acceptance in general. The latter was modified by cautionary statements relating to the need for constant education and to the inherent dislike of consulting more than one source for similar materials. Another noted that the "great jump in
interlibrary loan gives evidence that it is being used." The reluctance of the mature clientele was indirectly emphasized by the observation that "children pick it up [the use of the book catalog] more quickly."

*Records maintained in member libraries*—The question, "What records do you maintain in your library for the card catalog" was not clear for one library indicated that no records were kept. The other five libraries listed these records:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders slips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelf list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions cards (to show which branch has the volume)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the book catalog, five of the six libraries maintain shelf lists while the sixth indicated that it kept no records whatever. One library increased its two records maintained for the card catalog, "orders out" and "shelf list", by these three additional ones for:

- Books in master catalog
- Books in supplements
- Books received but not yet in book catalog

Another library noted that instead of keeping a complete set of cards in the pocket of a book for filing in a branch catalog, now only one green card is included "to indicate that book in book catalog is in the branch." Though no library specifically identified a serial file or record, it can be assumed that each must maintain one, presumably as part of the shelf list generally, because of the direction in the book catalog under each serial entry: For Library Holdings Consult Reference Librarian.

*Time lapse prior to inclusion of citation*—Because a time lapse can be more readily measured for the book format than the card format, the members were asked to comment on the time lapse between issues of the book catalog. All indicated a monthly supplement; one added that the catalog had been "cumulated so far, into a two year master, with supplements. Subject and children's each 9 months."

The methods of informing staff and library users of acquisitions during the time lapse varied as follows:

- By acquisitions file
- By book lists (weekly)
- By new book lists
- By new book lists (weekly) plus card file of books received but not yet in book catalog
- By typewritten lists
- By file in extensions in which order cards for books received but not yet in supplement are placed
When asked to compare the time lapse between issues of the book catalog and the schedule for updating the card catalog when each maintained its own cataloging unit or department, two libraries felt that the time lapse was "less with the card catalog"; two, "longer with the book catalog." A fifth admitted that no records had been kept but added, "I do not believe [the] card catalog was ever updated." The sixth library felt it was impossible to compare because of the relation of time lapse to the fluctuation in the backlog.

Though the questionnaire did not pursue causes of time lapses, one library attributed one current problem to the delay in receiving Library of Congress cards for best sellers and obscure titles. As a consequence decisions have been made to catalog best sellers under author entries previously recorded and to do original cataloging for obscure titles.

Location symbols in book catalogs—Because location symbols are included in the Black Gold book catalogs, the member libraries were asked if they felt that the symbol was an essential to their acceptance and use of the book catalog. The responses were: yes 4 no 1 not necessarily 1. The "not necessarily" was modified by "But it is an aid for both public & staff use. Feel there would be more frustration without, also interlibrary loan [value]."

A supplementary question sought the advice of the member libraries on the use of location symbols for a book catalog representing the holdings of fifty or more autonomous libraries. Of the five which considered the question, three would advise location symbols for the following reasons:

Catalog is virtually useless without knowing where books can be found.

If format is acceptable.

Unless locator symbol were in book catalog, a group of libraries of fifty or more might as well use CBI or Books in Print, and rely on some union catalog such as the ones we have in California State Library.

Two would not advise the use of location symbols: one because the procedure is "too costly and too time consuming"; the other because, "With new technology and random access catalogs can be produced on computers with a limited number of the 50 locating in one catalog."

When invited to suggest a substitute for location symbols for possible use within each member library, three members offered five alternatives:

1. Follow procedure now used with California State Library Union Catalog whereby after State Library informs member of location, the member library requests title on interlibrary loan.
2. Divide the 50 into sections and let one library in each section contact balance for holdings.
3. Propose that each member library add—by hand or stamp—its particular holdings [within the book catalog] for the benefit of public and staff.
4. Check shelf list for holdings.
5. Borrow title via teletype from another library if the book is not on the shelf.*

Characteristics of the book catalog—Because of their daily involvement in the joint use of both book and card catalog formats, the members were asked to identify those characteristics of the book catalog which were considered (1) improvements over the card catalog and (2) limitations as compared to the card catalog.

The improvements, cited by five, were:

1. Inclusion of holdings of six other libraries; richness of resources for interlibrary loan
2. Availability of all holdings to patrons in branches which prior to the book catalog identified branch holdings only
3. Portability of format
4. Space requirements less than for card catalog
5. Elimination of filing and withdrawal of cards
6. Ease of use (once learned)
7. Cost less than that for the card catalog†
8. Elimination of duplicate cataloging activities since cataloging is prepared once for the system

The limitations were noted as being:

1. Time lag between receipt of book and inclusion in and receipt of book catalog
2. Readability not so easy as that of the card catalog
3. Difficulty in making immediate corrections in and adaptations to both by staff and public
4. Consultation of more than one volume (and current necessity for consultation of both book and card catalog)
5. Increase in cost as collections grow and location symbols are revised

One member warned that the following problems, while not much worse than those associated with the card catalog, should be anticipated with a change to book format:

1. Actual errors in the printed book catalog are frustrating because they cannot be corrected on the spot, as can be done with the card catalog.
2. Filing errors are more evident on a printed page than when hidden in a card catalog.
3. Timing the printing of all new acquisitions to match the exact time when the book appears in the library is impossible. (This did not show up with the card catalog, as cards were not filed until the book was ready to go on the shelf. Current solution: maintain small file of cards for books available but not yet included in the book catalog supplement).
4. Transfer of backlog from member library to catalog center disturbs staff accustomed to extracting from backlog a title for which an urgent need had been expressed and having it cataloged immediately.

* Further checking of the local library's shelf list and circulation records, if appropriately arranged, would presumably precede borrowing via teletype.
† No cost figures were cited.

Library Resources & Technical Services
5. Acceptance of uniform decisions and procedures for a joint cataloging program of which each member must be aware from the beginning rather than spending time and effort finding it out the hard way. (Black Gold decision: To use LC cataloging).

In summary, the member concluded:

The book catalog reveals all aspects of the cataloging, both good and bad. Whether we like LC cataloging or not, at least we know what to expect and that all have the same cataloging and classification. In the event that other union book catalogs develop, if they also use LC cataloging, it will make inter-system cooperation easier.

Guidelines—The final question invited the Black Gold members to offer advice/suggestions/recommendations to autonomous libraries now considering a joint book catalog. The responses from four members have been paraphrased in the following six areas: (1) cataloging and classification policies/procedures for a book catalog; (2) system headquarters economies versus member library economies; (3) contracts with commercial firms; (4) communication with/among member libraries; (5) communication with the library's public; (6) advice to all librarians.

Cataloging and classification policies/procedures for a book catalog:

Adhere strictly to policies commonly endorsed by all member libraries.

Adopt a uniform code of cataloging such as that of the Library of Congress and do not accept variations. (This will reduce unit cost and help in adapting to advances in use of data processing by the Library of Congress).

Determine the scope of the book catalog in progressive phases not for the first volume alone.

Pattern realistically a schedule for supplementary volumes and for either partial or total revisions.

Direct that both the member libraries and the system weigh problems and errors as they relate to each volume. Evaluate the data and specify corrections and/or changes before contracting for revision.

Experiment with such innovations as these:

Make open entries for serial publications and frequently revised works with a note: For library holdings consult the reference librarian.

Avoid use of author cross references. Control is too difficult and the cross references would need to appear in each supplement containing an author's work. Use added entries instead.

Omit subject cross references. Refer to the authoritative list used for the book catalog, for example, the Subject Headings from the Library of Congress. (Note: Unless headings are revised, indicate in each subject section of the book catalog, the edition of headings used as an authority).
System headquarters economies versus member library economies:

Study the impact of the economics of any procedural proposal both on the system headquarters and on each member library.

Avoid the lure of transferring costs from one to the other for a momentary advantage unless clearly identified as such by all participants.

Question and accept or find an alternative to any proposal which requires that one or the other must allocate more time and staff to its fulfillment.

Re-appraise the economics of the need for and value of cataloging within member libraries, for example, the cataloging of recordings and other audio-visual materials, pamphlet materials, documents, when not in book form, publications from unusual or questionable sources, etc.

Contracts with commercial firms:

Distinguish between contracting for printing only and for cataloging and printing of a book catalog.

Explore the communications gap which exists between librarians and commercial firms whether the latter be traditional or au courant with data processing.

Recognize the “future plans” of any firm for what they are with an equal insistence that the firm acknowledge a similar recognition.

Discuss limitations in time and accuracy of the process which will actually be used, not what can be done eventually if the book catalog is to be prepared now and not at that eventual date. Negotiate a contract accordingly.

Recognize that catalogers, employed by a commercial firm, are responsible first to the firm and are somewhat impersonal in their preparation of a book catalog.

Specify the format of the book catalog, the details and examples of which must accompany the contract.

Specify in contract penalties for errors by the contracting firm. Consider the unit for estimating an error not a line but an entry since any part of the entry which is in error may affect all lines of the entry.

Specify in contract penalty for late delivery of book catalogs to equate acceptance by the system and/or the libraries that there will be no extension of deadline dates by the contracting firm. (Accept date of shipment rather than date of delivery as fair criterion for assessing penalty).

Specify in contract the authority and/or position of the cataloging staff within the system or center in relation to the printing of the book catalog, for example, that the cataloging staff does not simply edit each entry as an entity in itself but is concerned with its relationship to other entries.
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Communication with/among member libraries:

Budget for a staff orientation program which should include study and research by and for the staff, publications, and preparation of manuals for staff and the library's public.

Encourage continuing self evaluation of the library's public service programs, efforts to enrich the local collection through interlibrary loan, responses to the demands of the transitional periods, use of the book and card catalog formats and other bibliographic resources.

Prepare procedural manuals flexible in structure for updating without the necessity of reproducing the complete text.

Record any decision, temporary or otherwise, which requires response or activity on the part of any staff in any library.

Avoid when possible temporary decisions which, in their unlearning, foster a credibility gap. (Suggestion: Profit from the pioneering venture of the Black Gold System rather than repeat similar experiences).

Propose workshops for catalog librarians involved with systems or commercial firms as more encompassing book catalog programs develop.

Prepare orientation programs for catalogers, long confined to localizing their views, not only to systems concepts but also for public service activities unless they choose to seek cataloging assignments within a systems (or a broader) structure or within a commercial milieu.

