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"Soon I'll be taken to Abraham's bosom and would like to put in a few licks for C in S."

So wrote Joe Wheeler in a letter which came with a copy of his hard-hitting article soon to appear in *Library Journal* (15 September 1969). In a long life of notable service to many other areas of his profession Cataloging in Source had somehow eluded him. He refused to accept the arbitrary debacle of 1960 and he talked and worked to revive the dream. All too often he met sympathetic apathy.

But with these new licks things were different. Letters from readers to *LJ* endorsed the article; why not try again? Perhaps it was an idea whose time had come again. Meanwhile there was new interest by CLR, new interest by LC, a new grant. Last summer's ALA-RTSD program gave Joe Wheeler one more lick; and also other people once more talked seriously of CIS (now become CIP: Cataloging in Publication). We publish that program's papers in this issue of *LRTS*.

Joe Wheeler died. It is fitting that we dedicate this issue to the memory of the valiant fighter for the project it discusses.
Cataloging in/at Source*

Why We Must Have Cataloging in Publication

JOSEPH L. WHEELER
Benson, Vermont

As Peter Hiatt says, speaking of academic libraries: "The major focus is on collecting materials rather than on developing services. . . . A library is to acquire books (and hopefully all other forms of recorded ideas), but the library begins there. It is what a library does, not what it has, that makes a library." He couldn't be more correct; what he says applies also to every public and school library. Service; that's what counts.

Does a library have an obligation to be prompt in acquiring and processing and having important new adult nonfiction books ready for readers to use and borrow, on publication release date or within two or three days thereafter? May I venture the strong conviction that it very decidedly does. And that's just what may be overlooked in discussing cataloging in publication.

I'm supposed to talk today about LC's 1958-59 tryout of cataloging-in-source, and its "background." In only eight months it turned out only 1,203 books from 157 American publishers. The grant requested and made was only $55,000—what you might call a toe-dipping operation. And it failed. But I am saved today by that word "background." For the background then was about what it is today; 95 percent of about 60,000 public, college, school, and special libraries really wanted cataloging-in-source then; they want it today. Several hundred million dollars a year are now being spent on local, regional, and commercial processing, which can be cut down to a few million dollars of clerical work plus cataloging-in-publication.

Just from 1959 to 1969, the production and sale of books in the U.S. has doubled. Americans spent $2.5 billion for books in 1969. The U.S. Office of Education estimated that in 1967 Americans borrowed nearly a billion books annually just from their public libraries, in addition

* Revised text of material presented at the program meeting on cataloging in publication held by the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association at its Annual Conference in Detroit, July 1, 1970, under the chairmanship of W. Carl Jackson, Pennsylvania State University Libraries.
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to the millions borrowed from school, college, special, and commercial circulating libraries. People are using books more than ever, not less. But the really significant development in library usefulness to society has been the rapid, accelerating growth of reference-informational service to old and young.

What we're discussing is the nation's number one public source of information needed by all kinds of citizens, from youth to old age, to a degree of intensity and specialization and to a per capita extent which few librarians and scarcely any laymen visualized even in 1960. Libraries are no longer merely storehouses for the wisdom of the past. They must have ready today information published only yesterday. In every respectable town and city the public library has to be a dynamic service center, with a trained and dedicated staff, which can help every one get help for his individual problems. This is the objective which every catalog department has to aim at, for college and university libraries are in the same boat. And at least 25 percent of present costs could be shifted to library book funds from the savings. No wonder the publishers' reactions, in the 1958-59 tryout, were almost completely favorable, and so they are today.

During 64 years' membership in ALA, I have learned that libraries and librarians fall into three categories: (a) those who seem to feel that librarianship is merely a more or less passive job and that if readers don't get what they want it's just too bad; (b) the mildly concerned who mildly wonder whether they can mildly do more to make the library serve more actively in the community, or in the school, or on the campus; (c) the active achievers, who think day and night of how they can make each book reach more readers, how they can draw each citizen, especially each adult citizen, into the circle of active library users.

The librarians in this latter category really get up and scramble, they hustle, to have their library do a better job, to serve a constantly larger per capita clientele. That includes the college libraries and the campus population. The ALA has several thousand scramblers, who make it great; they make librarianship something to be proud of.

Every librarian and every citizen who believes in the surpassing values of the intellectual life, in "the things of the mind," in the social importance of information-seeking by every intelligent man and woman, in the tremendous value of books and reading and libraries, must feel outraged and humiliated when he realizes that up to this minute America's librarians have allowed the present slow, tardy, elaborate, costly, duplicated classifying and cataloging of library books to continue all these years. The Russians are leaving us behind. They seem to be interested in service.

* Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information 1968. p. 22.
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Look about and see the frustration of the public, especially busy men and women. They take the time and trouble to visit the library with high hope and faith. One university department head asked me, apologetically, how long I thought his university library should take to get a new book and have it ready, after publication date. “Two or three weeks,” I replied, for I’ve seen it done, as routine, within two or three days. “Well, here it takes six or eight months,” he said.

Patrons in general find that books published two or three months ago, which the library is certain to acquire in due time, have not even been ordered, or have been ordered but not yet received, or are at a regional “processing center,” or, most likely of all, are sitting in the library’s own catalog room for days, weeks, and in many cases months, because the catalog staff has not yet “got around to them,” or the library is “waiting for the printed cards.”

All this is intolerable, and inexcusable, a shameful reflection on the indifference and conservatism of the profession. Every one familiar with public, college, and school library operations knows that the chief time and money waste among the array of library operations is this duplicated processing, even when it is regionalized. And LC is not too prompt with its cataloging of new books. In Christmas week of 1969 at the American Historical Association convention in Washington, I picked up a book I needed on teaching social studies, and I have been using it five months. The LC entry appeared in Publishers’ Weekly for May 14, 1970. And think of the delays after that before you have LC cards actually in your hands and the book all processed.

Pitiful is the word for the plight of so many librarians who deeply desire to spend more of their time in helping readers and information seekers, but who are sunk in cataloging and classifying. Also, it is the chief cause for delay in getting newly published books into the hands of the readers (who are paying the bills), who have already seen the advertisements for the books, who wish or need or have pressing occasion to use the books for their own special purposes. It is this inexcusable duplicated processing, or waiting for printed cards, like waiting for Godot, I’m crying about. In many libraries, especially college libraries and large city libraries, it is consuming 35 or 40 percent of what should be the available book budget.

In my opinion it is reason number one why many library patrons have given up in frustration and why numerous public libraries show a decrease in circulation. It is a major reason why the public does not understand or admire librarians as we wish they would, even while the demand for reading has increased. I have tried not to exaggerate what appears to me a deplorable situation. A few weeks ago I met a highly competent, dedicated head of processing in a 10,000-student college library. He said, “I have several reservations about cataloging-in-publication. We have cut our costs down now to $4.00 per title.” I confess that to me $4.00 to process a book is preposterous, when every dollar is so badly needed in other library services and for more books. It is de-
plorable to be paying out $3.00 or even $2.00. It is regrettable to be giving up even $1.00.

I'm reluctant to spend time on the several makeshifts such as cards with books, centralized and regional processing, or preliminary cataloging plus doing it all over again, and so on. In discussing these substitutes we have to be realistic. For example, cards with books can never succeed, because (a) the mere costs to the publisher, for all the paper work and insertions in the books, are excessive; (b) sales to libraries are only part of a publisher's sales of a given book, and a great many smaller public, college, and school libraries buy through local dealers with whom the publisher can't predict and does not wish to bother about cards; (c) with cataloging in publication the incentive for having cards with books is mostly cancelled; it's just one big bother to monkey with them, for with printed cards they all have to be run through the typewriter to fill in the numbers and headings chosen locally; (d) some form of quick local duplication of the body of the cards is available already, except in the very smallest libraries, which makes printed cards less essential. All these various makeshift attempts not only are costly and unsatisfactory but also create bad delays. They should be and can be rectified by having the library profession rise up and demand that cataloging-in-source be resumed, at least for one-half or two-thirds of current trade books, the important half, so that no local or regional library will ever again need to make its own decisions on class number, subject headings, and author form or wait to order and receive printed cards. These decisions should and can be made at the one logical place, the Library of Congress, and all this cataloging information should within forty-eight hours be sent from LC, by quick transit, so that the publisher can print it all right in the complete printed book. Every library will then have the book and the cataloging information right together. It can then prepare the cards as a purely clerical job, immediately, and at a fraction of present costs. Henry Walck, the publisher, is already doing this.

If you ask: why did the LC tryout of 1957 and 1958 fail? I'll not attempt to give a satisfactory answer. Ostensibly there were discrepancies between the collation of the page proofs and those in the complete printed books. To 95 percent of libraries these minor discrepancies, which comprised 47.6 percent of the so-called errors of which the 1960 LC Report on Cataloging-in-Source made such a mountain, are inconsequential. For 50 percent of the books cataloged there were no errors or discrepancies whatever. In a few cases authors or publishers at the last moment made changes in titles or in the introductory pages. So far as I can discover from studying the report, the number of actual errors of fact or of judgment made in the forty-eight-hour span of each book were so few as to be unimportant. And the whole situation as to inaccuracies and discrepancies can be clarified, in a practical way, by adding a warning line, a caveat line, at the bottom of the CIS (cataloging-in-source) entry: "This classifying and cataloging is done from
the page proofs; verify from the completed book.” Only a few of the largest public and university libraries will need to actually do this verifying. Other than they, any meticulous bibliographer can do his own verifying. One device to assure final accuracy is a final revised LC card, which I hope and predict not one library in a hundred will bother with, for any form of duplicated cataloging is a costly snare and a delusion.

At the moment, June 1970, one cannot predict, but it seems feasible to assume, that CIP (cataloging in publication) can be done as it should be done, from the page proofs rather than from galley proofs, for the reason that in almost every case the publisher has to hold up the final printing for considerably more than four or five days, which would permit the typesetting and insertion of the LC card form in LC style, or in whatever typography will match that of the book itself. I trust that the CIP catalogers will not be asked to work from sets of manuscript pages; that would be the last straw.

Just how important, how vital, is it to insist on LC format? What we need primarily is the class number, DC and LC, and the subject headings, and the correct author form (which the publisher should send to LC with the proofs). And we assume that the author’s name on the title page, even though a pseudonym, will be the name used.

In a preliminary draft of my Library Journal article of September 15, 1969, I was chided for saying that too many libraries “make a fetish” of the LC printed card. No exaggeration: Webster’s Collegiate says a fetish is “an object believed among a primitive people to have magical power” or held in “obsessive devotion.” That’s it exactly. In fiscal 1969 LC sold nearly 79 million cards. Is there anything seriously the matter with a typewritten card giving the LC’s same cataloging information? Of course, if librarians put their minds to it, someone will eventually come up with the catalogers’ camera which will give a completely pure white-and-black reproduction from the LC format in the printed book, which Polaroid has not yet achieved. But how many libraries wish to, or need to, or can afford to pay good money for a special camera when most of the cards have to be run through the typewriter anyway to fill in the adopted class number, subject headings, and so on?

In a small college library where I was posted for a few months recently, card production costs at an arbitrary $2.40 an hour, or 4¢ per minute, ran to 17¢ in trying to locate LC card numbers, 24¢ for making out the card orders, 31¢ for the minimum set of LC cards, or 72¢ minimum per title, and $1.12 if LC looked up the LC card numbers. The fee for this is now 40¢. But then it also cost an average of 24¢ to run the LC cards through the typewriter to fill in the call number, the subject headings chosen, and the title card heading. So costs, just to get and prepare LC cards, were 79¢ if you already had the number, 96¢ if you had to find the number, and $1.36 if LC looked up the number for you. In contrast, the average per title was 62¢ to type typical LC entries.
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from BPR, average five cards each, five lines each, with everything needed on the cards. I believe that, with CIP, a rapid typist, at $2.00 per hour, can turn out these sets, without an error, at less than 50¢ a set and within two or three days, and that’s the end of costs and the end of the delay.

Obviously CIP saves money, probably an average of 50¢ per title in clerical work alone, plus all the costly costs of any decisions made locally by the trained catalogers. More than that it saves the frustrating delays in getting new books to reader shelves while the public is at its most active and intense in wishing to borrow them. Compare this with the present costs and present delays.

We realize that a commercial processor can take a large order of ordinary run adult or juvenile nonfiction and by machine methods assemble and process considerable lots of books at a possible cost of less than 62¢ per title. Or just how much less? But do not overlook that the library has to do equivalent paper work to order from a commercial processor as from a major jobber. The vital question is, who can get the books to the library most promptly? And what about the delay plus paper work when the commercial processor can’t supply all the books preprocessed, at the minimum cost? There is considerable paper work, also considerable delay in such cases, and they happen very frequently. We venture to point out that such combined book ordering plus processing is seldom all smooth sailing. The more shorts there are, with their inevitable follow-ups and inquiries, the more doubtful whether such ordering of books with processed cards gives as large a discount, as quick service, and as low total costs as to order straight from one of the three or four major jobbers, and process the books in the local library by CIP, as a purely clerical operation. There would be two exceptions to this: (a) in the case of branches of a city library or of a system library like Wayne County, Michigan, where all the branch representatives can and do gather weekly to examine, discuss, and select books before publication release date, and where obviously the ordering and processing can be done at a central place and the books delivered quickly to all the system branches; and (b) when a newly created library has to purchase a whole bookstock and can buy all the books already processed. No, not all, for there will be a lot of shorts even from the two or three largest processing concerns.