Consult with those directly involved with the use of the book catalog when exploring and/or evaluating the problems being created rather than with administrators alone. It can be assumed that "librarians of small libraries, who sometimes work with the public, using the book catalog, and/or who are responsible for training the staff who work with the public, are much more sensitive to the temporary imperfections of the catalogs than those who are several times removed, by a large staff hierarchy, from the public".

Schedule meetings within the system for discussion by the staffs of all the member libraries.

Communication with the library's public:

Budget for a public relations program to acquaint the library's public not only with the book catalog but with the impact of the interlibrary loan potential on the member library's resources.

Prepare a handbook or a demonstration through the use of film and tape which would illustrate the relationship between the book and card catalogs [and other bibliographic resources].

Advice to all librarians:

Recognize that no index is perfect and don't be too hasty to criticize the book catalog if mistakes occur. Just look at your own card catalog!

Recognize that a long period of time will intervene before all holdings are placed in the book catalog. Derive the most from both formats during the transitional period.
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These guidelines reflect the experiences of seven vital and optimistic libraries which seemingly compelled themselves toward success in a systems program which included an experimental venture with a book catalog. The success was neither instantaneous nor miraculous but rather a tribute to their adaptability and spirit. The guidelines, encompassing basic administrative principles, relate the success of that cooperative venture to the learned arts or skills of contemplating, coordinating, codifying, and communicating. Thus, while the book catalog format can readily be adopted by others, the Black Gold mystique may itself remain elusive and coveted.

Meanwhile as book catalogs for autonomous library holdings multiply, the philosophic can view the transition from card to book format wryly as another cyclic episode in American cataloging practices endured in reverse and accepted by their predecessors in the nineteenth century and poised themselves for the thrust of the next decade.

REFERENCES

Commentary on Three Topics of Current Concern

Phyllis A. Richmond
University of Rochester Library
Rochester, N. Y.

One of Esther Piercy's many talents was her ability to keep this journal interesting through the publication of timely, thought-provoking and discussion-inducing articles. It seems fitting, in an issue serving as her memorial, to honor her leadership by attempting on a small scale to follow it. It is with this purpose that the following commentaries are written.
"Adaptation" of LC Cards

It is sometimes suggested that savings in time and money can be made by taking the Library of Congress catalog cards exactly as they are and making no changes in them. So we decide we shall do so. The edict goes out in the Catalog Department that from now on we shall just type on the class number, and make other entries according to the tracing provided. This is fine for about three days. Then a sharp-eyed clerk comes to the Head Cataloger and says, "Look. My book has 345 pages and the LC card says 343. There is a two page bibliography in here, which may account for the extra pages." Or it may be a different imprint, or a series unaccounted for, or a label pasted over the imprint the Library of Congress used, or the book in hand may be a centimeter taller or shorter which tips off the clerk to the fact that something else is different. Where do we draw the line? Surely if we pretend to be even embryo bibliographers, our catalog card should describe the book in our library, not a slightly different one in Washington.

So we modify the edict and check our book against the LC card to be sure they match. While a difference in edition or printing looks like nothing much today, we may find tomorrow that we are the possessors of that slightly altered copy that is much in demand among certain types of scholars. By checking our books and cards we make sure that at least we have a decent bibliographic description of what we actually have in our stack.

This is a relatively easy question to which there is a fairly simple answer. We are now getting along nicely, taking our copy as it comes until we come to the Guessing Game involving the LC book number. On an LC card, this is given after the classification number and there is no problem. On the homebrew card resulting from original cataloging, this can be a problem and a half. How do we assign a book number in the certainty that the Library of Congress is not going to assign the same number to a different book in the same class? Assuming we do original cataloging, this is no minor matter. There are several possibilities. We can use the Cutter-Sanborn tables. We can get along without any book number and file alphabetically by author in each class. Possibly we might get a copy of the LC shelf list (and some means of keeping it up to date?) The best solution is that promised by Title IIC: no more original cataloging of current material. If every foreign book gets an LC card, then the Guessing Game is confined to serials, old monographs, rare books and the few odd items not cataloged by the Library of Congress. This is the millennium for which we all fervently hope.

Let us assume that we are checking our books against the cards to ensure that they are bibliographically identical and that LC is cataloging practically everything so that we have no duplicate book numbers in any given class. Then we have the problem of the Genius Head Cataloger who eliminates selected parts of entry or description. This goes along quietly until the Reference Department finds out. Then all Hell breaks
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loose. Sometimes it is done in cahoots with Reference and continues until there is a change in personnel, so that Hell is delayed in arrival. Saving twenty minutes’ time in the Catalog Department can mean a repetitive loss of the same twenty minutes at the Reference end. The cost to the library is ultimately greater, though the practice alleviates pressure at input. It is very hard to get administrators to see the false economy in the procedure, and unless the Head of Reference is a squeakier wheel than the Head of Catalog Peter is robbed to make Paul look good.

These are all internal problems. There is an even more difficult external one that faces many libraries. This is the Great Man problem. Every college and university library director has met this one. Professor X, who is a recognized world authority on the subject of Y, comes storming into the Librarian’s office and complains with great vehemence and at considerable length about the classification and/or subject headings assigned by the Library of Congress to his specialty. Does the Librarian, in the interest of taking the LC card exactly as it is, tell him to go fly a kite? If so, he goes to the President and the Librarian gets to fly the kite. Does the Librarian suggest that he write to the Library of Congress or undertake to do so himself? Maybe. More likely the Librarian tells the Head Cataloger that from now on books dealing with the subject Y are to be classified thus and so and they are to have the “appropriate” (i.e., Professor X’s choice) subject headings. This is how local deviations get started. It may be that in the future we can blame everything on the computer and avoid bowing before the rage of Professor X, but until that happy day there is so much more involved than mere alteration of a number or word that discretion is usually the better part of valor. (Why is it that the Professor X’s of this world always manage to be in a position to help or hinder the library in its perennial quest for annual funds?)

These four problems, involving accuracy in the case of matching card to book, expediency in taking the guesswork out of book numbers, long-term savings in the case of putting sufficient information on the card in the first place, and public relations in pacifying Professor X, all mitigate against taking the LC card exactly as is. Is it wise to cry for rigid uniformity on the semi-firm ground that adaptation of Library of Congress work is inefficient? (After all, if we lose $50,000 because Professor X wields great power at the budget end, what is efficient?) Would we not be better off to face the fact that adaptation is one of the facts of life—but try to hold it to a minimum?

To the purist, one may point out that this is not as bad as it sounds. When libraries are automated and we receive our new entries in the form of machine readable copy instead of printed cards, there is no reason not to program our desired local changes into the process, making our adaptations automatically (other than comparing book and card, which will always require a human so long as the book is in codex form). This, incidentally, is also a way of altering those rules in the new code with
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which one is unhappy. Once a catalog is in machine readable form, whole blocks of it can be altered rather easily. Then what would happen if we wanted to search each other’s catalogs as well as our own? What happens now? The LC copy is a lingua franca. Possibly this is the solution to the majority of the problems discussed here: use the LC copy as base level, but use it flexibly to meet the realities and necessities of the local scene.

Professional Catalogers and Clerical Work

A recurrent complaint in cataloging circles is that professionals are doing too much work that could be done by high grade clerks. In many respects this is true, and undoubtedly a careful survey of practically any Catalog Department would reveal the extent to which this is applicable in each case. The fact, if it may be called a fact, of professional catalogers doing more clerical work than is necessary is less interesting than the reasons for such a situation.

These reasons are apparent to any administrator:

(1) constant turnover in clerical personnel. The tendency to depart as soon as trained is especially aggravating. Admittedly the work is routine and repetitive, but this is true of much clerical labor.

(2) difficulty in getting clerks to do what they are told to do in the way in which they were told to do it. Since they rarely see the overall picture, even with good orientation, it is almost impossible to convey to them the degree of accuracy and consistency needed if a catalog system is to function properly. Assembly line operations are used because they make turnover in clerks something considerably less than catastrophic, but the price paid for this is lack of motivation. The problem is even worse with procedures necessary for automatic data processing because the margin for error is much less.

(3) inability of clerks to differentiate between a situation they can handle and one that should be referred to a professional. The result is that the clerk varies between pestering the cataloger with everything that comes up and not consulting the cataloger enough. Experience helps tremendously, but few clerks stay long enough to gain it. When an experienced clerk departs, it is indeed a day to put the flag at half mast.

(4) assuming intelligent clerks, all the usual consequences of distraction, carelessness and lack of attention. The problem of motivation is a major one since a great many clerks are, in their own minds at least, employed temporarily. Very few intend to make a career of clerking.

It might help if clerical positions could be glamorized (look what they did to the waitresses on aeroplanes). Semi-professional status could certainly be instituted for some clerical jobs, particularly those held by college graduates. Experience as well as attendance in library school should be a path to professional status. Courses in vital subjects such as cataloging and reference, should be available in nearby library schools for those clerks whose ambitions are moderate because of family responsibilities, but whose work would profit by association with the faculty and
students of a school. Students with clerical experience certainly liven up a class. There seems little point in giving borderline work now being done by professionals to clerks if the clerks do not have at least a touch of the professional training necessary to handle it successfully.

The mention of "borderline work" brings us to the point: the professional does a clerical job because it is easier and faster to do it himself than to take the time necessary to teach a constant procession of new clerks how to do it. If the job could be analyzed sufficiently well so that operations could be simplified by using a computer as an aid, then a single top level clerical worker could cover much of the assembly line work done piecemeal by many hands now. In such a case, the job could be both glamorized and made interesting for the clerk.

The flow chart given in Figure 1 demonstrates the steps involved in the process of checking the book in hand with the LC card. It assumes a keyboard/console arrangement operating in Time-Sharing mode, with the library’s own catalog and the National Union Catalog in storage and immediately available. On original cataloging, the professional would perform such recall procedures as needed to establish entry and so on, add his own material, and put the new item into storage directly, eliminating the clerical assembly line used for card reproduction and adaptation.

If computers live up to their promise, a cataloger would catalog. If errors and changes such as full or partial recataloging were keyed directly into the computer, clerical work would be quite different—no more typing cards or filing, for example. Rules for entry, reclassification or subject heading changes could be done in one fell swoop (one swoop per change). These alterations would take extensive and expensive programming, but the price would be small compared to the cost of changing manually. Lubetzy’s logical rules may yet be adopted . . . . . . courtesy of your friendly computer.

Users’ Jargon as Catalog Entry Points

The librarian who talks about library methods to scientists is often asked why library entry is so far from that familiar to the user. In most cases, it turns out that the user is employing catchword, acronym or jargon type of entry. He insists that “everybody knows” whatever these special forms are, and within his speciality this is true. He does not see why anyone would have difficulty with his words and, in fact, he does not even see that they are catchwords or equivalent until the librarian cites a few from another specialty and asks him if he knows what these mean. Invariably he regards this as unfair. His catchwords are acceptable, but the other person should use respectable forms. When one remarks that other people feel the same way about his specialty, he retires behind the old line that no one else uses the material in his field. The librarian gets the impression that he does not care to face the possibility that a broader outlook would make it necessary to note actual author and title forms instead of using the in-language of his group. Psychologically speaking,
this may be because an in-language is part of the distinctive criteria for separating one group from another.

If the librarian can get the scientist to admit, figuratively speaking, that what’s sauce for the goose is sauce for the garder, then he is told he should use the catalog or jargon entry, which “everybody knows,” as an added entry or cross-reference. To some extent, this is done. The mathematical seminars entered under Paris. Université or Paris. Ecole normale supérieure have added entries under Séminaire Schwartz or Séminaire Sophus Lie, etc. which are the mathematician’s method of referring to and citing them. Does anyone cite Chemical Abstracts the way it is entered? One has to pay some attention to reality.

Another case concerns books which are known under very casual titles, or ones where a early editor has left his imprint on later work done by others, or books with longer titles that have been shortened (Newton’s Principia). Sometimes these are caught in a special added entry. Sometimes they are not. New terminology is almost certainly fitted into old subject headings until it is established. One may suggest that in science, at least, writing a monograph is establishing a term or set of terms, since new work appears in preprint, report or article form, and a monograph is several years behind the frontier. The user who berates the library for not keeping up with the new terminology, at least that in monograph titles, has a legitimate complaint, one that is especially noticeable in those cases where the first part of the title is some non-entry form like Introduction to . . ., Principles of . . ., Treatise on . . ., and so on.

The problem of catchword or acronym entry is a major one with scientific serials. The user wants PNAS, and everybody knows what PNAS is. After the first day, the new librarian joins the group. Where corporate authors are involved, as in this case, the problems can be compounded. Here citations are notoriously inaccurate even if not in acronym form. When the user comes with the name of a serial editor, there often is an added entry, but when he appears with an approximation of the name of a corporate body, particularly the name of a conference or symposium, the problem of reconstruction can be a major one. He will, for example, ask for the proceedings of the Berkeley Conference. When the librarian explains that many conferences are held in Berkeley and asks what was the topic of the conference, he gets an approximation as a rule. (In case the reader is tempted to think “how silly,” notice in the library literature the number of references to the “Dorking Conference.” What was the topic? What is the entry?)

A goodly proportion of criticism of the catalog comes from users approaching it with what is essentially a catchword or jargon title, which they are unable to locate. Scientists are noisy in proclaiming their frustrations, but it happens sooner or later to everyone, including librarians.

To what degree should catalogers pay attention to popular usage in a subject field? At our own ALA RTSD CCS Pre-Conference Institute on the Library of Congress Classification in New York in 1966, reference was
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made to the "Red Book" and "Green Book." We all knew what was meant. What about a non-librarian? Should we put in entries for "Red Book" and "Green Book"? This seems pretty ridiculous. So is the request for the Berkeley Conference, but the user does not think so.

Recently, some scientists decided the library situation was so awful that they would bring their expertise to bear upon it. So far the only results have been either to relearn why the librarian does what he does, in which case the scientist comes to essentially the same conclusion as Cutter and others (witness the proposed COSATI rules for thesauri), or else he simplifies the situation to such a degree that it becomes something different, with very little relation to actual working conditions, and his "solution" will only operate under such aseptic conditions.

What is the answer to the problem of catchwords, acronyms and jargon? So long as a sign of being "in" any specialty is the usage of such jargon, we shall be faced with the user who expects us to know it. And in our own specialties, we will know it. Reference librarians will learn it in many more specialties, but this knowledge will not be fed back to the catalogers. One might question whether it should be, since there are fads in schools of thought and their terminology. If we do decide that paying attention to catchwords, acronyms and jargon should be a rather casual affair, which seems to be our present attitude, how do we best explain this?

There should be some explanation. One is greatly tempted to say the diplomatic equivalent of "Look, bud, if you want to communicate in Pig Latin O.K., but here we speak English." The problem is that these users feel the Pig Latin is English, and expect us to accommodate our procedures to that belief. Since we cannot possibly keep up with the makers of jargon, we are justified in waiting until this terminology makes its appearance in monograph titles, at which time we should regard it as established. Catchwords can be added wherever their use can be justified by reasons more logical than emotional ones. Except when they occur in titles, definition of acronyms should be left to dictionaries. Above all we should demonstrate to our users that jargon is jargon, even when they use it, that in-words today are out-words tomorrow, and that building for permanency requires us to select with greater care than if we were only preparing a product to last for a single lifetime. When we have made our point, we can go back to checking the ae's on that last LC card to see if the tracing is suitable for ADP without further tagging.
Figure 1. ADAPTATION OF A LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD - COMPUTER IN TSS NODE
Cameras for Copying Catalog Cards: Two Approaches

ALLEN B. VEEANER
Assistant Editor for Copying Methods

Introduction

The goal of providing a "cataloger's camera" was given early priority by the Council on Library Resources shortly after its formation in 1956. The Council's second Annual Report correctly attributed the gross inefficiency of then existing methods to short press runs of small size unit cards, followed by the requirement to "write up" individually each multiple card with separate subject headings, and headings for other added entries. In effect, there was no way of escaping the need to handle each card as an individual item. A contract was let to RCA for development of a device which would, right at the cataloger's desk, not only reproduce multiple cards, but also optically and photographically handle the "writing up" direct from the added entries printed at the foot of Library of Congress unit cards. This camera worked, but electrostatic reproduction problems associated with stock of catalog card thickness resulted in inferior graphic quality, and no further work was done on the RCA device. Following this failure, in 1964/65 the Council provided a grant to Hugh Hazelrigg of Indiana University to develop a camera using conventional photographic techniques and modified, readily available commercial components to make full-size copies from printed entries in the National Union Catalog, but without the features which would have eliminated the manual "writing up." This is the camera described in the accompanying article by Miss Mary Stanger, Catalog Librarian at Indiana University Libraries. A second development arises from the marketing of a medical and dental camera, the CU-5, produced by the Polaroid Corporation. Adapter kits were furnished for the CU-5 to permit direct copying from the National Union Catalog, or from full-size cards, but in neither case are the results those intended by the Council on Library Resources. The University of Vermont's experience with this camera is recounted here in the second portion of this report by Mrs. Helen Oustinoff, Assistant Director of the Bailey Library, University of Vermont.

In The Future of the Research Library, Verner Clapp still cites the "cataloger's camera" as a desideratum within a program for develop-

ment of new or improved devices for library applications: "A ‘cataloger’s camera’ or other card-duplicating device for producing complete catalog card sets (main entry plus filing entries) at one action." It is evident that this ambitious goal has not been achieved by the two devices herein described; the Indiana camera requires a darkroom and is at its best with batch processing, while the Polaroid product is not of standard size and is considered too expensive by some. Nevertheless, both cameras make a significant contribution towards speeding technical processing, since they considerably simplify the transfer of bibliographic data from established sources into the library’s own catalog. They may save little or no keyboarding work, but they do eliminate much manual copying and diminish the possibility of error. The rapid advancement of computerized technical processing may soon make obsolete the original “writing up” and quantity production requirements for the “cataloger’s camera.” However, it is unlikely that computers or optical character readers will very soon eliminate the requirement to copy bibliographic data from an authoritative source for re-entry into local, regional, or national, machine readable files. The forthcoming publication in conventional book form of the retrospective National Union Catalog actually accentuates the need for a quick, efficient, inexpensive means of moving cataloging information from the confines of a bound volume to the computer-controlled, machine accessible local record. It is therefore hoped that the two cameras thus far developed as partial solutions will stimulate further work on a follow-up design which could be called a “bibliographer’s camera.” An important library need remains unsatisfied.


The Cataloger’s Camera

MARY HELEN STANGER, Catalog Librarian
Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana

For years librarians have been attempting to get a camera which would give catalogers an immediate copy of a catalog card. Some of us can recall having attended a meeting of RTSD, Copying Methods Section at the A.L.A. annual conference held in Cleveland, in July 1961 where Verner Clapp, President of the Council on Library Resources, Ralph Shaw and some others were on the panel. Mr. Clapp said that he

* A revision of a paper read at the annual meeting of the Ohio Valley Group of Technical Service Librarians at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, May 13-14, 1966 and a report sent to Verner Clapp in February, 1966.
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hoped to see a camera developed which would just shoot the cards out so fast, it would just spew them all over the place. “He reviewed experiments in progress to bring out simpler, quicker, cheaper and more portable photocopying equipment—most of it having as yet little promise for a unit as compact and wieldy as a pistol-grip camera.”

Dr. Robert A. Miller, Director of Libraries, Indiana University, Bloomington, had also been interested in a camera which would provide immediate copy of cards from the Library of Congress Catalog of Printed Cards and the printed National Union Catalog. His idea was supported by The Council on Library Resources, which made a grant of approximately $4,000.00 in late 1964, so that we could develop and test an experimental camera in the Catalog Department of the Indiana University Library.

This camera, developed by Mr. Hugh Hazelrigg, Science Editor of the Indiana University News Bureau, utilizes a glass contact plate and the camera’s own weight to maintain accurate register with the printed page while the picture is taken. No clamping device is necessary, regardless of the position of the desired entry on the page, or the position of the page in the catalog. The camera is adjustable to produce a copy at the desired degree of enlargement. The camera takes only seconds to operate after one has located the entry which one wishes to copy.

The photographic process which we use was selected by Mr. Hazelrigg for its speed and economy as compared to other available rapid processes, and for the high quality of the finished product. Basically, we utilize the Fotorite system of rapid photographic printing. This, and some similar systems on the market, make use of a rapid processing machine, special rapid chemical solutions, and special sensitized papers.

We use one of the special papers (presently Eastman Kodak Ekta-matic Photomechanical Paper, Grade T) to produce the negative. From this paper negative, we can make as many final prints as we wish. For the prints, we use Fotorite paper, type RK-41, Contrast 4. We use a Fotorite processor (there are others available) and, in order to make prints from the negative as soon as possible, a Fotorite RapiDryer.