I do not overlook any of the supposed arguments for regional cataloging, especially if the ordering is done by regionals as it is in the best-organized state system of twenty-two regionals, i.e., New York State. But think of the delays after the decision to purchase. As a speaker at the 1969 American Historical Association conference said about traditional methods of teaching history: “All that won’t do any more.” That’s what we have to realize: “It won’t do any more.” We must make cataloging in publication succeed.

A few minutes to reassure two groups of worriers that CIP won’t
mean the end of the world. The clerical workers in present processing departments will not lose their jobs and turnover in clerical personnel is continual anyway. Assuming they are accurate typists, they will be as busy as ever. In libraries of any size, i.e., with book budgets of $10,000 or $15,000 up, it will be a year or two before CIP outranks ordering older books. All the public and college libraries with book budgets of over $25,000 or $30,000 will always need a trained person to catalog books older than 1971, to answer the innumerable questions, and to supervise the workers involved in a large bookflow.

The sort of educated, trained librarians such as good catalogers are, are greatly needed for the increasing vacancies and badly needed new positions as able reference librarians in public and college libraries. They don't need to worry about getting positions. Hardly any library has enough trained reference librarians, even assuming that appropriate work is relegated to subprofessionals. Note that I'm not using the term "technicians," a misleading, confusing, and harmful label, because somehow or other the taxpaying public thinks that all trained librarians are technicians. So, let's not worry about losing a job.

I am venturing to ask all of you here, how many of you think we should somehow find the way to make cataloging in publication succeed? How many of you feel that the time has come to find the way to make cataloging in publication really work, and to have it used in practically all libraries except the very few very largest? May I ask if you'll be good enough to stand? Practically unanimous. Out of about 650 to 700 persons here this morning, I can see only three who are not standing.

CIP in Mid-1970

VERNER W. CLAPP
Council on Library Resources, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

The history of the near-success of the 1958-59 experiment with cataloging-in-source and the subsequent refusal of the library community to accept its failure are punctuated by data from a recent survey of 391 libraries in 18 categories regarding attitudes toward prepublication cataloging.

If it is possible to plan with confidence for the new program of prepublication cataloging which it has been agreed shall be called cataloging in publication, or CIP, the reason lies in the near-success of the 1958-59 cataloging-in-source, or CIS, experiment, and in the experi-
ence gained and scrupulously recorded at that time. Accordingly, I shall commence my remarks by summarizing the principal facts of that earlier experience.

From June 1958 to February 1959 the Library of Congress (LC), with the assistance of a grant from the Council on Library Resources and in collaboration with the library of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, cataloged prior to publication 1,203 publications of 157 publishers at an average cost of $25.00 per title. These CIS entries were printed in about 90 percent of the publications cataloged. The success of the experiment exceeded expectations in terms of the number of books cataloged (the target had been 1,000 titles, the product was 1,236 entries); the shortness of the turnaround time (the average time required for cataloging, including the printing and proofing of a catalog card, was an amazing seven hours ten minutes per entry; 88 percent of entries were completed within twenty-four hours, 93 percent within twenty-six hours and 99 percent within forty-eight hours); and the acceptability of the program to librarians (98-99 percent approval) and publishers (the majority expressed willingness to collaborate in a permanent program if it were to be found to be useful to librarians, while some even admitted to being enthusiastic about the program).

In spite of these evidences of success, LC's report, which was published in March 1960, concluded that a permanent, full-scale CIS program would not be justified from the point of view of financing, technical considerations, or utility; that neither a full nor a partial program was desirable; and that there should be no further experimentation with CIS. The specific objections found to the program were (a) the interruptions to publishers' schedules; (b) the cost to publishers; (c) the interference with LC's cataloging routines and excessive pressure and frustrations for the catalogers involved; (d) the high cost to LC; (e) the large number of discrepancies (errors) between the CIS entries and the final (postpublication) entries for the same books; (f) authors' and/or publishers' objections to the publication of authors' birth dates and the substitution of real names for pseudonyms, as well as objections to certain subject-entries; and (g) the prospect of better means of disseminating LC cataloging information, specifically, through the Publishers' Weekly and Brodart Industries' SACAP programs.

CIS was thus ceremoniously buried, with the Library Journal a chief though not disinterested mourner at the grave, whence it reported on the "death shroud which now seems to cloak the cataloging-in-source idea." But the idea, refusing to stay buried, has repeatedly surfaced. Even before the funeral wreaths had withered, William S. Dix, the librarian of Princeton, was impelled "for the first time to write for conscience sake an open letter to the editor of a library journal," stating that he was "in principle downright unable to accept Mr. Cronin's "There should be no further experiments with Cataloging-in-
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In July of the same year the RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section proposed a limited CIS program to LC, but was, not unexpectedly, refused. In 1964 Homer I. Bernhardt wrote a master's thesis on CIS at the Graduate Library School of the University of Pittsburgh. In 1966 Joseph L. Wheeler in his turn vainly attempted to persuade LC to reverse itself, and as a result dedicated himself to this cause. Meanwhile, word was received from time to time of cataloging-in-source ventures in Australia, Brazil, and the Soviet Union. More recently an American trade publisher, Henry Z. Walck, has begun to print catalog entries, in card format, on the insides of the book jackets of his juvenile books.

However, in the summer of 1969, CIS surfaced so emphatically that it seems that this time it must either stay above ground or go down—the third time—at least for this generation.

In June 1969, in Atlantic City, the joint committee of RTSD/ABPC (American Book Publishers Council, now Association of American Publishers) was reviewing the results of its jointly sponsored pre-conference acquisitions program, where delay in the receipt of cataloging information had been identified as a principal obstacle to getting new books to readers. The suggestion was made that a new look be given to CIS as a possible corrective.

Just before this time the Council on Library Resources, which had maintained a continuous interest in CIS, learned that Miss Eleanor Buist, the Slavic bibliographer of the Columbia University Libraries, was about to visit the Soviet Union. Knowing of Miss Buist's previous report on cataloging developments in Russia, the Council asked her to make inquiries there about CIS. As you know, Miss Buist has just published an account of her findings in the Wilson Library Bulletin.

And then, on September 15, 1969, appeared Mr. Wheeler's forceful article, "Top Priority for Cataloging-in-Source." This alone would have brought CIS alive and kicking out of the tomb.

Shortly thereafter, at the request of the RTSD/ABPC joint committee, LC agreed to give the suggested new look to CIS in collaboration with the joint committee and the present speaker.

The first thing to be done was obviously to find out why, in spite of all the earmarks of success displayed by the 1958-59 experiment, LC had come out so strongly against CIS in 1960. An explanation emerges from an analysis of the cataloging procedure used in the experiment. In LC's complex and highly organized cataloging operation, it is not improbable that as many as 100 persons may be involved in the processing of any one book from the moment of its selection through the printing of cards together with their insertion in the various records, and the labelling of the book, concluding with its dispatch to the shelves. Even in the very truncated chain of operations provided for CIS (in which selection was assigned to a descriptive cataloger, revision was avoided by having all cataloging done by senior catalogers, and
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in which the operation terminated with the production of a corrected card proof, the book had to go through at least twenty persons, several of them several times, in descriptive cataloging, subject cataloging, serial record, shelflisting, Decimal Classification, card preparation, card distribution, and printing office, not to mention the expeditor’s office.12

With the exception of the expeditor and her staff, all the work was done by regular staff. In order to meet the target turnaround schedule of twenty-four hours from receipt of the page proof from the publisher to its return with a catalog card proof, all work was handled on a “nonstop-rush” basis, meaning that the items were not only given rush treatment at each station, but were passed on by hand to the next station.

The plan was superb, and—it worked. But in the very achievement it destroyed itself. The lethal element was the “nonstop-rush” schedule on which it was dependent. This schedule required that on an average of seven times a day throughout the period of the experiment (eighteen times a day at peak) a book was hand-carried from person to person in the cataloging chain, interrupting whatever the recipient was doing and demanding his immediate attention. It is obvious that nine months of this, though successful, was enough. As C. Sumner Spalding, the chief of the descriptive cataloging division who had a principal responsibility for the operation, reported to RTSD in June 1959, “to catalog in source is to catalog under tension.”13 Similarly Bella E. Schachtman, Mr. Spalding’s opposite at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, reported that, “tension was high and interruptions to other work were costly.”14

The great mystery of the 1960 report seems thus to be explained. It now remains to find a way to avoid the costly 1958-59 mistake. This will require an LC cataloging schedule that will take the heat off the catalogers. The question is whether such a schedule can be compatible with one which will not unduly interrupt publishers’ schedules. A search for a formula which will accomplish both desiderata is in progress.

Meanwhile, the other objections found by LC in 1960 have also been considered. The most important of these concerns the discrepancies between the CIS entries and the eventual (postpublication) entries for the same books. These discrepancies arose in large part from changes made in the book between page proof and publication. For example, the book might have been intended for publication in 1958 with 250 pages and a bibliography, but might have actually been published in 1959 with 245 pages and no bibliography. The three resulting errors in the CIS entry would naturally distress LC and the cataloger concerned and arouse the user’s scorn. Actually 50 percent of all CIS entries contained such discrepancies15 at the rate of 1.7 per discrepant entry, distributed as follows:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of discrepancy</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heading</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprint</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series note</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject headings</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC card number</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is obvious that the greatest incidence of errors (amounting to nearly two-thirds of the total), occurs in the collation and imprint. But these are the elements which are least essential to a CIP entry, since they can be easily ascertained by anyone with a copy of the book in his hand. It has accordingly been agreed that the CIP entry shall omit these two elements as well as the subtitle, but that all other elements shall be identical with the usual LC entry. This accords with the suggestions of the director of the Consumer Survey and of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee included in the 1960 report. A CIP entry is, in consequence, expected to resemble the following:

Capote, Truman, 1924–

In cold blood.

Appeared originally in the New Yorker in slightly different form.


HV6538.K3C8 364.1523 65-11257

Engels, Friedrich, 1820–1895

The German revolutions: The Peasant War in Germany, and Germany: revolution and counter-revolution.

(Classic European historians)

The Peasant War in Germany is a translation by Moissaye J. Olgin of Der deutsche Bauernkrieg.

Germany: revolution and counter-revolution was originally published in the New York Tribune, 1851–52, in a series of articles on which Marx and Engels collaborated.


DD182.E52 1967 943.008 67-15314
At this point in the "new look" it seemed that the moment had arrived when it would be suitable and useful to ascertain whether the interest of the library world in a prepublication cataloging program is similar today to what it was reported in 1960 to be. A questionnaire was accordingly designed, tested, and mailed last May. Before describing it, I shall for the sake of comparison describe the "Consumers' Survey" which was made in April-May 1959 at the close of the 1958-59 experiment.

The 1959 survey was directed by Esther Piercy with the assistance of Eleanor E. Campion, Virginia Drewry, Richard O. Pautzsch, and Joseph H. Treyz, Jr.¹⁷ The surveyors visited 219 hand-picked institutions in eight categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University and college libraries</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public including regional and state libraries</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special libraries</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School library systems</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School libraries</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstores</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographical publishers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial technical processors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>219</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and brought back completed questionnaires for 203 of them. The questionnaire contained 275 questions (!) which explored the respondent institution's sources of bibliographic information, the timing of its orders, the conjectured effect of CIS on cataloging, reference services, etc. (A lot of good information must be stacked away in those returns!) With respect to the need for and prospective usefulness of CIS the response was an overwhelming and enthusiastic approval—"possibly 98 or 99 percent." It appeared to the surveyors that the respondents expected CIS to improve all services, not merely cataloging. The principal expected benefits were getting books to readers faster, cutting costs of cataloging, and encouraging compliance with higher standards of cataloging. Booksellers were reported as viewing the potential of CIS as "fabulous."¹⁸

We turn now to the 1970 questionnaire. It was sent, in the second week of May, to 391 libraries in eighteen categories. All libraries, except those in categories 6, 12, 13, 14 and 18, were randomly selected. A total of 230 replies was received (some as late as July 31), constituting a 59 percent response. The categories, with the number sent and the number and percentage of replies in each, are listed in Table 1.

The questionnaire briefly described its mission, namely, to explore the potential utility of a CIP program. It referred briefly to the 1958-59 CIS experiment, cited Mr. Wheeler's Library Journal article, and gave some examples of the proposed form of CIP entries, including the two exhibited above. It then asked seven questions, all but two of which could be answered by a simple multiple-choice reply. These questions follow.
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### TABLE 1
**NUMBER OF CIP QUESTIONNAIRES SENT AND RETURNED, BY CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number sent</th>
<th>Number returned</th>
<th>Percent returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Public libraries serving populations of</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-24 M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ditto, 25-34 M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ditto, 35-49 M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ditto, 50-99 M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ditto, 100 M plus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The largest public library in each state</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(one placed in category 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Junior college libraries</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Four-year college libraries</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. University libraries</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. State public library agencies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. State school library agencies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fox River (Wis.) libraries that had expressed interest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Indiana libraries that ditto</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Contributors to LRTS symposium on CIS, Fall 1960</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Commercial processing centers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cooperative ditto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Special libraries</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Libraries which guinea-pigged the questionnaire</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The first question asked how the respondent would regard a program under which “it might be expected that within a year or two most new United States trade publications and reprints would contain entries . . . representing prepublishation cataloging by the Library of Congress” in the form exemplified by the sample CIP entries shown. Four choices of response were given. The distribution of replies among these choices was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of replies</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. With enthusiasm</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. With interest</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. With indifference</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. With disfavor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>229</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These responses suggest that CIP stirs the blood of librarians as much in 1970 as CIS did in 1959. Even when offered the choice of a cautious reply, two-thirds of the respondents preferred to go gung-ho! For some librarians even the response “With enthusiasm” did not sufficiently interpret their attitude, and they added exclamations such as

---

*Library Resources & Technical Services*
“Boy o boy!” “Answer to a prayer!” “Great!” and “Godspeed!”