The negative runs through the processor in about nine seconds, and through the dryer in about ten seconds. After the positive is exposed to the negative (this takes about four seconds) in a standard contact printer, it is similarly run through the processor. Usually, we run several negatives or prints at a time through each step.

In order to print only the specific entry desired and to eliminate a portion of the entry above or below the desired one, a jig was developed with masking tape and heavy paper for the contact printer. The desired entry is pencil checked by the person who searches and exposes the film. This way there is no question as to which card is wanted. The film holders are loaded in the dark-room by a student.

Briefly, the equipment is: The camera, processor, fast dryer, printer, timer, and trimmer. The materials are:

---
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Kodak Ektamatic photomechanical paper, Grade T
Fotorite paper RK4 contrast 4
Fotorite developer
Fotorite stabilizer

We started testing the equipment in early September, 1965. It has been used by the searchers for the Regional Campus Libraries, the Latin-American, Slavic and Hungarian searchers, as well as the Far Eastern searchers. Our Library of Congress card order clerks were not encouraged to use it, because of the congested area in which the camera had to be located.

On October 1, 1965, the searchers or users were instructed to keep statistics for one month as to the number of exposures and the length of time required to do this work. The following report was compiled as a result of keeping these statistics:

REPORT OF CAMERA USE FROM OCTOBER 1—NOVEMBER 3, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME in exposing:</th>
<th>rate of pay</th>
<th>no. exposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Operator A</td>
<td>169 min. (2 5/6 hrs.)</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Operator B</td>
<td>255 min. (4 1/4 hrs.)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator C</td>
<td>34 min.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator D</td>
<td>26 min.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hrs. 30 min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TIME in darkroom procedures: | |
| Operator E | 25 1/2 hrs. | 1.40 | 458 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST of materials:</th>
<th>Amt. used</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kodak Ektamatic photomechanical paper</td>
<td>1 1/2 bx.</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade T 8 x 10 100 per box (cut to 4 per sheet) = 400</td>
<td>593 sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fotorite paper, RK 41, contrast 4</td>
<td>5 9/10 bx.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>18.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(500 sheets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fotorite developer</td>
<td>6 bottles</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(qt. size)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fotorite stabilizer</td>
<td>8 bottles</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(qt. size)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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DIRECT MATERIALS COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ektamatic paper</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RK 41 paper contrast 4</td>
<td>18.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fotorite developer</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fotorite stabilizer</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials cost per exposure: 10.4 cents
TOTAL per exposure: 21.6 cents

EQUIPMENT COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary model</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production model</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 4 × 5 film holders</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fotorite processor</td>
<td>$269.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact printer</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimmer</td>
<td>$59.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fotorite RapiDryer</td>
<td>$315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safelite</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: $2,874.00

During this early experimental stage the labor cost per exposure was 11.2 cents. The materials cost per exposure was 10.4 cents making a total cost of 21.6 cents per exposure, excluding any overhead, equipment, or depreciation costs. There is, in my mind, a question as to whether this period of testing was long enough to make a valid observation.

Probably the most economical use of our camera and system would be with one operator, who would take all pictures and do the processing. This operator could be part-time only, unless great use of the camera required full-time.

For example, if he worked five hours per day, at a rate of $1.40 per hour, he could turn out, we think, about 100 pictures. This would mean a labor cost of about seven cents each. Use of one operator also would mean savings in materials (note that the preceding figures include about 160 lost pictures, mostly from errors of beginning operators).

The Regional Campus searchers have used the equipment most to search for L.C. cataloging information. In a report of their searching procedures, Mrs. Carol Welsch, of the Regional Campus Library staff, wrote:

Often a hand-copied card had to be returned to the catalogs to recheck numbers or spelling. The camera leaves no doubt about the accuracy of the card copy; the clarity cannot be questioned. The searcher places the volume with the slip enclosed at the appropriate place on the camera table ready for the picture, takes the picture, and, when a sufficient number of pictures are completed, gives the plates to the darkroom employee for developing. Purchase requests too recent to appear in the collated book catalogs are searched in the 1966 proofsheets, and copied by the Thermo-Fax method.
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In summarizing the study of the use of the camera for copying cataloging information for 200 purchase requests, Mrs. Welsch reported that the time was 13 ¾ hours, while the old method required 20 ¼ hours for completing 200 purchase requests.

While the Regional Campus Libraries are searching for catalog card information, the Latin-American searchers are seeking the specific entry. Two positives were developed for the latter; one was filed in the process file of the Order Department and the second travelled with the book. The Slavic and Hungarian searchers have used the system to provide catalog card information; their copy travelled with the book.

**Improvements Needed**

Although the present experimental camera weighs only 10 pounds, 10 ounces, it does have to be lifted off and replaced on a hook above shoulder height; this can tire the shoulders, especially if the same person operates the camera all day. Possibly a pulley or a spring attached to the camera would help. Future models of the camera can be made lighter.

Occasionally the paper curls as it is fed through the processor. The operator just turns the paper in the opposite direction in order to straighten it.

Originally we planned to take the copy from the camera and expose it on an offset master with the Xerox 914. We abandoned this. After a cost study in December on three methods of securing cards, ordering Library of Congress cards, offset, and Xerox, we decided to continue as we are now doing, using Library of Congress cards and offset printing. In the card cost study, we considered the cost of the camera for making copies to Xerox because we have no proofslip file prior to 1961.

We investigated the cost of using Polaroid® film with our camera and found that the cost of the Polaroid film is 23 cents per exposure for a 3 ¾" × 4 ¼" print, not including the labor cost. The Polaroid process gives a satisfactory copy from the Polaroid CU-5 Camera, but we feel that it does not have the quality which our process gives, as the background in the Polaroid print is not as bright. It is also apparent on a 3 ¾" × 4 ¼" print that there is not space in the lefthand margin for adding a classification number or putting location stamps. The print is glossy, so one cannot write on it. Our end product is, therefore, cheaper, better, larger, and more distinct than Polaroid.

We also sought information about Polaroid from the Library Technology Program. There remains the obstacle of high cost; even at a generous discount, the cost per print will be in excess of 20 cents according to the information supplied by the Library Technology Program.

Mr. David Hoffman, formerly Head, Information Service, the Library Technology Program, hopes that it will be possible to develop a camera whose product will be a short run offset master. He states: “We feel it would be most desirable to copy material from a printed catalog,
The University of Vermont Uses a Polaroid CU-5 to Speed Book Processing

HELEN OUSTINOFF, Assistant Director
Guy W. Bailey Library
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

The development of a "cataloger's camera," that elusive, Utopian piece of equipment, had been studied and worked on at the University of Vermont Library, as it had in many other libraries, but every experiment came to a dead end because of cost, lack of flexibility, and an increase, rather than a decrease in processing time. Although we had to admit defeat, we were still on the look-out for someone else's success, and in the Spring 1965 issue of Library Resources & Technical Services, Allen B. Veaner's article on "Developments in Copying Methods, 1964" included the statement:

Polaroid has just shown what may be the closest approximation to the "cataloger's camera" yet to appear. It is the CU-5, a camera with a built-in electronic flash and which requires neither focusing nor exposure adjustments. 3 1/4" X 4 1/4" prints are yielded bearing images the same size as the original; accessories are available for changing size. The camera, originally designed for dental work, will be made available in 1965 and is expected to fill applications in education, criminal investigation, insurance, and perhaps librarianship.

A search of the literature did not turn up any recorded library application, so we wrote to the Polaroid Corporation in Cambridge, Mass., to ask the names of libraries which might be using the camera. Polaroid replied that the camera was new to the market, that none was being used in a library at the time, but that they would be interested in investigating the application with us. We described what we hoped to

Letter from David Hoffman, April 22, 1966.
achieve by using photography, and as a result of our discussions, Polaroid lent a camera to the Library for a three month trial which began on March 1, 1965.

It soon became evident that the usefulness of the camera began with the acquisition routine. Most of Vermont’s book orders, currently 19,000 per year, come from faculty members and from three state colleges for which the Bailey Library conducts an acquisition-cataloging project. (About 20% require original cataloging, but we expect this number to be reduced as the Library of Congress’ National Program for Acquisition and Cataloging (NPAC) gets under way.) Before orders are sent to the jobber, we search for complete bibliographic information, usually starting with the National Union Catalog. When a correct entry is found, a picture is taken with the CU-5 camera.

We use the camera with a ring light and power pack attachment to avoid exposure variations arising from ambient light entering from nearby windows. The power pack is a small box, 6” × 7” × 3½”, connected by a straight cord to an electric outlet, and by a coil cord to the camera, which is 7½” × 4”, and with the lens attachment is 11” in height. A small table adjacent to a wall gives adequate room for the camera and an open volume of the National Union Catalog.

No special skill is required. The user holds the camera by its pistol-grip handle, places the frame over the entry, and squeezes the trigger. The film is pulled from the camera, and 15 seconds later the finished print is peeled away from the paper negative. The operation is quickly mastered, and there is little waste.

No correction need be made on the original order. The picture is stapled to it and given to the typist as copy for the multiple order forms. If a variant entry is found, it is copied as a basis for ordering under an established entry, and for cataloging information. One copy of the order form is sent to the vendor, and the Polaroid print is filed with the original and a carbon duplicate slip. When the book is received the slips are pulled from the file, the invoice cleared, and book, print, and slips are sent to the cataloger.

With the photographed Library of Congress card copy in hand, the cataloger has all the necessary information available. If any changes are needed, he makes them on the print with a ball point pen. Should the print be from the British Museum Catalogue or another bibliographic tool, he uses the information to make a work slip for the typist. The typist then copies the print on a Flexowriter, adds the call number from the back of the title page, programs the machine for the number of cards needed, and the job is done.

Staff reaction was typical—some were eager to try a new gadget, others were skeptical, but after a few weeks’ use, all agreed that the amount of time saved was worth the adjustment to a changed routine. A conventional 1:1 (life-size) print proved too hard on the eyes, hence a 1:6 magnification is now used, and eye strain is eliminated.

How much does this cost? The initial shock of learning that each
print is slightly less than 25 cents is overcome when an analysis is made of the advantages of the camera.

First is the increased cost of Library of Congress catalog cards, with the minimum charge now ranging from 22¢ to 27¢. Before the December 1966 increase, the Library spent an average of 38¢ per set of cards. Now we spend less than 25¢ for a print, plus the cost of typing and reproducing the card copy. We have not analyzed this cost, but we have not had to increase the number of typists, even though we are increasing our book purchases. We have discontinued ordering LC cards except for series standing orders, and titles for which no information is available at the time of receipt. Thus we save a half-time clerical job formerly spent ordering, receiving, matching, and following up orders.