If the a and b responses are added, the total (97 percent) is close to the “98 or 99 percent” approval reported in 1959. There seems to be no correlation between the various responses to this question and the type of library, except perhaps in the case of category 15 (commercial processing centers) where there was an abnormally low 33 percent enthusiasm. But there were only 6 respondents in this class, hardly a representative sample.

The 1 percent of respondents who viewed CIP with disfavor represents two junior college libraries and one commercial processing center. The reasons for their disfavor will be reported below.

2. The second question asked whether the respondent expected CIP to “make possible a significant reduction of the time required to get books cataloged, processed, and on to the shelves.” In the replies, which are summarized below, there again appeared to be no correlation between the various replies and the type of library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of replies</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The third question was “Do you expect that your library would use CIP?” In the questionnaire sent to the state agencies (groups 10 and 11), for the phrase “your library” was substituted “the libraries within your area of responsibility.” A three-choice answer was provided. The response was as follows (some respondents checked both a and b):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of replies</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I would expect my library (or the libraries within my area of responsibility) to use CIP entries to make catalog cards (or book-catalog entries) for the books in which such entries appear, and I would not expect it (them) to purchase cards for such books from LC or other services</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I would expect my library (or the libraries within my area of responsibility) to use CIP entries to set up temporary cataloging controls pending receipt of printed catalog cards</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I would not expect my library (or the libraries within my area of responsibility) to make direct use of CIP entries to make either permanent or temporary catalog records.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The fourth question asked the respondent to estimate the effect of CIP on his institution's total cataloging costs (or, again, in the case
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of state public and school library agencies—categories 10 and 11—the total cataloging costs of the libraries within their area of responsibility), “presuming that at least 75% of new United States trade publications and reprints were covered by CIP.” Because no precise form of reply was suggested, answers took various forms, as follows:

*Expected effect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs would be reduced</th>
<th>Number of replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. In percent of cataloging costs</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. In dollars per annum</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. In dollars per title or volume cataloged</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Nonspecific</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs would be increased</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reduction, no increase</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate not possible</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>201</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 70 estimates of reduction in terms of percent of cataloging costs spanned a gamut of from 2.5 percent to 80 percent, the mean being 29 percent. There seemed to be no significant correlation between the type of library and the proportion of savings expected; the expectations typically ranged from 5 percent to 50 percent within any one category.

The 28 estimates of reduction expressed in terms of dollars per annum similarly spanned a range of between $750 for two libraries in category 2 (public libraries serving populations of from 25 to 34 M) and $24,000 for a library in category 9 (university libraries) or $50,000 for the libraries within the area of responsibility of a state school library agency (category 11). Because of the degree of correlation between the estimate and the type of library, the range and the mean is given below for each category.
For the six estimates of cost reduction in terms of dollars per title or volume, the estimates ran from 26¢ per volume to $2 per title. The average was $1.31 per title (counting a title as 1.7 volumes).

The 45 nonspecific estimates of reduction, as well as the other estimates tabulated, used verbal descriptions such as "drastic reduction," "very little reduction," "general increase," "reduction and increases cancel each other out," and "we are unable to estimate at this time."

5. The fifth question asked what other effects were expected from CIP. This produced a large variety of replies, mostly describing desirable effects. Among the most frequent were the following:
   a. Increased efficiency of processing through simplification of procedures.
   b. Release of professional staff from cataloging to other work.
   c. Improvement in the quality of cataloging through greater accuracy and assistance in cataloging difficult material.
   d. Increase in desirable standardization.
   e. Facilitation of interlibrary cooperation in such matters as interlibrary loan, union catalogs, etc.
   f. Release of funds for purchase of additional materials.
   g. Facilitation of bibliographic citation.
   h. Eventual facilitation of checking dealers' catalogs.
   i. Expediting LC's cataloging.
   j. One enthusiast foresaw that "About 10,000 staffers will be freed from the dungeon of the cataloging department and be forced out into the light where the real action is and patrons are, and ultimately make it possible to make wiser and more relevant use of staff."

On the other hand, the possibility of some undesirable effects was feared, such as:

   k. Enforcement of standardization to the point of regimentation and the elimination of choices.
   l. Cluttering up of copyright pages.
   m. Increased cost of books or LC cards in order to absorb the cost of CIP.
   n. "Hardening of the arteries"—the sacrifice of local cataloging autonomy and interest through dependence upon central authority.
   o. One of the two disfavoring junior college libraries believed that CIP would require revision of its entire cataloging procedure.
   p. The other disfavoring junior college library feared that CIP entries will need to be replaced by LC cards; however, it admitted the value of preassigned LC and DC class numbers.
   q. The principal objection of those disfavoring the commercial processing center was that CIP would interfere with the promotion of a "cards with books" program.

6. The sixth question asked whether the respondent estimated
“the advantages of CIP to be sufficient to justify an increased cost of cataloging such as occurred in the 1958-59 experiment, when it reached $25 a title.” The answers to this question were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of replies</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>218</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, from the comments made it is apparent that the question was widely misunderstood. The intention had been to refer to an increased cost of cataloging to LC (which had been mentioned in the covering letter), but many respondents thought that it referred to them. In consequence, the large number of negative replies may be regarded as resulting from a misunderstanding.

7. The last question inquired whether the respondent foresaw “that a machine-readable version of the CIP entry (e.g., on an ‘advance edition’ MARC tape) would be useful.” The answers were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of replies</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>229</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So much for the questionnaire to libraries. Many questions regarding CIP remain to be explored—its use in federal, state and United Nations documents, in periodicals, music, audiovisual and other non-book materials; the use of the term “juvenile”; the use of the LC version of the Anglo-American cataloging rules, etc. But the very mention of these problems suggests that CIP must learn to creep before it can even walk; that its utility to the American library community—and indeed to the whole community of book readers and users—is dependent upon that world making its needs known to the cataloging agency, and taking action to assure that means are made available to that agency in order to meet them.

Meanwhile it appears to be demonstrated once more, as fully as is needed, that CIP would be welcomed and used. Accordingly, the commencement of CIP—this time for keeps—depends on other factors: the willingness of LC, the feasibility of adjustment to publishers’ schedules, and money. These are the topics for this evening’s meeting.

**REFERENCES**

Report on Library of Congress Plans for Cataloging in Publication

WILLIAM J. WELSH, Director
Processing Department
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Introduction

When we were asked in October 1969 for an expression of attitude about a renewal of cataloging-in-source, our response was positive. We were interested and we were determined to make it succeed. Profiting from the experience gained in the 1958-59 experiment, we specified that:
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6. For example, the Australian National Library was reported to be discussing the possibilities of a CIS program with the Standing Committee of the Australian Advisory Council on Bibliographic Services in July 1965.
15. Not 48% as stated in the 1960 report, if the count in the Appendix is accurate (Ref. 2, p.20, 144-5).
1. A survey of libraries be conducted;
2. a survey of publishers be conducted;
3. an expert investigator be secured;
4. there be adequate funding;
5. there be adequate space; and,
6. that those factors be eliminated which represented the most crucial problem areas in the 1958-59 experiment.

Survey of Libraries

You heard Verner Clapp's eloquent report on the results of his survey of a carefully selected group of libraries of all types and of both commercial and noncommercial processing centers. The sampling of libraries was more widely representative than in the 1958-59 survey and you will have been impressed by Mr. Clapp's statement that 97 percent of the libraries responding were enthusiastic or interested in a revived program.

Survey of Publishers

Last spring Robert W. Frase, acting for the Association of American Publishers (a consolidation of the American Book Publishers Council and the American Educational Publishers Institute), approached a group of publishers about their reaction to the program and about feasible schedules and procedures. The response was favorable. Verner Clapp, working with Robert Frase and others in the publishers group, will complete his draft of a questionnaire to be sent this summer to perhaps 200 or so representative firms. The returns should be in hand and tabulated by September.

Expert Investigator

We are all fortunate that the Council on Library Resources has made available the expert services of Verner Clapp. He, as you know, was responsible for LC's undertaking the 1958-59 experiment, was disappointed at the result, remained convinced that cataloging in publication could be made to work under the proper conditions, kept in touch with changing circumstances, and pushed for a renewed program when a change of climate indicated that the time was ripe. Conversant with both the library and the publishing world, Mr. Clapp was the ideal person to conduct the needed investigation.

Availability of Funding

LC plans to request a foundation grant for the first three years of a pilot project which will be viewed as the beginning of a continuing program. We have already made an informal approach to a foundation and are encouraged by the response. If the pilot program succeeds, as we expect, and unless some totally unexpected circumstance arises, we will, toward the end of the three years, request a federal appropriation to continue the program.

* 24 *

Library Resources & Technical Services
Availability of Space

Space will continue to be a problem with LC until we occupy our third building but we are confident that the needed room can be found. We plan to use our present staff to the maximum extent and the additional personnel required will not present an insuperable problem.

Most Crucial Problem Areas in the 1958-59 Experiment

I can report that we shall take great pains to avoid the difficulties which plagued the earlier effort at cataloging-in-publication. Imprint, collation, subtitle, and page references for notes will not be included in the entry. It was found in the 1958-59 experiment that these items cannot be predicted with confidence at the time that prepublication cataloging must take place, and that they can easily be ascertained from an examination of the book itself in its final, published form. Equally important, we shall make every effort to find the arrangement for publishers' submission of copy to LC that will prove to be the best time frame in terms of receipt of copy, preparation of cataloging data, and return of copy with that data to a publisher without delaying his schedule. Procedures which are as flexible as possible, accommodating themselves to the publishers' requirements, will be worked out.

General Plan for Achieving Maximum Coverage

In the initial stage, the program will begin with a small group of publishers, perhaps from one to six major firms, increasing gradually as the requisite additional staff at LC is built up. We expect to draw up a budget by October and to make a formal request to a foundation in November. If all goes well, the program could begin operating on January 1, 1971. We would aim at 10,000 titles, chiefly American trade books, during the first year and at 30,000 titles by the end of the second year, maintaining production at this level during the third year of the pilot project. Later, as feasible, an effort would be made to bring in nontrade publishers, e.g., the Government Printing Office (working with the individual government agencies which send their manuscripts to GPO for publication), university presses, learned societies, and professional associations. The National Library of Medicine has offered its cooperation in covering the output of medical publishers.

Product

Briefly expressed, the CIP entry will contain everything now on an LC printed card except for the information between the end of the title proper and the beginning of the series statement. Spelled out, the following information will be supplied: author, title, series statement, notes, subject and added entries, LC classification number, DC classification number, and LC card number. The entry will normally appear on the verso of the title page, printed in a format similar to the LC
catalog card format. Entries for children's books will add annotations of the type now carried on our catalog cards for juvenile literature. Typography of the cataloging entry will probably match that of the book.

Use of Product

Two alternatives suggest themselves. Subprofessional assistants would prepare the master copy for catalog cards, using the cataloging in publication information, transcribing the title page, and formulating the collation. These steps would be accomplished by typing. Not to be ruled out, however, is the possibility of photographing the information from the back of the title page onto a slip or card of the required size and then typing in the additional information to be supplied. Procedures will undoubtedly vary from library to library.

Procedures at LC

A. A control unit will be created to receive, log in, monitor progress, communicate with publishers, return cataloging copy, and keep statistics.

B. Catalog information will be built up on data sheets.

C. We will input into MARC and make available an "advance edition" of MARC tapes.

D. We will use MARC output of copy for control cards for use when book arrives.

E. We will complete cataloging when the book arrives, print the cards, and update to full MARC record.

Value of "Advance Edition" of MARC

A. Cataloging in publication would make possible the distribution of an "advance edition" of MARC which could be of great utility to such book-trade journals as the Publishers' Weekly and the American Book Publishing Record, providing them, at an early stage, with the information needed for their listings of current titles.

B. As an acquisition tool.

C. Possibility of print-outs in specified subject fields.

Cards-with-Books

We will continue to push this complementary program. CIP will help to make cards available faster since all essential cataloging information will have been recorded and on hand well in advance of publication date.

Problems

In the 1958-59 experiment it was discovered that working with page proofs frequently allowed insufficient time for all the operations involved and resulted in undesirable pressure on those concerned. We have already studied the possibility of using galley proofs which are
produced at a considerably earlier stage in the publishing cycle. A test run by McGraw-Hill on a number of its publications indicated that, so far as this important firm is concerned, there would be ample time between the printing of galleys and final publication to work in a cataloging in publication operation. This finding will be compared with the situation prevailing at another large publisher of more general titles, such as Doubleday.

Looking to the future, the effect of technological change must be taken into account. The application of automated techniques to typesetting is still in an experimental stage but the practice of eliminating galleys will probably increase as more of the operations involved in publishing become mechanized. Catalogers might have to work with computer print-outs.

Other problems will arise from the unwieldiness of galley proofs, from the lack of information that appears on dust jackets (frequently providing useful information about the author and the subject of the book), and from the seasonal nature of the publishing industry, with a heavy peak load in the fall.

At the 30,000 level, over 100 sets of galleys would be in process at each stage every working day. An effort will be made to design equipment for stabilizing each set of materials for physical handling during processing.

Securing the participation of publishers will involve correspondence, personal visits, determining the key person in each firm who should be the point of contact, and maintaining relations when this person is replaced.

Fast communications will be required, involving air express pick-ups and deliveries. Speed will be particularly essential when working with reprint publishers where schedules are particularly tight.

There are certain to be occasional disputes over main entry, use of authors' birth dates, use of real names for pseudonymous authors, and the like.

Benefits

The responses to the questionnaire sent out by Verner Clapp listed many potential benefits, including a possible reduction in cataloging costs, a marked reduction in the time required for cataloging, the use of any funds saved for better service, and the purchase of more books. No less important is the contribution cataloging in publication will make to all bibliography and bibliothecal effort through the final and definitive identification of each book recorded, once for all, in the book itself.

In summary, we are prepared to move ahead assuming a favorable response from publishers and the availability of funding.
The dictionary catalog is described as a logical answer to the inadequacies of the divided catalogs of the nineteenth century. The claims in behalf of a return to the divided catalog are challenged. The author suggests that the divided catalog actually intensifies the problems of congestion and confusion at the catalog. He contends that the dictionary catalog is more compatible with current library practice, avoids redundant entries, eliminates double searching, and is less likely to mislead the library user.

Although the dictionary catalog, with its integrated author, title, and subject approaches, is actually a more recent phenomenon than split catalogs, there is a continuing trend to revert to the older, divided catalog approach. The advantages of the dictionary catalog that brought about its widespread adoption and practically drove the split catalog from existence have been all but forgotten in the literature of technical processes.

We hear little of the demerits of divided catalogs today, and the cure for what we do hear seems to be more splitting. The latest bandwagon is the title catalog, and the form heading catalog may not be far behind. Beyond that, the sky may be the limit, though it may be a while before libraries will emulate the Argentine National Library which split from three to thirty-seven card files in five years.¹

It seems high time that someone rose to the defense of the integrated dictionary catalog. The profession ought to consider that the University of Toronto and the University of Chicago, despite the enormity of their catalogs, took the trouble to refile their cards from divided catalogs into single dictionary units, even though they had spent considerable time dividing them previously. Others may wish to consider why American libraries almost universally abandoned divided catalogs in favor of the integrated alphabetical file, and may ask if an approach that was found inadequate in the nineteenth century is justified today.

We hear arguments that the dictionary catalog (not unlike libraries generally) is a victim of mass production in publishing and communications materials. Catalogs, reflecting these developments, are be-
coming bulky and sometimes bewildering. Their heavy use can create almost intolerable congestion, forcing patrons even to wait in line for this or that drawer. Beyond that, they require great expense to maintain, update, file, and revise.

Contrariwise, we are told that the divided catalog is more economical, easier to use, and less congested. On the surface, all the arguments against the dictionary catalog and for the divided catalog (in almost any of its several variants) seem true enough. But it is not a very good idea to judge an iceberg by its surface alone.

Let us first examine the matter of catalog size. This has become a matter of growing concern, especially in larger institutions. Catalog bulk is not only a result of the size of a collection, but also of its complexity. Adequate bibliographic control of complex material requires more entries, analytics, and cross references, whether it be for slides, phonograph records, films, or simply for an irregular supplement to an annual report issued as a part of various series by an agency which changes its name at least twice a year. Efforts to reduce catalog bulk run the risk of making the material less accessible, though prudent professional judgment can occasionally reduce redundancies and dubious entries.

The introduction of split catalogs usually requires some redundancies and some dubious entries that are unnecessary in the dictionary catalog. I refer to duplicate cross references, subject cards for autobiographies, annual reports, etc., without which the collection would suffer in retrievability. Hence, the total bulk of the library's catalogs increases with the divided catalog. Central Baptist Seminary in Kansas City reported that their divided catalog required 1,488 extra cards for the first 12,162 volumes cataloged, that is, over 12 percent of their volumes each required an extra card.2 The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee library, which already had two catalogs, added an additional 31,643 cards when it introduced a third (title) catalog, which among other things required duplicate title main entry cards.3 Clearly, the divided catalog is not the answer for conserving total catalog space. We are going to have to accept the fact that the problems of catalog size and complexity are going to be with us no matter how we organize our catalogs.

As for congestion, this is certainly a problem whenever a catalog is heavily used. Some who have adopted the divided catalog claim that congestion has been thus reduced. They do not tell us if as many people use it as before; and certainly there would be less congestion if people find it ineffective and use it less. But assuming it is just as effective and that just as many people use it, it is likely that there is more congestion, at least at parts of the catalog. Studies, thus far, do not indicate anything approaching an even distribution between subject and author-title users. At the University of California, the use of the author-title catalog was found to be 2½ times that of the subject catalog.4 Central Baptist Seminary found that the author-title catalog was used...
almost five times as much as the subject catalog. Central Methodist College library reported that 64 percent used the subject catalog, while only 34 percent used the author-title catalog. The reference librarian at Northeastern Illinois State College has concluded from her observations that the subject approach is more heavily used. (Perhaps undergraduate-oriented users tend to use the subject approach, while graduates and specialized subject users, relying more upon bibliographies and reading lists, tend to prefer the author-title catalogs.) It seems to follow that clustering and concentrated congestion at one of the catalogs would result from dividing; and that while some congestion would be reduced at the other catalog, it would be aggravated at the other, and in some cases, would even be worse.

Probably the best argument for the divided catalog is that it saves the library time and money. This seems to be borne out in a study by André Nitecki, where the reductions in filing and revising time were sufficient to more than offset the expenses of dividing and of duplicating entries.

But should library economy be the prime consideration? What about economy to scholars and users? If divided catalogs complicate confusion and congestion, and there is every evidence that they do, is there not the danger that the losses in user time will at least offset the savings in library time?

The University of Toronto shifted from the divided catalog because of increased confusion and congestion. Central Baptist Seminary, while favoring the divided catalog, revealed a survey which suggests that the split catalog can be misleading:

When using our divided catalog do you have any trouble deciding which catalog to look in when seeking material about a person, such as, for example, about Karl Barth?

- YES—Would use A-T catalog
- NO—Would use Subject catalog

When using our divided catalog do you have any trouble deciding which catalog to look in when seeking material produced by an association, or governmental agency such as, for example, the National Education Association?

- YES—No idea where to go
- NO—Use subject catalog
- NO—Use A-T catalog

In the latter case, only about half knew where to go. In the first instance, a substantial number would have had to use both catalogs before finding what they wanted. It is not improbable that some might have left the library, after checking the wrong catalog, under the impression that the library had nothing at all about Karl Barth. The use of signs would help, of course, but this presumes that they will see the signs, and immediately understand the distinctions between author, subject, and title.

User confusion is conceded by other split catalog advocates. Brother
Edmund Joseph of LaSalle College Library writes:

It was found that many undergraduates did not understand the catalog, the most common error being an inability to distinguish title and subject entries. The prime reason for dividing was to aid in the use of the catalog by making this distinction more obvious.\(^{10}\)

The technique of seizing upon a nebulous distinction as the basis for public catalog organization, in the hope that the user will be thus edified, is interesting; and applying the same logic, perhaps we can force students to learn Persian by introducing it on our cross reference cards! The only trouble is that the approach did not work. Thus, Brother Joseph was obliged to admit that “students who scarcely understood the use of the catalog continue to be confused,” and that “frequently . . . students consult the wrong catalog.”\(^{11}\) He added that the reference department found the split catalog of no help in locating materials more easily. The most he could say for it was that it appeared to relieve congestion, and sometimes facilitated searches for specific items.

Some libraries have reduced confusion by including author-as-subject cards and cards for criticisms of specific books in the author catalog. To an extent this is an admission that the separate catalogs are not always effective, and it is a concession that the integrated approach is sometimes more helpful. The difficulty with mixing subject cards in the author catalog and title cards in the subject catalog (as might be done for catch-titles) is that an already confusing distinction becomes compromised and even less apparent. How is the user to know where the library has drawn the line? If he finds some subjects in the author-title file, might he not reasonably expect to find others there as well? Is there not also the danger that he may think the library has not been careful in dividing its cards, and that to be safe, he must consult both catalogs as a matter of routine? If he is a sophisticated user, he may realize that subject information is often obtainable through author and title (especially catch-title) cards, and to do a thorough search, he must check in each catalog. He may realize, as Gilmore Warner does,\(^{12}\) that almost every book is to an extent a revelation of its author, and that for biographical material, both files will be helpful. I have often wondered who is penalized the most by catalog schizophrenia, the thorough researcher who is forced to double search, or the casual user who looks in the wrong catalog, and leaves the library without finding what he needs.

It was largely the overlapping and grey areas between author, subject, and title entries that made the integration into a single dictionary file attractive to American librarians. The earlier special lists by author, title, or subject entries were found ineffective for answering such questions as “Why must I look in more than one place for materials dealing with the Supreme Court or for books by or about Landor?” It was recognized that annotated editions of, say, the U.S. Constitution,
books of the Bible, or of Chaucer selections, while not often using subject entries, could sometimes be of considerable subject value, and were too often overlooked. The logical answer was to combine the separate units into a straight alphabetical listing. The transformation was widespread, and even the trade catalogs began to abandon their separate author and subject volumes in favor of single alphabetical files, as did the Bowker American Catalogue in 1905.13

There remains another area of difficulty, resulting from the failure of separate catalogs to encompass current library practice, including many entries that fail to qualify as either authors, subjects, or titles. Is Illinois. Laws, statutes, etc. an author? It is certainly not a title or a subject, though a patron might well argue that in essence it is about Illinois. Or consider the person who wants material on the Treaty of Paris of 1763, and must be referred from the subject catalog to the author catalog under the nonauthor form entry Gt. Brit. Treaties, 1763. One solution would be to adopt either a main entry-title catalog or a form heading catalog, neither of which is an easy concept for the public to grasp, and which would predictably enlarge the guessing game between the library and its public.

We could get around this by adopting a catalog based upon much more commonly understood principles, such as those of the alphabet, which allow for form headings and other peculiarities of library practice. The dictionary catalog does not demand a sophisticated understanding of fine distinctions between authors, titles, and subjects, but merely recognition of A, B, and C, though some knowledge of library filing rules is helpful. Second-guessing the librarian is minimized, and double searching is not required of the user, who, after all, justifies the library in the first place, though it should not be forgotten that the librarian is also spared double searching.

Of course, we hear that divided catalog users like it that way, and there are studies to prove it. But it may also be true that users tend to prefer whatever arrangement their library has. Thus, we find general acceptance of split catalogs at Central Methodist College14 and at Central Baptist Seminary,15 while the University of Toronto users are happy with the dictionary catalog after having tried it the other way.16

The dictionary catalog can certainly be improved, and the adoption of the Anglo-American code, whenever feasible, plus consistent and logical filing, should help mollify critics of the complex library catalogs. With advanced technology, we can also look forward to economical book catalogs and computers as more realistic answers to catalog space problems than retrogressions into the nineteenth century. In the meantime, the dictionary catalog may be the best response to the scholar who complains that "the catalogue ought not, in the opinion of a heretic, to be carved into parts and distributed throughout the library. A single dictionary catalogue would not defeat or fool the student as easily as one split up...."17
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Reprinting: Problems, Directions, Challenges*

Introduction

CONNIE R. DUNLAP, Head
Graduate Library
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

BECAUSE OF THE INCREASE in reprint publishing in recent years and the problems encountered with reprints the four sections of the Resources and Technical Services Division have combined their program times in order to treat this subject more fully. We can hardly expect to solve all of the problems in three and a half hours, but perhaps it will be possible to air at least some of the most important ones. The discussions today will be concerned with scholarly reprints, including microforms as well as hard copy.

Librarians often complain that reprint editions sometimes seem to be only a figment of the publisher's imagination, that titles are announced as if they were actually available, and that projected publication dates are frequently not met. While it is a legitimate precaution for the publisher to test the market before undertaking an expensive publication, it is also incumbent upon him to announce publicly his final decision within a reasonable amount of time. In this way funds will not be committed unnecessarily and librarians will not have to check again and again for titles not received. Librarians are often aghast at prices charged for some reprint editions, yet the publisher has a right to expect a just and profitable margin between the cost of reproduction and the sale price. Librarians lament particularly, incomplete, incorrect, and misleading bibliographic information, the omission of series notes, original publication dates, and so forth. To identify certain titles properly requires sleuthing by a master detective. Librarians decry the reprinting of works of inferior scholarship or those that have been superseded by better titles. Some examples are the

* Revised text of material presented at the Joint Sections Program Meeting of the Resources and Technical Services Division, American Library Association at its Annual Conference in Detroit, July 2, 1970, under the chairmanship of Esther D. Koch, University of California, Los Angeles, moderated by Connie R. Dunlap and Alfred H. Lane, with Fred Ruffner and Harold Mason as resource persons. The papers by Howard Sullivan and Eleanor Devlin were not delivered because the meeting was canceled.
whole sale reprinting of titles in *Books for College Libraries* and black studies. Publishers counter by pointing out that if we buy worthless titles, we have only ourselves to blame. Antiquarian dealers are often puzzled by the republication of some titles when a seemingly ample supply (usually costing far less than the reprint) exists on their shelves. But the cost of searching for second-hand titles and the delay caused by lengthy searches may convince many librarians that the extra initial cost is worth it in the long run. A further consideration is the paper quality in many second-hand titles published after 1900. Librarians who lend to reprinters grumble about searching long lists of titles that are never borrowed, the treatment a book receives from some reprinters, and the length of time it is kept by nearly all.