If the National Union Catalog does not provide copy at the time the book is ordered, it is often available when the title is received; or sources such as American Book Publishing Record, or Publishers' Weekly provide adequate information for cataloging. Previously, the Library used proof slips and xerographic copy, until the time spent filing the slips nullified the advantages.

No less important than identifiable monetary savings are certain intangibles: time saved in correcting and adding information to the original order form; the accuracy of photographic copy versus possible errors in hand copying (is it Grey or Gray? check again); the elimination of the "Books waiting for LC's" section. The time lapse between the receipt of a book purchase requisition and placing the cataloged volume on the shelf has been reduced appreciably. When a professor sends a checked bibliography instead of purchase order forms, it is a simple matter to photograph the entries, adding departmental and budget information with a ball point pen, instead of copying each title onto an order slip. These prints are then alphabetized, and the public catalog searched before the order is placed. We telephone o.p. catalog orders, and if the dealer can tell us at once that the item has been sold, we can return the print to the professor with the information.

The disadvantages? Polaroid prints are not card catalog size, and they do project somewhat above the conventional slips in a drawer, though not enough to prevent the drawer from closing. To save time, prints are not coated for permanency, and once in a while they fade before the cataloger receives them. This, however, happens so seldom that it is not a problem; it occurs only with search items that have remained in the file for more than six months. A new photograph is taken to replace faded prints. For titles in a low-priority backlog, a searcher takes pictures and these are coated, because it may be some time before these titles will be cataloged.

The next logical development will be that of making satisfactory card reproduction directly from the Polaroid print. The Library is experimenting with a masking device on the lens frame to eliminate all but the desired portion of the card copy. A cutting device will trim the border from the print, which will then be tipped to a 12.5 × 7.5 cm
card, leaving a margin on the left for the call number. This can then be reproduced by an electrostatic copying machine. We are not yet satisfied with the results, but we are making legible copies. In any case, the Library has no wish to return to pre-camera procedures.

Fig. 1. Cataloger's Camera, Indiana Univ. Library Catalog Dept.
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Fig. 2. Polaroid CU-5
Mind over Mortar, or, Advanced Planning for Technical Services in a New Public Library Building*

BARBARA M. WESTBY, Field Director
Library of Congress Overseas Office,
Oslo, Norway
(Formerly Coordinator of Cataloging, Detroit Public Library)

Is there a new library building in your future? As a technical services librarian you cannot afford to be a spectator. You must participate in the planning. Design a vehicle that will take your technical services department smoothly down the expressway to the new librarianship of the future. Someone has said that we tend to overestimate what can be done in a year but underestimate what can be done in five. Much advanced planning and thinking must be done before the architect comes. I hope your building has a sufficient gestation period so that you have time to consider all the factors that may affect your procedures and then have time to plan accordingly.

One of these factors is the Library Services and Construction Act. A new building, and a new technical services department, are perhaps more assuredly in your future because of its passage. More importantly, and more immediately, it means more money for more books, and I do not need to tell technical services directors what that means. But perhaps I should remind administrators that they must provide space and staff and that more abundantly. There is no such thing as providing the technical services department with too much space. The Wheeler-Githens formula of 100 square feet per person is still valid. One writer even recommended 150 square feet. Wheeler and Githens also recommended that there be an allowance for a fifty per cent expansion of the present staff. Is this unrealistic? I think not. By what percentage has your library grown in the past 20-25 years. How much will it, or do you wish it, to expand in the future? The technical services department will grow by the same percentage. Miller and Metcalfe have both stated that one mistake that has not yet been made in planning a building is too much space.

Space costs money, and budgets for new buildings are never as big as they seem. Inflation shrinks them further. But please do not reduce the technical services department simply because it is a closed department. Too often in the past it has been allotted the space that is left over or that
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no one else wants. I am not minimizing the needs of the public service
departments. I am only asking that technical services be given equal
treatment. The quality of library service is dependent on internal or-
ganization and efficiency, which in turn are promoted by a good physical
plan. The public library standards recommend planning for 20 years, but
large public libraries will remain constant longer than that.

The Detroit Public Library opened its doors at its present location in
1921. Eight years later the Catalog Department, for example, had ex-
panded into alcoves in the adjacent stacks. Seven more years found the
official catalog and the shelf list moved into the corridor. Continuous con-
solidation throughout the years had jammed our desks together like sar-
dines in a can by the time we moved into our new department. This time
schedule of expansion is being repeated in other libraries even today.
Denver Public Library has outgrown its allotted space in six years. Al-
though Kansas City (Missouri) Public Library has 4200 square feet, it will
soon need more. The Technical Services Department at the University of
Houston was too small after two years. Recently I visited a library which
had a technical services department that was too small on the very first
day of operations. And this is a library where the director traveled ex-
tensively for ideas and presumably did much advanced planning, but
where was it when he laid out the floor plans for the technical services?
He must never complain about the costs of cataloging. His administrative
decisions in planning, which have resulted in inefficient and inadequate
working conditions, will be a large factor in the costs.

Textual material in the future may not necessarily appear in book
form. The Atomic Energy Commission Reports now appear only as 4 × 5”
microfiche. Do you catalog them? If so, will you need to provide for
your catalogers various types of microform readers, if those in the public
areas will be inaccessible either due to location or heavy use? Libraries
now have microfilms, microcards, microfiche, films, phonograph records,
tapes, etc. What will the future bring?

Another consideration in your advanced planning is the future or-
ganizational and service pattern of your library. The standards for pub-
lic libraries recommend larger units of service. Will your library be a
central unit in a metropolitan, regional, or multi-county system? Then
your technical services operations will be affected. The number of titles
to be purchased and cataloged will increase, and the number of copies to
be ordered and processed will multiply, in proportion to the number of
libraries added to your system.

Regionalization means cooperation. In the future we must do more
than pay it lip service. The explosion in knowledge, the specialization of
this knowledge, and the speed of communicating it means that we must
cooperate in the housing and processing of it. Perhaps your library will
purchase one or two subjects in depth while a neighboring library will
stress another area of knowledge. This may require more catalogers with
special skills. The cataloging or indexing information of these coopera-
tively acquired items must be interchangeable. What form will this take—
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accession lists, bibliographies, catalog cards, book catalogs, computer print-outs, or computerized information available on-line?

This input and output leads to the consideration of another aspect to your advanced planning, and that is mechanization. This is a major question and is the one which must be answered by any library planning to build in the future, for it affects all your operations, procedures, and organization. The critical part is to evaluate the influence of miniaturization and of electronic transmission systems on your future operations. Form follows function, but we are not compelled to give form to unknown functions. Automation is here and it is inevitable. I admit to fatigue in trying to keep up with the literature and trying to sift the wheat from the chaff. I am not interested in the plethora of words written on paper operations and how wonderful they are. They emphasize theoretical considerations rather than practical experience. I am not interested in a status symbol. I want to read honest appraisals of actual operations so that I can analyze their value in my own procedures. I am disturbed about references to compromises made to accommodate the machine. I do not favor the perpetuation of inefficient methods, but I believe that the machine should do our bidding, not we bending to the will of the machine. However, we cannot bury our heads in the sand ostrich fashion and expect only to feel the breeze of automation on our exposed posterior as it passes by. Like a good journalist we must answer the what, how, when, where and why in order to plot our new building.

Shall we automate everything or only order routines and serial records? We should plan for what we need fully and adequately but should not add fancy extras that we do not need. Will our automation produce catalog cards, book catalogs, or no visible catalog? Are you sure? One library planned its building with all systems go for automation. Later, when more practical considerations changed its orbit, it found that it had no space for a card catalog. If you have book catalogs, shall these be for the central library too or only for the branches and member libraries? Will copies be sold? Will you have full electronic data processing? Will it be based on a file of punched cards, or on disk storage of magnetic tapes? Then provision must be made for equipment and for space to store tapes or \( 3 \times 7'' \) cards. Harry Bauer, in the Wilson Library Bulletin, once accused us of having a \( 3 \times 5'' \) complex. Now perhaps we can add a \( 3 \times 7'' \) complex. We must depart from the traditional approach to our problems, but on the other hand all will not change. Various cataloging processes at the routine level will be aided by mechanization. However, the intellectual processes: the choice of entries according to ALA rules, verification of authors, assignment of subject headings and classification numbers will still be the function of the librarian though he may be working with an unwieldy \( 5 \times 7'' \) or \( 8 \times 11'' \) sheet instead of a \( 3 \times 5'' \) slip.

Ralph Parker, who practices as well as preaches automation, has stated that librarians of the future will have little direct contact with the machines. Others would have us using video consoles with key punch input, light pencils, teleprocessing terminals with dial and dataphones, tele-
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types, facsimile transmission, etc. Audio input of numerical data will be available in the very near future and audio output is here now.

Computers have been viewed by some as only glorified slide rules, while others have endowed them with man, or even god, like qualities. I suspect the truth lies somewhere in between. However, computers are stupid, until told what to do. It is we in technical services who are going to tell them what to do. Catalogers, already a scarce commodity and in great demand, are going to be in even greater demand. I have never been afraid of unemployment. Henry Ford’s assembly line created more jobs, not less. Richard Shoemaker of Rutgers, in the Southeastern Librarian for Spring, 1964, stated that we once chained, or locked in cages, books that were considered valuable or fearsome, and he suggested that catalogers, being valuable or fearsome or both, should also be chained or locked up before they are lured to richer or more persuasive libraries. Now there’s an interesting sidelight on advanced planning!

Technical services are not only going to grow but get noisier in the process. This suggests separate quarters for the machinery. Humans may be smarter than machines, but they will put up with a lot more in their physical surroundings and working conditions. The machine is more particular, though the present third generation of computers has become more tolerant. Transistors have replaced vacuum tubes and further micro-miniaturization by solid state technology has reduced the weight and heat of computers. Fifty pound per square foot is the present requirement. A raised floor is optional according to one IBM man since the arrangement of the equipment allows the cables to be laid out of the way, but another holds that it is best to raise or depress the floor to house the cables.