If we were to stop talking long enough to listen, I suspect the reprinters would have a few legitimate complaints of their own, for we surely contribute more to the problem than we realize. To listen and to discuss are the reasons for being here today. And if from our discussions we can construct the framework of a better understanding and a better working relationship, our time shall not have been wasted.

Scholarly Reprint Publishing in the United States: Selected Findings from a Recent Survey of the Industry

CAROL A. NEMEYER
*Columbia University School of Library Service*
*New York, New York*

Data from a two-year survey of the reprint industry based on personal interviews and questionnaire responses are summarized. The industry is described in terms of type of firm, geographical distribution, various formats of reprints, and general marketing strategies. While the lack of bibliographical control is stressed, considerable attention is also given to the lack of communication among reprinters and between reprinters and librarians about the problems of the industry.

My purpose here is to highlight selected findings of a survey whose objective was to identify and describe the nature and extent of the scholarly reprint publishing industry in the United States. Two years adrift among reprint publishers with the advantage of communicating from a position of "no advocacy" has provided an opportunity to gather factual data and opinions as well as form impressions about the industry and its active participants.
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Background and Need for the Survey

The reprint industry is a twentieth-century phenomenon, the camera-born offspring of the publishing-bookselling-printing triumvir. By the decade of the sixties, the period of this survey's focus, few, if indeed any other part of the publishing industry seemed in such a dynamic state of growth, change, and turmoil as the reprint sector.

The major factors that spurred the industry to unprecedented levels of action in the 1960s were:

1. Technological innovations, improvements in offset printing and micropublishing processes and resulting economies made short pressruns of specialized, small-edition titles feasible to produce and sell.
2. The injection of large amounts of government funds into the nation's educational sector nourished the library and book worlds. Upgraded curricula at all educational levels, the formation of many new libraries, and the expansion of existing library collections created demands for more copies of older scholarly works than generally could be satisfied through normal book trade channels.

Prospective customers found reprints of scarce and rare titles acceptable as: (a) replacement copies of deteriorating original works, (b) additional copies of works permitting preservation of originals, (c) new copies for new or expanding library collections, and (d) space savers in microform.

Reprint editions offer the possibility of wider distribution of specialized scholarly works with a predictably small market potential; too small to attract most regular publishers who need to allocate resources to works of new authorship.

The Gaps

The reprint industry has operated largely with an unexamined sense of its positive contributions to the scholarly world. To date, negative aspects of the industry and more newsworthy ones perhaps, have received the most attention. This fact, I believe, has created the industry's most dominant personality traits—defensiveness, suspicion, and a kind of adolescent self-consciousness. Reprint publishing is a part of the publishing world; yet is apart from it.

In July 1968 when this survey was proposed, reprint publishing was found to be plagued by, and partially responsible for, serious information gaps that cloaked the industry with a veil of mystery. Plainly, people asked, "How do you find out if a particular title has been reprinted? By what publisher? In what format? At what price?" It seemed that the lack of reliable, consistently reported reprint information was a deterrent to cooperative relations among reprinters and between reprinters and their prospective customers.

Four of the major reprint information gaps that yawned widely two years ago are still not satisfactorily resolved:

1. There is no association of reprint publishers to provide overall
industry information, to field questions about individual firms, or to recommend or enforce standards of performance.

2. There is no complete, accurate directory of reprint publishers.

3. There is no comprehensive, enumerative list of reprinted titles, current or retrospective.

4. There is no published list of titles that are out-of-print, out-of-stock, or in the public domain in the United States.

These voids create tensions within the reprint industry that exceed what is normal in competitive businesses, and waste publishing house and library staff time and money.

Discovering the Universe of Reprint Publishers

For the foregoing reasons, this survey was begun in a partial vacuum. The identification and description of the industry had to depend primarily upon obtaining factual data and reliable opinions directly from as many reprint publishers as could be found and who were willing to cooperate in the survey. As of this writing (August 1970), 274 U.S. reprint publishers have been identified. (In June 1970, 269 publishers comprised the universe.)

Early in the survey, personal interviews were conducted with 92 publishers, booksellers, printers, and librarians; 48 were found to be reprint publishers. The interviews were loosely structured, but intended to elicit standardized responses to the fact-seeking questions. Opinion questions were deliberately open-ended to encourage publishers to provide additional information, to suggest or expand upon problems, and to describe their firms with a measure of individuality. The interviews proved extremely valuable for these purposes, and in the subsequent design of a 29-item questionnaire.

Obviously the industry did not stand still while interviews were arranged and conducted. New firms entered the field or popped into view at a fast pace, making it clear that not every firm could be personally interviewed. A questionnaire was structured, pretested, and mailed, in October 1969, to an additional 250 firms and organizations believed to be reprint publishers. Returns were received from 157 firms, a gratifying 62.8 percent response from an industry that is disorganized and highly competitive. Thirty-one respondents eliminated their firms from further study, stating that they are not reprint publishers. These are useful negative responses since most of the names were culled from existing lists of reprinters.

The 274 identified firms will be listed, and in many cases described, in the Directory of Reprint Publishers which will appear as an Appendix to the full report.¹

Summary of Selected Findings

1. Types of reprint firms.—Eight types of organizations that publish reprints have been distinguished. Table 1 lists the eight categories and the frequency of their occurrence within the publisher universe
studied. Type of firm information is known for 233 firms (unknown for 41 firms). The first group, called “commercial” for lack of a better designation, includes firms that are primarily publishers. Since all the firms have been included in this survey because they publish reprints, this label tends to confuse. Some examples might clarify the type of firm included in the first group: Humanities Press, Citadel Press, and World Publishing Company are essentially trade publishers, with special reprint programs. A few firms engage also in “other” business, such as Macoy Publishing and Masonic Supply House and Argonaut, Inc., a coin dealer. About sixty firms, or one-half of the commercial group are specialist reprint publishers. For them, publishing reprints is a primary or sole business. Examples are Garrett Press, Kennikat Press, and Maxwell Reprint Company.

The commercial publisher group (122 firms) accounts for slightly more than one-half (50.4 percent) of the 233 firms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Business</th>
<th>Number (N = 233)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Publisher (COMM) a</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM:BKSL b</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookseller (BKLS)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKSL:PRTR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press (UNIV)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micropublisher (MICR)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICR:COMM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association or Society (ASSN)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSN:BKSL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer (PRTR)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRTR:COMM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library (LIBY)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBY:MICR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation (FNDT)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNDT:MICR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Specialist reprint houses and trade publishers with separate reprint programs are included in this category.

b Dual listings are assigned to establishments that indicated their “primary” business is divided into two functions.

As is true of the overall publishing industry, clear demarkation between types of firms cannot always be drawn. Companies venture into related fields: printers issue titles under their own imprint; booksellers take a publishing gamble; and libraries and associations publish. Mindful of these provisos, Table 1 at least suggests the diversified structure of the reprint industry. People with a wide variety of back-
grounds and primary interests are currently engaged in reprint publishing.

Forty-two booksellers (plus ten firms that are also printers, publishers, and one association) publish reprints. Most are antiquarian bookmen who, recognizing the demand for titles they have cataloged as original copies, utilize reprographic techniques to provide customers with titles.

The micropublisher group (sixteen firms, plus one equally involved in publishing hard copies) does not include all micropublishers currently in business. It was realized early that the micropublishing industry, while closely related to hard copy reprinting, also bears distinctive characteristics. The firms included in this survey have been found to be heavily engaged in programs of microrepublishing. Examples include the Micro Photo Division of Bell & Howell Company, University Microfilms, 3M/IM Press, and Readex Microprint Corporation.

Some firms issue the same titles in hard copy and microformats. For example, Greenwood Publishing Corporation's Radical Periodicals of the United States series is available in hard copy, microfiche, and microfilm. Other firms may be considered microrepublishing specialists, such as University Music Editions, Inc., publishers of a microfiche reprint series, and, a recent entry into the field, Mikro-Buk.

Libraries, associations, foundations, and societies are increasingly engaged in publishing reprints. The emerging role of libraries as publishers, an interesting and significant development, is more fully discussed in the final report.

The printer-turned-publisher is a direct result of offset printing technologies. The lures have obviously been great, for there are now seven printers (plus three equally engaged in commercial publishing) who issue reprints. Several firms, Crane Duplicating and Edwards Brothers, for example, are primarily service printers, manufacturing to other publishers' specifications but heavily involved in republishing.

The significant point, aside from the diversification of the industry noted above, is that reprint publishing can be a business for anyone with an original to copy and photographic capabilities to reproduce an edition. This fact tells us nothing of quality or expertise needed to select, market, and distribute reprint editions successfully, but does explain the highly competitive and fragmented nature of the industry.

In discussing some reprinters-who-would-be-publishers, Hayward Cirker, Dover's innovative president, likened these characters to vanity press operators, with librarians supplying the funds rather than authors. It is central to understanding the reprint industry that there are some reprinters who engage in piratical practices, who undercut prices and involve theirs and other firms in cutthroat tactics; however, the vast majority of reprint publishers appear to conduct themselves as responsible businessmen.

2. Geographical location of reprint firms.—The 274 firms have
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headquarters in 39 states. Reprint houses, like other types of publishers, are heavily concentrated in New York, which has almost three times the number of firms (92) as California, home of 34 firms. Exactly 50 percent (137 firms) are located in 8 Northeastern states; some 20 percent (53 firms) are based in 7 Western states. The remaining firms are scattered nationwide, with the next heaviest concentrations in Illinois, Michigan, and the District of Columbia.\(^2\) In states with only one reprint publisher, firms are generally (not always or exclusively) engaged in reprinting regional material, or are a part of bookselling or printing firms.

Because reprint houses do not generally have the same need as regular publishers to be close to megalopolitan clusters of authors, authors' agents, and advertising agencies, the high degree of urban concentration is somewhat unexpected. Because reprint firms frequently contract printing and binding away from home, and arrange for warehousing outside expensive urban areas, location of headquarters is perhaps a less significant industry feature than might be presumed.

There is, however, an important aspect of the geography of the industry that needs further study: What is the relationship between reprint publishers' locations and their use of libraries for borrowing material and for conducting research? Presumably, libraries in the areas of heaviest reprint publisher concentration are subject to the greatest number of dealings with reprinters.

Therefore they might be most desirous of establishing formal arrangements to deal with reprinterers. On the other side of the coin, these librarians might also be exceptionally effective in improving communications between libraries and reprinterers. A mutuality of interests exists. What is needed is more knowledge of how to maximize the gains currently being made in smoothing relations between reprint publishers and librarians.

3. Format of reprint editions.—Reprints are issued in the following formats by 216 firms for which these data are available: Hard covered books (183 firms); paperbound books (103 firms); microfilm (reels: 31 firms); microfiche (15 firms); micro-opes (3 firms); microcards (8 firms); ultramicrofiche (3 firms); and xerographic (electrostatic) prints (12 firms).

Microfilm is either an intermediary step to hard copy productions (Bell & Howell's Duopage Books and University Microfilm's OP Books) or an end product (Research Publications, Inc.'s League of Nations materials on film). Many firms issue material in different formats. Some firms issue parts of series or titles in microform and supporting finding aids in hard copy (United States Historical Documents Institute's Dual-Media project reproducing the Proceedings of the U.S. Congress).

Casebound books are the most frequently produced reprint format. The publisher's choice of format is dependent upon many factors: the nature and quality of the original; production facilities and

\(\text{\textbullet~40~}\) Library Resources & Technical Services
capabilities; the prospective market; projected costs and prices; and competition.

There is a wide variance in the quality of reprint products. Aside from quality of content, physical quality is a matter of utmost importance to library customers and is, fortunately, a subject of increasing concern to responsible reprint publishers.

4. Form of material reprinted.—Reprint publishers’ catalogs are rich with titles which were originally published as monographs, books in series, periodicals, government documents, newspapers, manuscripts, annual reports, travel accounts and diaries, music scores, library and advertising catalogs and genealogical records. They have been reproduced as exact facsimiles, anthologies, extracts, and abridged or enlarged editions. The imaginative resurrection of many forms of original material is both a benefit and a vexatious problem for librarians who, pleased with increased access to scarce original source materials, are troubled by the lack of indexes to older works and the lack of consistent bibliographical descriptions.

5. Number of titles reprinted.—It is difficult to arrive at a precise figure of how many titles have been reprinted by United States publishers. First, one has to surmount the recurring dilemma of title-counting (titles versus volumes, titles in series, etc.). Then, one must realize that publishers, responding to questions about their total title output, might have tended to check off a higher rather than a lower range, for reasons of “prestige,” business pride, comparative status, or whatever. Therefore, it must be stressed that the estimates of title output that follow are subject to cautious interpretation.

Using the UNESCO and Publishers’ Weekly system of title counting, publishers were asked to check an A through J range of titles, where A equals fewer than 10 titles, and J equals more than 5,000 titles. Title output information was supplied by 201 firms. From their responses, I estimate that these 201 firms have reprinted at least 85,000 titles since their programs began. If microrepublished titles are added, the figure is closer to some 120,000 titles. Table 2 shows the number of companies that say they publish in each title range. My estimate of 85,000–120,000+ titles is considerably higher than previous estimates, which generally have put the output at between 3,500–4,000 reprinted titles.

The 85,000+ estimate was made by multiplying the number of titles in each range (A–J) by the number of companies that say they publish in that range. For this reason, and because only 201 companies supplied these data, I believe the estimate is, if anything, on the low side.

From Table 2 it is clear that the largest cluster of firms (58) publish between 10 and 49 titles; the smallest number of firms (3) publish between 1500 and 2999 titles. About 78 percent (157) of the 201 firms that answered this question have published fewer than 300 titles each. Most of the J-range respondents are micropublishers, who tend to
issue many titles, but in very few (often single) copies. These figures therefore tell us nothing about the number of copies published.

The most significant result of this "numbers game" is that, without a doubt, reprint publishers have issued a great many titles, probably more than are generally recorded in the bibliographical reference tools of the book trade. Reprint publishers compete for book dollars from library budgets. Reprint publishers are an important segment of the total publishing industry, at least in terms of title output.

**TABLE 2**

**Estimated Number of Titles Reprinted by U.S. Publishers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>No. of Titles (Min.)</th>
<th>No. of Companies</th>
<th>Possible No. of Titles in Each Title Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45 - 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10 - 49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>580 - 2,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>50 - 99</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>950 - 1,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>100 - 299</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3,500 - 10,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>300 - 499</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,000 - 2,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6,000 - 11,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1,000 - 1,499</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10,000 - 14,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1,500 - 2,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,500 - 8,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,000 - 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>More than 5,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45,000 - 45,000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total No. of Companies</td>
<td></td>
<td>88,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total No. Titles, Minimum Range</td>
<td></td>
<td>119,557a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total No. Titles, Maximum Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Because J range is open-ended there is no way to ascertain the top limits. Therefore, only the lower limit (45,000 titles) was added to the sum of ranges A–I (74,557) to arrive at an estimated maximum range of 119,557 titles.*

6. **Edition size.**—"Short run" and "small-edition" publishing are examples of terms in common usage in the publishing industry that are without precise definition. Edition size generally defines the number of copies of a title manufactured at one time, and is a major variable factor in manufacturing costs. Size of editions is also an important determinant of sales price per copy. If the total number of copies of reprints were known, and if the total number of titles and sales price per title were known, then it might be possible to answer a frequently asked question: "How 'big' is the reprint industry?" To date the findings do not provide sufficiently reliable data to answer this question authoritatively.

To get a better idea of what short runs or small-edition publishing means to the participants in the reprint industry (who generally describe their industry in these terms) publishers were asked to indicate the size of their typical initial pressrun for reprint editions; 149 firms supplied this information. Publishers checked edition size ranges...
from A (fewer than 100 copies) to G (more than 2,000 copies). The largest cluster of firms (41) checked range F, a pressrun of 1,000-2,000 copies; 36 firms regularly print in range D (500-749) copies; 16 firms issue fewer than 100 copies. The majority of publishers in the A range are micropublishers issuing titles on demand.

These data were further interpreted in the light of conversations with printers and others in the publishing industry; with the result that I believe the D range, or 500-749 copies, is a realistic estimate of the typical short-run print edition for scholarly titles. Some publishers arrange to print but not to bind all copies until sufficient orders are received. Some titles are held in sheets for later decisions regarding type of binding. There is at least one publisher-printer-bookseller who prints an edition with three or four different title page imprints, all his, who actually cuts away all but the title page bearing the imprint for which an order is received.

Sixty-five firms that regularly issue pressruns of over 750 copies are relatively small (fewer than 100 titles). From the data collected it appears that there is no significant correlation between the size of a firm (measured in number of titles published) and the size of the pressrun. The size of pressrun correlates more significantly with the format and the material reprinted. In general, hard-cover editions are produced in smaller pressruns than paperbound editions. The choice of binding is, in turn, based upon the projected “popularity” or “scholarliness” of a title. Among other findings, the data indicate that (1) many publishers do not bind all the titles they print; (2) many publishers set the sales price for their titles on an anticipated initial sale, spread over the first and second year after publication, these copies bearing the price burden for additional copies in the inventory; (3) publishers base estimates of pressrun size on information gleaned by “advance market testing,” which creates the “announced but not yet published” syndrome that distresses librarians. This practice is not a matter of past practice, but is an ongoing industry marketing device. However, there are indications that more publishers are telling this story more truthfully. Publishers more often announce that a title is forthcoming, asking for “expected intentions to buy” rather than forcing customers to encumber funds. Surely this marketing approach is preferred by librarians.

7. Markets for reprints.—College and university libraries (including junior colleges) are the primary markets for most reprint publishers. Public libraries rank second in importance. Then, in descending order, individual customers (faculty, scholars, authors, etc.), bookstores, schools, and wholesalers. One of the minor surprises in these data is that thirty-eight companies report that individuals are their primary market. Ten firms report they do not sell at all to colleges and universities, and two firms sell only to these markets.

Publishers would like to expand their school and public library markets but are unsure about how to reach them. Wholesalers,
some questionnaire respondents noted, "should not be considered markets, since they sell to the other categories listed." While it is true that wholesalers get trade discounts, I believe most publishers think of wholesalers as a market outlet. Perhaps the point is debatable.

To reach their prospective customers, most publishers issue catalogs or fliers, which range in style and quality from crowded mimeographed sheets to professionally created reference tools.

The cost of catalog production and distribution is high. Many publishers have queried me (sometimes I have become the interviewee instead of the interviewer) regarding the effectiveness and utilization of their catalogs by librarians. Gabriel Hornstein, president of AMS Press, informs me that the monthly newsletter alerting service costs his firm about $12,000 a year to produce and distribute. Albert Boni, president of Readex, reports that his 1969-1970 catalog cost about $16,000; Fred Rappaport, Johnson's vice-president, notes that their fall 1969 "Red Dot" catalog costs a little more than $1.00 each and that a major catalog costs about $18,000 to $30,000 to prepare, print, and mail.

It is easy to understand therefore why many companies would appreciate feedback from catalog users, feedback that terminates in sales, of course, but also information about user satisfaction or reasons for dissatisfaction. One may be reasonably assured that suggestions or comments about the organization of catalog information will be attended to at the executive level in many firms.

8. Public domain.—Publishers have reacted strongly to the question of payment of royalties or fees to authors, heirs, or original publishers for reprinting titles that are in the public domain in the United States. The complex matter of copyright and the differences between U.S. and international copyright fall beyond the study's scope, but it is important to note that there is no such thing as international copyright that will automatically protect an author's writing throughout the entire world. British works published before 1956, when the U.S. joined the Universal Copyright Convention, are unprotected in this country, even though a British publisher might hold a copyright abroad. Publishers of English-language books and periodicals manufactured outside the U.S. and not eligible for UCC exemptions may secure ad interim copyright here, affording them short-term protection only.

Problems occur in the reprint industry because some publishers do not follow what other publishers believe is the "spirit" of the copyright laws. Firms that choose not to pay royalties for public domain material are perfectly within their legal rights. Other firms do pay royalties or fees for works in public domain, feeling a moral responsibility to reimburse authors and publishers for original work or monetary investment. Some of these firms apparently also find future dealings with original publishers enhanced.

Several publishers say they check the records at the Copyright Office; if they find that a British publisher has taken pains to secure
short-term protection, they pay him royalties or request his permission to reprint his titles.

Many trade and university presses have not renewed copyright on works which, in past years, seemed unlikely to be candidates for new markets. These works, now in the public domain, became grist for reprint publishers’ mills. Long lists of university press titles currently appear in reprint catalogs, to the chagrin of some original publishers who have since joined the reprint ranks. But, once in the public domain, a work remains in the public domain.

The issue of “ethical” versus “legal” payments for public domain material elicited the following representative comments from reprint publishers:

We always pay if we can find a rightful owner—an author or his heirs, or the original publisher—if the firm still functions.

We pay when necessary.

The practice is desirable but impractical. Costs of production and short pressruns (in this case, 300-500 copies) make a royalty difficult outside of copyright.

The law is clear and has a moral and ethical basis as well as a legal one. It would be absurd to pay.

Some firms offer a courtesy fee or token payment. The majority of the respondents say they favor payments, but there are firms (particularly among the “new” entrants) that feel payments are absolutely wrong and will pay nothing unless a work is under United States copyright protection.

9. Is the title well running dry?—Reprint firms are increasingly interested and involved in publishing original works. To find out if this trend relates to availability of older titles, publishers were asked if in their opinion “the well is running dry” as this statement applies to “titles of merit” in their future publishing programs.

Responses from 118 publishers range along a continuum: 65 firms think there is plenty of reprint work left for their programs to prosper for years; 15 firms feel the well may be running dry; and 10 feel the well is dry already. Other firms expressed indifference to the question or said they “don’t know.” Some representative responses follow:

Hell no, good books go OP every day.

Well is not dry, but bibliographical imagination is needed.

Programs are limited only by lack of funds, not a lack of titles.

The real possibilities of photographic republishing are only now being realized. Areas of study are expanding, and thousands of valuable books go OP every year that scholars and libraries will continue to need.

Statement applies to the fast-buck reprinter who lacks an appreciation or real insight in the contents of the books he reprints. For him, after the Voigt-Treyz thing, there is nothing.

It is dry already!
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Four firms that find the well running dry were founded before 1960, and publish hard-cover and paperbound books. Two firms are in the music field; two issue Western Americana. Five firms founded in 1960 or later also see the well running dry. Four of these, publishing hard-cover books only, issue history and/or political science, literature, sociology, and black studies. One firm publishes in the field of sports and recreation.

10. Association of Reprint Publishers.—Recently there has been much talk about the possibility of reprinters forming an association or council of publishers. Firms were questioned as to their willingness to participate in discussions which might lead to an association. Of 155 firms who responded to the question, 78 said they would probably agree to discuss, 51 firms would probably not, and 26 firms are either indifferent or unsure.

In April 1970, at the invitation of the ALA Reprinting Committee and the American Book Publishers Council (now the Association of American Publishers) more than 70 firms attended an informal meeting in New York City, at which the idea of an association surfaced as a primary topic of interest. On the matter of forming an association, AAP's president, Sanford Cobb, offered the advice of AAP's legal counsel to interested reprint publishers. He also suggested the possibility of divisional status for reprint publishers within AAP. The ball is in the hands of the reprinters; it is up to them to decide whether or not a group involvement is best for their long-range interests.

Conclusions and Recommendations

I have not talked here of the personalities involved in reprint publishing. In my two years of discussions with reprinters, I have discovered the obvious but often overlooked fact that reprinters are people, not the amorphous group of faceless "theys" generally pictured. Some are calm, some nervous; some are arrogant, some modest; some are scholars; most are businessmen. Some are dedicated to serving scholarship, while others are probably the piratical "buck-aneers" who have tarnished the industry's reputation. It is a hopeful sign for the future of reprint publishing that the latter group of "quick buck" bookmen are a minority.

Competition within the industry remains keen. The same economic facts of life affect librarians, who need to control book-buying budgets carefully. These signs point to greater selectivity on the part of the publisher, who must build lists, as well as on the part of prospective customers, who must seek quality but spend judiciously. To the extent that less responsible reprint publishers are squeezed out of the industry because of inferior products or poor business practices, these belt-tightening economic pressures will be helpful to the reprint industry's future.

Increasingly, publishers of hard copy reprints are also issuing microreprints. More reprinters are publishing original works. These trends
in the industry suggest that the lines that divide reprint publishing from regular publishing are becoming increasingly indistinct. Some reprinters who now issue original material are showing fewer signs of "guilt" about reprinting. As they gain more confidence in their procedures and as their products and marketing capabilities improve, reprinters may become less hysterical about what their competitors are doing making communication among reprinters more feasible than earlier. With more open communication channels, the industry might be willing to share some "secrets" with customers. To the extent that customers are made aware of why some phases of reprint publishing are inherently different from regular publishing, the problems become solvable.

Now, a few simple suggestions.

1. People in the reprint industry are still generally bemused by the mystiques of library science. Many reprinters have questioned how librarians select titles; what information is wanted in the reprinted books; what reprinters should be doing about Library of Congress cards; and how microforms should be listed and described.

These queries suggest the need for a series of tutorial workshops or seminars, perhaps conducted by the ALA Reprinting Committee, in cooperation with interested librarians, members of the Library of Congress, publishers of book trade reference works, and anxious reprint publishers. Together, such a group can iron out some of the "nuts and bolts" problems which loom large for publishers and irritate librarians.

2. Many library and other professional associations have committees currently concerned with reprints. (The Music Library Association, The American Association of Law Libraries, the ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table Task Force on Minority Materials, and others). Some of the committees appear to be duplicating efforts. Many are subject-oriented, but their findings would be of interest to a wider audience. Therefore, I suggest a central reprint committee projects clearinghouse and reporting service. Perhaps the ALA Reprinting Committee could serve as the "umbrella" for such a group effort. A newsletter describing committee projects and findings would be useful, particularly if it is also distributed to reprint publishers.

The current state of bibliographic controls imposed upon reprints is both chaotic and penurious. Reprint publishers must find ways to make certain that their titles are either consistently recorded as "regular" books in standard book trade reference sources, or they must spearhead a search for alternative bibliographic control methods. This is an area of interest where librarians and publishers can and should work together. The benefits can be mutual.
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   A guesstimate of only 15,000 reprints was made by reprint publisher Burt Franklin, in “Ten Years of the Hard Cover Scholarly Reprint, A Retrospective View and a Proposal for Improvements in Processing Orders,” *The Reprint Bulletin*, XIII:1 (July-August 1968).

4. Reprint editions of public domain titles are not copyrightable, except for substantial new matter added. There is nothing therefore to prevent a reprint from being microfilmed by another publisher, except lack of motivation or demand in the marketplace. Some micropublishing by hard copy reprinters may be undertaken in self-defense, to discourage piracy. What does one call a pirate who pirates another pirate—a repirater? Someone recently suggested “meta-pirate!”