The amount of air conditioning and humidity comfortable for humans is now acceptable to the machines: 60°-80° Fahrenheit and 40-60% humidity. The present hardware is also equipped with acoustical covers so no extra sound proofing is needed. If you plan to mechanize, allow 600-800 square feet for the computer and peripheral equipment. This will permit expansion. The fourth generation in 1970 will undoubtedly be smaller. The key punch operations should be in a separate room. So too should the supervisor and the programmer. The machine operator can have a desk inside or just outside the data processing center. There should be a conduit outside the building leading to the room so that external storage machines in Washington or elsewhere can be tapped. If you wish to make the center a show place, then use glass walls and a raised floor.

Any automatic equipment installed today must have several capabilities: It must be compatible so that libraries can cooperate and exchange information via punched cards, tapes, teletype or whatever the future holds, or we will be back where we are now, all repeating the same jobs in different locations. It must be capable of sending and receiving catalog information to and from the Library of Congress. At the Detroit Public Library we do 40-50% original cataloging, but if LC can increase this
coverage I want to be able to get it. And let us not kid ourselves that we can precatalog all the materials we order. The original input at ordering time must be correctable at cataloging time.

Each university seems to be riding its own automation horse its separate way. Perhaps they can afford this. They have computer complexes on their campuses to which they have access, and maybe even student programmers and research funds. However, I think it is also true that too many people have moved into this field with inadequate knowledge or study or ability to cover the heavy expenses. But public libraries have no such luxury and are bound by city budgets. We need to pull together rather than compete. I would like to see ALA or the public libraries or both furnish leadership in this area. We must analyze and devise the procedures best suited for public library operations and then suggest the hardware to carry out these tasks. EDP requires standardization and uniformity, but let us devise these for the sake of the efficiency of our operations, not for the sake of the machine.

Minder and Lazorick have suggested the following in their paper on the “Automation of the Pennsylvania State University Acquisitions Department”:

The traditional library organizational pattern may not be adequate in an automated system. Most technical service divisions are organized along lines of operation performance: acquisitions, cataloging, binding. A computer oriented system may work more efficiently if it is form oriented. Books separated from periodicals, serials, etc. A book is a one purchase transaction which is cataloged as a unit and sent to shelf as a unit. A periodical is a continuing type of transaction that theoretically has no ending and must be handled at predetermined periodic intervals. Serials too are continuing but somewhat irregular. These factors: unit transactions, continuity, and irregularity, are essential factors in computer utilization.

Organization of work flow and programming by form allows for addition of other forms, such as Technical Reports, for example, later without disrupting the system. This is done by designing a separate system for each form. This does not necessarily mean that Technical Service Departments need be physically reorganized in an orientation. Records will be handled differently but output can be integrated: One listing of all forms or separate forms.

The data processing program suggested by IBM for the Detroit Public Library was a progressive one utilizing present equipment: an 026 key punch, 514 reproducer, 557 interpreter, 085 and 077 collators and an 082 sorter (650 cards a minute), and adding a 407 renting for $800 a month. This would be a card file system, printing upper case only, mechanizing orders and serials. This could progress to a card based system using a 360/20 model renting for $2500 a month. This would in addition produce book pockets and labels, and catalog cards alphabetized in filing order in both upper and lower case. A final stage could be a 360/30 at $5000 a month with both a card and disk storage. In the beginning we would add to our staff a supervisor and a programmer at $9000 and $7000 respectively. We have an operator, 2 key punch operators and a clerk-typist.
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The staff would increase as the operation increased. Automation creates jobs so your budgets will never be less, but more.

In the literature on the planning of library buildings, the Technical Services Departments have been sadly neglected. The chapter by Wheeler and Githens in their book the *American Public Library Building* and the paper by Robert A. Miller on “Technical and Administrative Functions in the Library” presented at the Building Institute in 1946 are still valid. There is an article by Maurice Tauber in the Summer 1960 issue of *Southeastern Librarian*. Little else exists.

However, the suggestions in the literature on library buildings are applicable to us. The first step in planning is to write a program, which is a statement of your philosophy and goals—your purpose, scope and function—and the requirements for carrying out your goals. The factors I have discussed so far must be considered in this planning. Make a detailed checklist of all the tasks now performed and to be performed, and the requirements of each as to staff, space, and equipment. Analyze your procedures and don’t move an inefficient or outmoded practice into a new building. The new building may allow you to do an old job a new way. The organization chart resulting from this should reveal your work flow and the interrelationships of the various sections in your department. Your program should also show your need for proximity to the card catalog, bibliographical tools, and business office. Involve the staff. Visit libraries and learn their good and bad features. Be imaginative. Frank Lloyd Wright stated that a building grows out of conditions as a plant grows out of the soil. We must see that the soil is rich and fertile.

Following is a suggestive though incomplete checklist. I have already mentioned microform readers. Do you need a phonograph with earphones for the record cataloger? One music cataloger, whom I know, had permission to use the piano in the auditorium of the library. I do not recommend a piano, but it illustrates that you must consider many things. Electric typewriters? Copying and duplicating equipment? Pasting machines? Number and placement of electrical outlets? Of telephone outlets? Do you want telephone jacks on the catalog cases? Shelving? On all walls? Work tables? Trucks? Posture chairs. Types and sizes of desks? Storage space for supplies? Do you want a walk-in closet? They can look messy on open shelves.

The flow of work should follow an assembly line pattern. As a matter of fact for book processing I recommend an assembly line itself—be it roller, roller skate, or conveyor belt. It saves much tiring and wasteful lifting of books. In the Detroit Metropolitan Area both the Wayne County Library and the Detroit Public Library operate assembly lines. The latter is horseshoe in shape with the straight end that closes the shoe being located in the shipping room. Yes, the processing section is located next to the shipping room although it is two floors and a half a block away from the rest of the catalog department. There has been some inconvenience due to the fact that the processing section is located so far from the official catalog. In the shipping room boxes of books are opened...
and invoices checked on the line. Then the books are placed on masonite palette and pushed through a window into the processing room. After work on the books is completed they arrive back in shipping through another window at the other end of the line and are distributed into agency boxes for delivery. In processing new materials it is well to have on one level: loading dock, receiving area, space for unpacking, invoicing, cataloging and classification, preparation, mending. If steps of the work progress in logical order with no backtracking, on one level and on wheels, then more units or work will be performed per man hour. Horizontal access is cheaper than vertical access.

The second phase of a building program is the preliminary sketch—the architect's graphic translation of your program. You now see the location and shape given your quarters. You should check its location in relation to shipping, administrative office, business office, public catalog, other departments and the sections of your department to each other. Your work space must be planned for maximum economy and efficiency. As stated in the public library standards: "Efficient planning is obviously difficult if the work is physically hampered. Poor lighting results in a slow-down in work and increased error, too little equipment causes unnecessary handling of materials, crowding decreases concentration and increases irritation, poor machines produce poor work, distances between work-related areas mean wasted time and energy, and traffic through a workroom brings confusion and disruption." Keep these points in mind and be critical. Watch particularly for traffic from outside the department.

Blueprints look impossible, but like everything else if you proceed slowly and focus gradually, instead of trying to understand them at one glance, there is no difficulty. Make a layout of the space. Cut pieces of furniture and equipment to scale. Use a different color for each category: desks for clerks and catalogers, official catalog, shelf list, etc. This will facilitate an overall view. Experimenting with different arrangements will reveal the best utilization of space and the best supervisory control. If you are fortunate enough to obtain extra space, do not plan its use now. It will be easier then to expand in the future.

There should be a minimum of fixed walls to allow for maximum flexibility. The mechanical and technological discoveries of the age will necessitate changes in procedure and room arrangement so one should plan for the most usable simplicity. One section of your department may increase while another decreases.

As a final check you should do some role playing. Wear several hats: that of the technical services director, the chief of the various sections of the technical services department, and order librarian, a cataloger, a clerk, etc. Then mentally walk through the tasks and spot unnecessary walking, backtracking, etc. Most important pretend you are a book. This is, after all, our stock in trade. Does the book follow an orderly route from shipping carton to shelf? If so, you have it made. Advanced planning requires more than a superficial overview. It is drudgery to study.
your problem, develop new methods, and assemble necessary data to clarify your wishes to the planner and the architect. But then does not everything worthwhile require work?

From these working sketches come the detailed blueprints. This is your last chance before the mental image becomes mortar. You should check for the following: is there an acoustical ceiling; what kind of floor covering; a soundproof room for equipment; do the doors have thresholds—book trucks cannot pass over them easily; where are the elevators; are there book lifts; if so, will they hold a book truck or will you have to lift books off and onto a waist high lift; are there horizontal conveyors or vertical selective bookveyors; are they located so that you can make use of them; are there plenty of electrical outlets to accommodate all future electric and electronic devices; where are they located; where are the shelves; where are the light switches; are they at centralized positions or are they on several walls necessitating a complete walk around the room to turn lights off and on; what are the traffic patterns in your room and from outside your room; there should be none of the latter. Do not overlook the factor of human engineering. Francis McCarthy in his paper at the Buildings Institute for 1961, Planning Library Buildings for Service, has some charts on space for browsing, bending, pulling out trays, etc, which you will find interesting and useful.

About lighting I have no advice, except to avoid glare and contrast. The footcandle debate has found no agreement among illuminating engineers, architects, librarians, and ophthalmologists. I recommend windows with north light. I claim, but have no proof, that artificial light is better for the eyes if it is blended with natural light. I have some support from Robert O'Connor, New York architect, who states that there are both psychological and physiological advantages to such a mixture. Denver Public Library insisted on north light for its technical services department and has not regretted the decision. Kansas City (Mo.) Public Library has two glass walls and so loses that much shelving. Windows must be placed so as not to create glare.

The Catalog Department at the Detroit Public Library is an interior room and I might make a few comments on that. A nine foot ceiling creates no hardship. The walls are white but with four walls of shelving some of the starkness is relieved. I would recommend a slight tint of color, however. Clara Breed of the San Diego Public Library suggested pale yellow or pale peach. A bit of burnt umber added to white is also an idea. And pale blue is restful. Another touch of color could be used in the book trucks. One writer suggested fire engine red, mediterranean blue, etc. Each department could have its own color which would also identify ownership. The technical services department should not be neglected in the interior decoration plans. Color and decorative features will improve morale, and attractive and comfortable furniture should be considered. I am a firm believer in the Scandinavian formula of beautiful things for everyday use.

I have mentioned nothing about binding. You must provide for
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mending and repair, pamphlet binding, application of bookplates, pockets, plastic covers, etc. However, if you do not have a bindery, the best advice is do not start one. The costs are high both in equipment and union scale wages.