5. Some newcomers to “original” publishing fail to acknowledge the fact that there is bad original publishing just as there is bad republishing. Bad republishing is perhaps the less pardonable, since it is an intentional or ignorant duplication of previous mistakes.

The Changing Philosophy of Reprint Publishers

FRED RAPPAPORT, Vice-President
Johnson Reprint Corporation
New York, New York

Reprinting is an industry which has emerged in response to the demands and needs of the academic world. Its rapid growth has occasioned changes in the methods of selecting titles, pricing, promotion, and dissemination of information.

Reprinting, as you know it today, has developed into a widespread industry devoted to the needs of the academic world. It has made your work as a librarian easier, on the one hand, but often complicated and
frustrating, on the other. I am sure that you, as well as we in the industry, have called it a “jungle” at one time or another. Certainly, as reprinting grew out of its infancy, many problems were incurred, and only some of them have been resolved; the familiar announcements, for example, which precede the appearance of a reprint by months and years and in some cases precede nothing at all; and the unfortunate duplication of titles caused, in many cases, by lack of adequate dissemination of information within the industry itself.

To get back to my theme, one can see that time has brought about many changes. No commercial industry can afford to rest easy at any time. We must remain responsive to the market we serve. We know that the demands and needs of the academic world change constantly, and we believe that through our various programs we have attempted to anticipate the needs expressed by the library community.

As you may know, our entrance into the field was initiated by Walter Johnson, the founder and president of our firm, as a result of his widespread interest and experience in the antiquarian field. The demand for scholarly periodicals far exceeded the supply, and original publishers, on the whole, did not appear to be interested in reprinting their publications. The economics of reprinting periodicals by photofont was just coming into its own thirty years ago. The leader in this field was the American Library Association which, in 1938, received a grant from the Carnegie Corporation for the purpose of bringing back into print books badly needed in American libraries. The second step was the appointment of an Out-of-Print Book Committee by the ALA. Then, through efforts of the Alien Property Custodian and the Joint Committee on Importations, established in 1939, the J. W. Edwards firm became the first to undertake reprints of books and periodicals on a fairly large scale. Later, in the forties, reprint projects were begun by firms such as ours, and the reprint publishing industry began to develop.

It was in these early, exciting days that certain ground rules were established. Reprint editions had to be limited, since the market would necessarily be small; the more limited the edition, of course, the higher the costs. In spite of the knowledge culled from the antiquarian experience, the possibilities of failure were equally as great as the possibilities of success, since there was no body of reprint publishing experience on which to draw. Because the financial commitment was potentially very heavy, the reprinter set out to determine what the demand for a particular journal would be before actually publishing a reprint edition.

We no longer believe, by the way, that the practice of prepromoting without a publication commitment is totally justifiable. We know that budgets and fiscal year closings create added pressures for the librarian and plead guilty to the accusation that we have, in the past, been responsible for the loss of large sums set aside for the purchase of reprints during a given fiscal year.
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If you are familiar with our programs, you will find that we have abandoned the policy of prepromoting without a publication commitment and have moved towards a position similar to that of an original publisher. Awareness of your needs has been a prime motivating factor in our attempt to develop a realistic program and to stick to it. It is the body of reprint publishing experience that we now have that gives us the confidence to take this gamble. This was considered a revolutionary step a few years ago and still is today, in some circles. We have not, of course, been 100 percent successful, but our efforts are in that direction and it has been most rewarding to learn that our attempts to achieve this goal have been recognized in the library world.

It has been interesting to watch reprint publishing develop from early skepticism on the part of the academic world to today’s acceptance of reprints. At one time, there was resistance to the idea of purchasing reprints. I believe we have now won the confidence of librarians and scholars, who know that reprints are true facsimiles of the originals and have the additional advantage of being printed on a low-acid, long-life paper which retards deterioration (a problem for libraries with the originals).

Many of you will now ask why, if reprints are accepted as substitutes for originals, we still reprint runs of periodicals which are partially in the original edition. Many periodicals are under copyright and must therefore be reprinted with the permission of the original publisher. If the publisher has extensive holdings of back stock, we are obligated to reprint only the missing parts. This has two effects. First of all, it increases costs, since the original format may be an odd size not economically adaptable to offset presses. Secondly, it limits the number of runs that we can offer to begin with. Thus we may quickly sell out the set, while it continues to appear in catalogs that are prominently marked, “available for immediate delivery.” As our back list has expanded over the course of the years, it has become increasingly difficult to keep pace with the necessity for re-reprinting.

You may have noted that in other cases we list only those parts we have reprinted, even though we know you would prefer to obtain a complete run from one source. Strangely enough, many publishers do not always respond to our requests for the originals we need to complete a set. Either more issues and volumes have gone out of print, or there are long delays in shipping the material to us.

We are changing past policies in this area as well, and now reprint only complete volumes, wherever possible. In the long run, this approach will work to our advantage as well as to that of the original publisher. And it will work to the advantage of our customers, since the volumes will be uniform, reprinted on a long-life paper, more durable, and readily available for a longer period of time.

We are well aware that a major grievance of the library community concerns the high cost of reprints. We can assure you that we do attempt to make our reprints as reasonable as economics will allow, but
the fact is that the economics of reprinting have not changed drastically since the industry began.

Reprint editions range from 200 to 400 copies for periodicals and from 400 to 1,000 for books. The average life of a reprint edition ranges from three to ten years. These figures have not changed appreciably since the birth of the industry. Librarians were and are virtually the only purchasers of periodical reprints. It is the very rare scholar or scientist who is interested in adding a 50-volume journal set to his personal library, and the numbers would not increase if we decided to double or triple a reprint edition so that our price for the periodical might be lower. The edition of a book reprint is larger and the price thus comparatively lower precisely because the market for a single book includes scholars, professors, and even, in rare instances, graduate students.

Pricing must take into consideration the number of pages, halftones, foldouts, color work, as well as the royalty to the original publisher if the title is under copyright. We try to avoid text reductions, but attempt margin reductions where this is necessary to fit offset presses. We work closely with our various suppliers in trying to develop new techniques that will reduce costs, and we do, believe it or not, pass any savings on to the library in our prices.

While our product does not lend itself to awards in the field of book publishing, I think you will agree that we produce a quality product for the market we serve. We have always worked toward this end and will continue to do so in the future.

I am sure many of you wonder how we arrive at a decision to reprint periodicals and monographs. As I mentioned, in the early days of reprinting, the most important guideline in the selection of periodicals for reprinting was the experience in the antiquarian market. When there was some demand for a particular item that was unobtainable on the second-hand market, a reprint seemed like a good idea. If the periodical was still under copyright, the first step was to obtain permission from the original publisher. The second step, as you know all too well, was to make an announcement and wait for the orders to arrive. Today, with years of experience behind us, we can develop sound reprint programs, basing our decisions not only on our evaluation of the quality of a particular title but also on the anticipation of your needs for reprints of a title and even of specific subject areas.

From the beginning, there was a different approach to the selection of books, since the antiquarian experience was primarily in the field of periodicals. We turned to scholars in various fields for our book programs and over the years developed an advisory board of academicians who have been responsible for many of our programs. Our editorial department works very closely with these advisers in weeding out and selecting only the most important works. In many cases, the adviser will indicate that a new introduction will be a valuable asset to the reprint. He arranges the contracts with a scholar, who will then prepare the
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new material, under guidelines set up by the publisher.

Here, too, both we and our editorial advisers have become more sophisticated in determining the individual titles and subject areas that should be made available in reprint to meet the needs of the library and academic communities.

Once a title is selected, all available information is checked—Books in Print, for example, or the catalogs of other reprinters—to be sure the title has not already been reprinted. Every effort is made to ascertain whether the rights are free. We are by no means 100 percent successful. We regret this as much as you do since we are well aware that issuing a competitive edition in a very limited market is not at all to our advantage. We cannot claim to be a better judge of your needs than you, and we are always open to your reprint suggestions.

We also need you to tell us how we can most effectively disseminate information about our programs to you. Today, sales representatives visit you and you meet us at exhibits and meetings such as this one. We publicize our product in the periodicals read by the librarian and the academic community. But the most effective means of reaching you is by direct mailings of catalogs and announcements. Our mailing lists have been built up over the course of twenty-five years, and today there is generally a staff whose only responsibility is to update and add to these lists. Reprint purchasing is no longer concentrated here in the United States but occurs on a large scale everywhere in the world. Accurate maintenance of mailing lists is vital to our operation.

Who could have foreseen twenty or twenty-five years ago, when the first few journals were reprinted, the extent to which reprint publishing could grow in such a short period of time. When the reprint industry began, it worked very much in the dark. There was little knowledge or experience in the mainstream of publishing that was useful to us. We did not know what your requirements and needs would be, nor could you anticipate the problems the reprint industry would solve or create.

Through trial and error, we have learned to invent our own tradition and guidelines. I believe that we are publishers in the true sense of the word. With the knowledge and experience we have gained—often painfully—we can effectively anticipate the demands that will be forthcoming from the academic community. We can pursue those projects that will meet the needs of the libraries. Our product can be a valuable contribution to the market we serve.

In conclusion, let me stress that the changes I have talked about have been in direct response to our interaction with you, just as the industry itself was born in response to your needs. We have learned from you and continue to need you to tell us how we may best serve you.
The Ethics of Reprint Publishing

Daniel C. Garrett, President
Garrett Press, Inc.
New York, New York

Librarians have charged reprint publishers with deceptive marketing tactics, high prices, and needless duplication of titles—practices which would seem to reflect a questionable code of ethics. In reality, these practices reflect deeper problems: poor communications and understanding both between the librarian and the reprint publisher and within the industry itself.

Some possible solutions to these problems include: (1) the formation of a reprint publishers' association which would set up self-policing guidelines; (2) formal complaint committees set up between RTSD and the new association; and (3) active direct communication by librarians with reprinters.

Earlier this year I was given the privilege of talking to you today about "The Ethics of Reprint Publishing." How this came to be a topic for this meeting I don't know, but the implication is that we have problems. These are problems which I think should be of intense interest to the librarian and which many reprinters would rather not talk about. Basically and honestly you have many specific complaints about the reprint industry that on the surface appear to reflect a code of ethics which is questionable by anyone's standards. In my opinion there are really only two basic problem areas in the reprint industry. There are those problems which are between the librarian and the reprinter; and there are also those problems which are between the reprinters themselves. One of these areas is far more serious than the other, but the two are so intertwined that it becomes almost impossible to identify cause and effect.

Let's talk about the obvious things first. Most of the complaints, I believe, are not really problems of ethics but simply problems of communication and understanding. One of the most prevalent complaints is the deceptive marketing tactics that we reprinters use. Fred [Rappaport] said that this is not being done anymore but I think that collectively it is being done. We'll send out an announcement of a title with no indication of whether or not it's actually available, or worse yet, say it is available when it's actually not. It's a lie, and certainly questionable in terms of ethics. But then ethics is largely determined by intention. What is the intention? What are we really saying? We're saying we need to have some idea of whether or not this book is needed, and we're also saying that if we were entirely open with you and told you that the book was not published that we don't believe we would get a response from you at all. In other words, we must make a projec-
tion of what we can reasonably expect sales to be. We must have feed-
back from you in order to do so. Why do we need to project sales? 
Very simply—if we could not we would have no means of telling what 
to publish. What I’m really saying is that these deceptive marketing 
tactics are mainly an effort on our part to communicate with you as 
to what it is you really need. The alternative would be to publish 
nothing or to publish everything in a haphazard, random, hit-or-miss 
manner. The results of which, besides the obvious waste, would be 
higher and higher and higher prices. The needed titles would have to 
carry the cost of those which would be sitting in somebody’s ware-
house gathering dust.

This brings me to your next very common complaint—the so-called 
high prices of reprints. I’ve heard time and time again that reprinters 
charge high prices, but prices are relative. And when I try to find out 
what it is that they’re comparing reprints with, it’s generally trade 
books. There is a sound reason for this price difference between reprints 
and trade books. Basically it’s a matter of difference in print run. A 
typical print run for a reprint is 300 to 500 copies, as has been said 
earlier, while as few as 100 copies is actually feasible. It may take as long 
as five years to sell out a run of 300 copies. A run of 500 copies sold in 
one year could be considered a best seller. On the other hand a trade 
book is not considered economically feasible unless several thousand 
copies can be sold in a very short period of time, generally several 
months.

To illustrate the difference in costs that this difference in print 
run makes let’s look at an example. If a book costs say $1,000 to pro-
duce 100 copies, producing 200 copies does not cost $2,000. As a matter 
of fact for $2,000 we could probably print 1,000 copies. Therefore, the 
100 copies would cost $10.00 per book, whereas the 1,000 copies would 
only cost $2.00 per book. A 100 percent increase in total outlay actually 
reduced the unit cost by 500 percent. Great! We’ll print 1,000 copies at 
a unit cost of $2.00, and sell them to you for $6.00. We have a good 
profit margin and you can buy the book at the price of a trade book. 
We’re both happy, right? Wrong! Suppose that you only need 50 
copies. We sell that 50 copies at $6.00 for a total return of $300. Result— 
950 copies gathering dust and $1,700 out the window, not to mention 
the associated expenses of advertising, salaries, rent, etc. A few times 
around like this and there won’t be anyone around to reprint any-
thing.