Approval of the blueprints is not a signal for relaxation. During construction, changes may be initiated due to structural requirements, higher costs, or second thoughts. Make certain that these do not seriously affect the operations of your department. Your final task will be the scale drawing which shows the arrangement of furniture and equipment and which will be used on moving day.

If you prepared your homework well, you and your staff will enjoy working in a cheerful and efficient department. Your mental image, skillfully developed, will produce a picture in mortar and brick that will be pleasant and practical.

**MANN AWARD NOMINATIONS SOUGHT**

Nominations for the 1968 Award of the Margaret Mann Citation are invited from all readers of *LRTS*. Librarians who have made a distinguished contribution to our profession through cataloging and classification are eligible. Please do not hesitate to repeat the nomination of names formerly submitted.

Nominations should be sent (by December 15, 1967) to the Chairman of the Award Committee: Marion L. Kesselring, Brown University Library, Providence, Rhode Island 02912.
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**The Diagram Is the Message**

Jesse H. Shera, Dean

and

Conrad H. Rawski, Professor

School of Library Science

Case Western Reserve University

Cleveland, Ohio

Part I

From the Grottoes of Combarelles and Altamira to the galleries of the Louvre the walls bear eloquent testimony to man's basic need for pictorial representation. First, say the historians of art, there was sculpture; "the object represented through all its profiles," writes Faure, "having a kind of second real existence." Sculpture was followed
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by the bas-relief, "which sinks and effaces itself until it becomes engraving," and finally there was pictorial convention, the representation of the object painted on a cavern wall. The modern archaeologist, armed with the tools of science such as carbon 14 dating, might disagree with this sequence, but the argument is irrelevant to our purpose. What is important is that man needed pictorial representation both for communication with his fellows and for self-expression. Pictorial representation, then, can not only be traced back to the Reindeer Epoch and the dawn of civilization, it shares with language, writing, kinesics, and all the variant forms of non-verbal communication a major role in that total process by means of which cultures came into being and evolved. From the bison of Font-de-Gaume to the image from an overhead projector is quite a leap technologically, but the intervening millenia have not altered the human compulsion to outwit time, as it were, by recreating to hold unchanged forever the fleeting image of a moment.

In the present essay, the authors are concerned with but one specialized form of the picture—the diagram. Diagrammatic representation is a skeletal form of graphic representation; in it extraneous detail is omitted, it is highly stereotyped and stylized. But it does not dispense with the pictorial as if. It merely employs reduction. This reduction may eventuate in outline drawings of botanical specimens in a fieldbook for flower identification, the denotative devices of a picture language (e.g., Otto Neurath's Isotype), the abstract figures used to exemplify molecular structures in organic compounds, the schematic wiring diagram for an electrical circuit, or Charles Morris' graphic representation of the human action system. The element of reduction that characterizes, and in a sense defines the diagram may either facilitate or impede recognition, or even make recognition impossible. Its success or failure depends upon the extent to which it employs a form of signification that is meaningful to the viewer. For diagrammatic representation employs what may be regarded as a very special and often sophisticated form of semasiography, and the solution to the problem of signification that it presents is quite different from that which attempts to invoke reality in more elaborate pictorial terms. But if that which is pictured cannot be recognized by the viewer, it matters little how it is pictured. As Abraham Kaplan has observed, "Appearance is what is to be known, reality what it is known as." The object of the diagram is to reveal this reality. There is no other justification for its existence.

The diagram is a special case of picture-making: it bodies forth its subject in a pictorial way, in shapes which themselves possess a characteristic content, but are used to represent another. Any histogram in Fortune illustrates this characteristic of the diagram.

The problem of symbolic significance presented by diagrammatic representation, one might say the semiotic of the diagram, have long occupied the most competent minds of Western scientific and philosophic thought. We do not propose to attempt to scale these precipitous paths, even were we competent to do so. Our objective is much more
humble. Science is probably responsible for the extensive use of diagrams because the attributes of the diagram as representation fit so appropriately many of the concepts, phenomena, and processes of science. From the literature of science the diagram, which probably began in that shadowy realm of cosmology, or had, at least, philosophic origins, spread to other neo-scientific fields, the social sciences, management, history, linguistics, and eventually even librarianship. So recent has been its introduction into library literature that one will find few examples of diagrams prior to the 1930’s, for it was during those years that librarians turned the corner and saw before them the vision of a new heaven and a new earth bathed in the light of the scientific method.

It may, therefore, not be altogether inappropriate for librarians to pause for a moment in their mad rush into scientific methodology to inquire into the nature of diagrammatic representation, to remind themselves of its proper use, and to ponder Alfred North Whitehead’s remark that “the object of symbolism is the enhancement of the importance of that which is symbolized.”

Part II

A simple diagrammatic situation obtains in the family tree reproduced in Figure 1. Correspondence with fact is obvious in this filiation scheme. It becomes much more subject to interpretation when used, e.g., as a stemma in descriptive bibliography—although specialists, who are painfully aware of the complexities behind the lines connecting texts A and B, may remind us that certain skeletons in family closets could also affect the stemmatic simplicity of family trees.

Similar relatively straightforward situations obtain in various kinds of block-diagrams as long as they map synchronous or diachronic situations as in Figures 2 and 3. Both diagrams involve, as it were, implicit locus problems. In the case of Figure 3 this is duly accounted for by Professor Ash, when he refers to information theory as “an attempt to construct a mathematical model for each of the blocks” in the figure, and adds that “we shall not arrive at design formulas for a communication system…”

The diagrammatic situation recalls Clyde Coomb’s insistence that the term data be restricted to observations which are already interpreted in some way and “are in part a product of the mind of the observer. . . . We buy information with assumptions—‘facts’ are inferences, and so also are data and measurements and scales.” Pictorial information likewise is bought with assumptions. If one would not understand that in Figure 4 the legends enclosed in blocks and the swirl of connecting lines between them signify steps, decisions, conditions, and circumstances which are considered to be situationally related significant determinants in accordance with present-day theoretical convictions, he would not benefit from P. J. Runkel’s careful commentary. As soon as we are not attuned to the inferential situation and, if you will, the style of thought which generate the diagram, we find it difficult to read the
picture. Figure 5 is a representation of the mechanism of government, the wheels of state in the Holy Roman Realm. Iconographic expertise may bring us somewhat closer to the meaning of the diagram and contemporary modes of representation. But the hierarchical pattern, significant as it is, will surrender its message only if and when we understand the theory of state and government and, in this case, certain specific popular and regional ideas, traditions, and idiosyncrasies held by the fifteenth-century designer. Modern organization charts are said to harbor similar intricacies. Conversely—Figures 4 and 5 do make explicit situations of complexity and articulate pictorially, at least, certain aspects of these situations which as such do not seem to lend themselves readily to articulation.

S. R. Ranganathan uses diagrammatic representation for his modes of which the field of knowledge may throw forth new specific subjects: dissection; denudation; lamination; and loose assemblage. These diagrams are well known to librarians. They have a long and interesting history as representations of class relations and syllogistic moods in formal logic. Schopenhauer, who used the familiar circle diagrams to indicate conceptual relationships in his Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung (1818), credited the ‘exceedingly happy idea’ of graphic representation of these relationships to L. Euler (1768), J. H. Lambert (c. 1765), and G. Plouquet (1763), “who used squares and probably thought of it first.” Actually, the use of the figures can be traced further back to J. C. Sturm (1661), J. H. Alstedius (1614), and L. Vives (1555). Leibniz used both circles and straight-line figures to diagram the old mnemonic designations coined by Peter of Spain. Sylllogistic diagrams were familiar to the ancient commentators of Aristotle and the Megarian Stoic school. Their use during the Middle Ages is yet to be explored, although medieval predilection for diagrammatic representation and, specifically, the pons asinorum (a diagrammatic statement of the Aristotelian doctrine of the inventio medii), is well established.

Schopenhauer diagrams within the context of his presentation and with obvious reliance on the traditional Euler figures. He diagrams what we know and neglects the visual factors exhibited by his figures. This is amusingly demonstrated in his representation of “dissection” of a conceptual sphere including two or more concepts which “exclude each other,” yet fill the sphere.

Euler’s graphics of propositions and syllogisms in his Lettres à une princesse d’Allemagne are much more elaborate. He is fussily concerned with the proper interpretation of his figures. One might make bold to state that Euler would not have let pass Schopenhauer’s figure, above.

These circles, or rather these spaces, for it is of no importance of what figure they are of, are extremely commodious for facilitating our reflections on this subject, and for unfolding all the boasted mysteries of logic, which that art finds it so difficult to explain; whereas by means of these signs the whole is
Euler uses these “emblems” to develop a veritable pictorial notation which, he hopes, would be “a great assistance towards comprehending more distinctly wherein the accuracy of a chain of reasoning consists.”

(Letter 103, February 17, 1761.)

Euler, Schopenhauer, and Ranganathan use diagrammatic figures of great similarity. Ignoring the purposes for which each employs the figures, we may observe that a variety of situations is mapped with essentially identical graphic shapes. Euler’s emblems “are” more explicit than Ranganathan’s because of Euler’s insistence on detailed contextual exploration, illustrated by the diagrams in Figure 7. The “lamination” emblem, for instance, appears as a paradigm for both, affirmative and negative situations, and we are reminded to look, as it were, in more than one direction, beyond the shape of the emblem. In the case of syllogistic diagrams the figures for relations between more than two or three classes developed by J. Venn and W. E. Hocking, are the graphic results of precisely such “thinking beyond the diagram.” On the other hand, the concrete pictorialism of the emblem as such may invite further interpretations resulting in clarification or extended application. Thus Peter Caws uses a series of “lamination” emblems to represent the relations between the world of ordinary experience and scientific theory, and maps imaginatively the scope of argument in each part of his Philosophy of Science.

Part III

In our attempt to follow on a humble level Wittgenstein’s advice to “treat of the network, not of what the network describes” we have traversed familiar territory. We all have long been aware of the fact that pictures depict as we look at them, that they are what we see and signify what we know. It does not take much intellectual effort to understand the implications of the diagrammatic situation which offers concrete, definite emblems and the attendant advantages of explicit relationships graphically represented, but has to be clearly understood in its conceptual context in order to be properly construed as a paradigm.

Most of us, at one time or another, have been aware of the illusion created by certain forms of advertising, which shrewdly ring the changes on these properties of the diagrammatic situation as they present us with stunning graphic tableaux of “irrefutable objective scientific data gathered by an independent research organization”. This is abuse, or more or less serious deceit, aimed at “them”—the unthinking public. But it is important to remind ourselves that essentially the same condi-
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tions obtain when we use diagrams in our attempts to ascertain the truth through reflective inquiry. If used properly diagrams can explain and simplify, can reveal an underlying order, permit systematization, and point to gaps in our knowledge or our design. They enable us to set forth, for all to see, the essentials of a situation or what we consider these essentials to be. As a means of representation they are more elastic than quantitative techniques and allow us to map with considerable precision situations which otherwise seem to preclude such treatment.

As a medium for the communication of thought, diagrams are easy, direct, tangible—we almost said healthy. These properties, in turn, may beget undue affection for them, and we may diagram what cannot, hence, should not be diagrammed. The debit side includes the implicit emblematic pitfalls discussed above, the dangers of undue simplification, distortion or misrepresentation, and deceptive finality (present in any formalization). It is so very easy to conflate the diagram with what it is supposed to represent, and to accept uncritically as properties of the “real” subject those which, in fact, are the emblematic properties of the diagram.

“Ah,” you say, “who would make the mistake of assuming some connection between the color green and the French, just because France is green on most political maps?” To which we can only meekly reply that whoever has thoroughly grasped this lesson obviously does not stand in need of our disquisition, which derives its justification only from the fact that, alas, we often know less than we think we know.
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Fig. 4. P. J. Runkel's Model for Pupil-Teacher Interaction.
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"CONFIDENCE"
In Our Complete Periodicals Service

—American or foreign. All periodicals, handled with a degree of accuracy, second
to none! Write for our Brochure—then ASK FOR REFERENCES from any one of the
hundreds of Librarians taking advantage of our outstanding and accepted proce-
dures—Specialists in the Special Library field. Send your list and ask for a quotation
and recommendations.

"PROMPTNESS IS A TRADITION WITH McGREGOR"

—and Promptness is a mark of
Experience, Trained Personnel,
Ample Facilities, Proper Work-
ing Space, Financial Stability,
Responsible Management, Com-
pleteness of Service, and Effi-
ciency.

SUBSCRIBE TO
McGREGOR
PERIODICALS
BULLETIN

MOUNT MORRIS
ILLINOIS 61054
Most Up to Date and Complete Cataloging Text

Wynar, B. Introduction to Cataloging and Classification, 3rd ed., 1967. 316 p. $6.50 cloth

This complete revision contains 16 chapters and includes:

- 230 LC cards illustrating Anglo-American Rules
- Text and cards contrast ALA and new Rules
- Theoretical concepts of classification and subject headings
- Individual analysis of LC and DDC; LC and Sears subject headings

Write for our catalog

LIBRARIES UNLIMITED, INC.
P.O. Box 9842 Rochester, N.Y. 14623

ANNOUNCING

A computer compatible filing code
FOR: DOCUMENTALISTS • CATALOGERS • LIBRARIANS
PUBLISHERS • COMPUTER PERSONNEL

An important book for those using or contemplating use of computer information storage and retrieval systems. A workable filing code that makes it possible to deal with all catalog entries, even the most complex.

Written by Dr. Theodore C. Hines and Jessica L. Harris and sponsored by The Bro-Dart Foundation, this new filing code suggests actual steps for implementing filing rules for all bibliographic material dealt with on the computer. The code, wherever reasonable, makes the mechanical filing abilities of a computer compatible with accepted library procedures.

“COMPUTER FILING” includes a set of manual filing rules recommended for achieving the same arrangement with or without adoption of the computer code so that later conversion to computer based catalogs will be easier. Included, too, is an extensive filing example showing comparison of rules of the code with A.L.A. rules.

Address orders for Computer Filing of Index Bibliographic and Catalog Entries to

The Bro-Dart Foundation
Dept. LRT-1, 113 Frelinghuysen Avenue, Newark, New Jersey 07101
EspeciallA for Christmas Giving

WOLF AND THE GOOD WOODSMAN by Helen Hoover, illustrated by Charles Mikolaycak. A different kind of Christmas story. It tells about Great Wolf who saves the Good Woodsman and is invited to the Christmas feast. Ages 4-8. October. Trade Edition: $3.50; Library Edition: $3.00 L/L.

This is a modern Christmas fantasy about two girls who get a magic ride on a carousel, and over the top of the biggest Christmas tree they have ever seen. Ages 4-8. October. Trade Edition: $3.50; Library Edition: $3.00 L/L.

RANDFATHERS ARE TO LOVE and GRANDMOTHERS ARE TO LOVE by Lois Wyse, illustrated by Martha Alexander. The things grandparents do for grandchildren and the love which is given in return. Ages 3-6. October. Trade Edition, each book $2.50; Library Edition, each $2.35. As a limpcased gift set, $5.00. Until Dec. 31, $2.25 each; set $4.50.

Dramatic Non-Fiction for Older Readers

China, the Hungry Dragon, a Background Book for Young People by John Scott. Like THE STORY OF VIETNAM, the enthusiastically-received first book in this series of Background Books for Young People, this book examines Chinese history to answer many of our questions. The author is a Time Magazine correspondent and noted China authority. Ages 12-up. November. Trade Edition: $4.50; Library Edition: $3.75 L/L.

TO GRANDFATHER'S HOUSE WE GO, A Roadside Tour of American Homes written and illustrated by Harry Devlin. The pages of this book, illustrated with rich, full color paintings of houses, span two and a half centuries. The young reader can see his country's history in terms of the homes of his own ancestors. The houses shown are likely to be found in travels in the family car. Ages 10 up. November. Trade Edition: $3.95; Library Edition $3.34 L/L.

The symbol L/L denotes Parents' Magazine Press Longlife Library Bindings

Send for our Catalog with fully annotated back list

PARENTS' MAGAZINE PRESS
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, New York 10017
FOR LIBRARIES:

ONE SOURCE FOR ALL YOUR PAPERBOUND BOOKS

Free on request:

NEW • Our 27 page list of "RECOMMENDED PAPERBACKS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS"

• Bowker’s PAPERBOUND BOOK GUIDE FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

• Bowker’s PAPERBOUND BOOK GUIDE FOR COLLEGES

• Our circular: “One Source for Paperbacks” (lists publishers whose books we stock, time to allow for delivery, quantities needed for discount, etc.)

Now you can obtain in one order inexpensive copies of classics, as well as best-sellers, mysteries, westerns and other popular categories.

PAPERBOUND BOOK DISTRIBUTORS

(A division of Book Mail Service)
82-27 164th Street•Jamaica, New York 11432•Phone OL 7-4799

Now in our 17th year
ISSUES
OF NATIONAL UNION CATALOG
AVAILABLE FROM GALE

RECENT ANNUAL ISSUES OF THE NATIONAL UNION CATALOG AUTHOR LIST, INDISPENSABLE CATALOGING AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES NOT RECENTLY AVAILABLE TO NEW AND EXPANDING LIBRARIES, ARE NOW BEING REPRINTED IN A LIMITED QUANTITY BY GALE FOR IMMEDIATE DISTRIBUTION.

THE ISSUES OF 1963, 1964, AND 1965, TOTALLING MORE THAN 21,000 PAGES, ARE BEING REISSUED IN THIRTY FOUR VOLUMES. A FEW SETS NOT ALREADY SUBSCRIBED FOR WILL BE AVAILABLE AT THE FOLLOWING PRICES:

1963, ORIGINAL FIVE VOLUMES IN TEN, 6,603 PAGES ............... $368.00
1964, ORIGINAL FIVE VOLUMES IN TEN, 6,467 PAGES ............... $368.00
1965, ORIGINAL SEVEN VOLUMES IN FOURTEEN, 9,075 PAGES ..... $403.00

BILLING CAN BE DELAYED UNTIL YOUR NEW FISCAL YEAR, OR OTHER PAYMENT PLANS CAN BE ARRANGED ACCORDING TO YOUR NEEDS.

TELEPHONE
TOM SCHLIENTZ IF YOU WISH TO RESERVE A SET OR IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.

SEND ORDERS IMMEDIATELY TO
GALE RESEARCH COMPANY
1400 BOOK TOWER • DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226 • TELEPHONE: 313-961-2242
THE FIVE YEAR INDEX 1960-1965
Scheduled for late fall 1967

THIS PRICED SUMMARY INDEX, complete in itself, will report over 108,000 prices of single lots of books and serials, autographs and manuscripts, broadsides and maps which brought $5 or more at auction from September 1960 through August 1965.

In this five-year period, 276 sales (301 sessions) were held in the United States; 249 sales (439 sessions) were held by three houses in London; and one added sale (3 sessions) was held in Melbourne, Australia.

Alphabetically arranged by author, the entries are carefully articulated according to date, issue, and condition. Important information which helps to relate and clarify prices is given where necessary.

Books in all languages and all fields are represented, from the incunabula period to the present day. Serials and magazines are also included.

Autographs & Manuscripts, Broadsides, and Maps are listed in separate sections. Approx. 2,000 pages, buckram

THE INDEX MUST BE ORDERED SPECIFICALLY
Standing Orders for Annual Volumes do not apply
EDITION IS LIMITED
All previous Annuals and Indexes are out-of-print

ORDER NOW
Price: $95 net

AMERICAN BOOK-PRICES CURRENT
509 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10017
The complete paper for the complete program

YOU CAN HAVE A WELL ROUNDED PRINTING, STORAGE and FILING PROGRAM when you use PERMALIFE, a Thorographic paper by Standard of Richmond. PERMALIFE is acid-free and absolutely dependable. A life of several hundred to a thousand and more years is assured.* Use PERMALIFE with confidence for

- Library Catalog Card Stock
- Envelopes for storage of documents and manuscripts
- File folders for storage of maps and large documents
- Letterheads
- Reprints

PERMALIFE is beautiful in look and feel, and will give true copies by photo offset. PERMALIFE TEXT and PERMALIFE BOND are water-marked for your protection. For permanency use PERMALIFE and be sure.

*According to tests made of PERMALIFE by the W. J. Barrow Research Laboratory. Details upon request.

STANDARD PAPER MANUFACTURING CO.
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA
For Libraries That Want Quality Bookbinding

Glick Bookbinding Corp.

Specialists in the Binding and Rebinding of Books and Periodicals

Serving Institutional, Public And Research Libraries Since 1905

32-15 37th Avenue
Long Island City, New York 11101
784-5300

In Nassau and Suffolk
Area Code 516 483-9534

In New Jersey
Area Code 201 642-5374