The only one to benefit in that transaction was the printer, and 
then only if he got paid. Bankrupt companies somehow have a way of 
not paying their bills. Wouldn’t it have been better to have printed 
the 100 copies at $10.00 cost, taken the same markup and sold it for 
$30.00? Result—50 copies at $30.00 returns $1,500 on out-of-pocket 
costs of $1,000. Only 50 copies now gather dust and hopefully some-
body else will want them in the future. Those who needed the books 
got them. The publisher made a profit. And in this case everybody
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should be happy. Even the printer got paid. How does all this translate into communication and understanding? Understand, you cannot compare reprints with trade books on the basis of price. They're two entirely different animals. Communicate what it is you need to have reprinted and how many copies you'll buy. In other words, respond. In this way much of the risk can be eliminated from reprint publishing and the savings can be passed on to you.

Let's look at the previous example again. Suppose that instead of 50 copies being needed you really needed 100, and suppose that in some way you've informed us of this fact. Instead of that same book being priced at $30.00 we could have priced it at $20.00 and made more profit. For 100 copies sold at $20.00 brings in $2,000 on the same $1,000 out-of-pocket cost; $1,000 profit now as opposed to only $500 before. We could have reduced the price by one-third and could have made 100 percent greater profit. The old adage of "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush" is entirely appropriate here.

The third very common complaint is the needless duplication of titles. Earlier I said that most of the problems that exist between us are not problems of ethics. This complaint, however, does raise a genuine question of ethics and brings me squarely to the problem area that I mentioned before. This area reflects a problem which exists within the industry, that is, between reprinter and reprinter, not between librarian and reprinter, although you are very much affected. Honest accidental duplications do occur, but these are strictly the result of poor intra-industry communications.

There are also duplications which are entirely intentional and are based on perfectly sound scholastic reasons, where new material, superior quality, or continuation of an important package or a series is concerned. An example of this latter situation is a project which we are presently publishing—The American Authors Series. Our purpose here is to bring together in a collection the heretofore uncollected works of certain authors. The first printing of the first edition of a given work is usually chosen as the reading text. This first printing is photographically reproduced, full-size in its entirety, from half-title page to advertisements, if any. In this way the text of the work is presented exactly as the author first saw it in book form, and no resetting is needed. Any major changes and later printings or editions are reproduced in an appendix. There are new critical introductions, bibliographies, textual and bibliographical notes, portraits, informative photographs, and other illustrations many of which are being published here for the very first time. Included in each collection will be, with very few exceptions, all works published during the author's lifetime or prepared by him for publication at the time of his death and subsequently published. So you see, to eliminate a particular work from such a series because it's been published by someone else would destroy to a great degree the value of the collection.

However, the real question of ethics arises when the publisher who
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possesses sufficient financial muscle deliberately duplicates a title with the full knowledge that there will be no profit for himself or for another publisher who has committed himself to publishing that title. The purpose of such a publisher is solely to force the financially less powerful publisher out of business. If this goes on indefinitely, these more powerful and unscrupulous publishers will be the only ones to survive. At present there is no legal protection within the copyright law. The frequency of these occurrences has caused a situation in which the antitrust and unfair aspects of antitrust law are being seriously investigated. The obvious intent is to initiate appropriate action if the condition should continue.

Earlier, in talking about deceptive marketing tactics, I said that it was imperative that the publisher have your response in order to project sales. This is entirely true. But now you begin to see that at least in part the deception he has been practicing is aimed elsewhere. It may be the case that he is deceiving you, but his intention is to deceive the competition.

The problems that exist between the librarian and the reprinter as exemplified by your complaints—high prices, poor quality, deceptive marketing tactics, poor service, duplication of titles—are all relatively simple to solve unto themselves. The complicating factor here is this negative dynamic that is operating within the industry—the very real fear of being run out of business. Unless this situation is clearly exposed for what it is it will continue to operate to the detriment of both the academic community and the reprint industry.

What can be done about this situation? There’s been much talk over the past several years about the formation of a reprinters’ association. One of the functions of this proposed association would be the setting of self-policing guidelines within which the publishers can operate for the protection of both the purchaser and the publisher. Thanks to Al Lane and the RTSD section of ALA, such an association may be close at hand. If the reprint industry is to remain an open industry, not controlled by the syndicated interests of a few, we must pay more than simply lip service to such an association. It’s time that this association became fact.

What can you do as individuals to help solve these problems which so vitally affect you? Communicate with us directly through letters, telephone calls, or knock on the door if necessary. If you get no satisfaction, I recommend that you formally record your complaint with the RTSD. I further recommend that both RTSD and the new reprinters’ association set up formal complaint committees to receive and record your complaints as well as ours, and that the committees meet jointly and periodically to resolve these problems once and for all. I firmly believe that such direct lines of communication between librarian and reprinter would be the first really constructive cooperative effort that could be made to genuinely serve the needs of the academic community.
Microforms: Where Do They Fit?

ROBERT F. ASLESON, President
University Microfilms
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Microforms produced for library purposes have made available reprints, original publications, and replacement copies. While microforms have not been completely accepted by users, they have provided a low cost, quality product which, in many cases, can be produced on demand.

In talking about the functions of microform in the publishing industry and in libraries, I think it might be best to start off by saying that there are in the way I look at it three different functions or three different places in which microforms do fit. One certainly is in the area of reprinting. Where things are not available through the normal sources and a reprint of some type and format appears to be appropriate, microform certainly is one that we all should look at carefully. The second area, and one that is of increasing interest, is the area of original publishing such as our dissertations program. In most cases microform is the only way these materials will ever be published. The third area is something I call replacement. That is what I would term our periodical microfilm program where you do have the hard copy, but for space-saving reasons or for branch libraries, you decide to replace the paper edition with a microform. I think these latter two—the original publishing and the replacement—are extremely interesting. It is how we make our daily bread, and, at some point, I would like to have a chance to talk about these, but here we will restrict ourselves to microform and its role in the reprinting industry.

For the last thirty years people have been looking at microforms and looking at library problems and looking at the publishing industry’s problems and saying maybe that is the answer to a lot of the difficulties that libraries are having in coping with the fantastic outpouring of new material while trying to collect and build up collections of older materials that have been published before these libraries were even founded.

As you know, this really has not happened. Microforms have not become the saving grace of the library world and there are many reasons for it. First, I think it is important that we have a clear understanding of the terminology that I will be using. I have taken my clue from the Guide to Reprints put out by NCR in which they say they are listing anything that has at least 200 copies printed per edition. Anything below that is what we term demand publishing. I would like to make this distinction between reprinting and demand publishing. The important thing to bear in mind when you do make this kind of a dis-
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tinction is that the economics are very different. Just as Dan Garrett
has pointed out that the economics of conventional publishing, trade
publishing, or original publishing are much different than the econ-
omics of reprinting, so the economics of reprinting are very different
than the economics of what I term demand publishing.

In demand publishing we make no attempt to try to determine
what the size of the market is in advance. We produce what people
tell us they want produced. We produce one copy at a time on demand.
We search for the book that they tell us they want. As Dan Garrett did
point out in regard to reprinting, there are heavy, front-end costs. The
master copy, finding the book, and the editorial work make reprint-
ing an extremely expensive front-end cost operation. In our method of
publishing—the demand publishing method that is used by the micro-
forms people—we do not have that expensive front-end cost. We simply
have to find a copy of the book or the periodical and then microfilm
that piece of material. So the initial front-end cost is quite low. How-
ever, unlike the reprinter whose last copy is pretty cheap compared
with the first five or ten, we are producing single copies on demand,
and for each one that we produce, whether it’s the first or the twen-
tieth, the costs are the same. We do not have the same economics that
the reprinter has. This is what makes us very concerned about a
point which Carol Nemeyer mentioned—this business of access, our ac-
cess to your materials. The facts have to be faced and we just are not in
the same kind of economic ball game that the reprinter are; and
further, the microform publisher cannot afford to pay the fees that
many of you are starting to ask for before you’ll let us use your ma-
terials. As was pointed out, that is a subject for another half-day dis-
cussion, and I hope that someday we will have a chance to really sit
down and level with you on that question. But I think it’s important
that you do understand that the economics of the situation are much
different.

Demand publishing is really a field that was pioneered by University
Microfilms. It goes back over thirty years now. The first programs
started were the programs to microfilm titles from the Short Title Cat-
alog. Eugene Power, whom many of you I know have met over the past
years, had the original idea. He lived in Ann Arbor, Michigan. He
worked for Edwards Brothers, the printing company, and knew that
every summer his friends in the English Department always seemed
to disappear. So he started trying to find out what was going on.
“Where do you go in the summertime?” “Well, we are going to En-
gland. That is where all the books are, in the British Museum, or Ox-
ford, or Cambridge.” Power had been fooling around with microfilm
and he thought that it might be the answer to his problem. He had
been looking for some way to use microfilm in a publishing vein. So he
started producing microfilm copies of these Short Title Catalog books
with a camera in the British Museum, brought them back to the
United States, and then produced copies on demand for American li-
libraries that wanted to build their own collection in microform of these early titles. Well, it was wonderful for him. It was wonderful help, I hope, for the libraries. The only people that really suffered of course were the English scholars who no longer had that excuse to go to England (and we still get a few kicks in the ribs from them). But for the most part they have settled down now and have found other ways to justify their jaunts abroad.

In the field of demand publishing or in the context of our discussion this afternoon, microforms have two functions they can serve. In the one case, the microform itself is the end item. It is the item that the user uses in the library, in his office, or in his home. These can be either roll film, fiche, microcards, or microprint. The other way that microfilm is used is as the intermediate to producing a paper book which we use in our out-of-print book program. A couple of other companies also have been pioneering in this application of the microform as an intermediate to providing the customer a paper copy of the book. The cost, with the microform as the end item, is roughly one-half to three-quarters of a cent a page. That is a pretty good rule of thumb, and it is holding true even for the high reduction materials which many programs have announced.

Using microfilm as the intermediate is a relatively new development. It goes back about thirteen years and started when Xerox Corporation produced the first copy-flo machines. A copy-flo machine is a xerographic machine that produces copies from microfilm. This machine came out in the late 1950s. Immediately Mr. Power and some other people who had been in various aspects of the publishing business saw its potential as a device to be used in conjunction with scholarly or academic publishing. They began to produce finished books from the microfilm that they had in their vaults and this led to a completely new industry which in our case we call our OP Book Program. The costs on this type of production range anywhere from 4¢ to 8¢ a page dependent upon the format you want, the size of the book, the language of the text, and various other factors.

Since I have the opportunity, I would like to go into a little greater detail on the way the publishing of out-of-print books works. Basically the system is the same whether it's University Microfilms, Microphoto, or any other company using this technology to produce out-of-print books. For the most part, we depend upon your requests to determine what books are needed and what books you want. At the moment we have a standing offer to go out and find any book that you say you need. Now this leads us into all kinds of experiences, and I'm sure that someday somebody who's been working for University Microfilms is going to go out and make himself a fortune writing a best-selling novel about some of the experiences we have had in trying to find these books. It is a problem, and I'm sure many of you realize it. The reason you know it is a problem is because for the most part you come to us last, after you've tried every other conceivable source in the world.
Unfortunately, you'll say you want it in a month after you've spent two or three years searching the antiquarian book market and every reprinter's catalog and everything else looking for it. But again, we are willing to tackle those tasks. We sometimes shed a few tears in the process, but most of the time we end up finding the book for you. We are producing and adding to our program about 1,000 titles a month through this mechanism where individuals, libraries, and research people of all types come to us requesting materials that are not available through the normal sources. We then put the original microfilm master into our vault. We advertise the availability of that title in a monthly service which we call The OP Book Finder and then we come out with a cumulative annual catalog which lists all the titles that we have available. We have one that is going to press very shortly which will have about 50,000 titles in it so you can see that we do have a very broad range of titles. We are proud of the fact that in terms of the number of active titles that you can buy from us we are certainly the largest publisher in the world.

There are many other implications to this OP book on demand publishing program where microforms serve as the intermediate. We do pay royalties. We do for the most part borrow books from libraries. We do respect the copyright law. I think there are some positive implications for you also in terms of your interlibrary loan operations. We are producing tens of thousands of copies of books a year. If we did not have these books available those of you who represent major research libraries in this country would undoubtedly be getting many of these requests as additional burdens on your interlibrary loan operation. So the fact that there is in the country a couple of centers such as ours, where rare, out-of-print, difficult-to-acquire materials that you may have but which are not generally available can be acquired by people who need them, is a service to you and helps to reduce your interlibrary loan requests.

From time to time those of us who are in this kind of business run into some static from you concerning our handling of want lists. We are hoping that we will be able to come up with some mechanism where we can do a better job with want lists. Here, I have to share a little story with those of you who are in the inside. When I first came in this business and heard about these want lists, which were a brand new thing to me, I thought "oh my gosh, you know that's great." Talk about market research, talk about getting an indication of demand from your customer, what better tool do you have than a want list? Well, it didn't take long for me to find out that that's just a subterfuge people use to put off those professors. But we all know the fact of the matter and I don't think I have to go any further.

There are many advantages that microforms have; let me quickly list some of them.

1. It is relatively simple to microfilm a book.
2. Most libraries and other repositories for learned information have microfilm facilities.
3. It is easy to ship microfilm.
4. It is easy to use and if you need equipment it is now widely available at modest prices.
5. It is long-lasting when properly manufactured.
6. It is inexpensive.
7. You can make full size copies from microform on equipment that is now available.
8. By using different film emulsions and by knowing what you’re doing with the chemistry that is involved, you can vary the quality of the film. You can get high contrast, low contrast, and change intensities. For some purposes, this is an advantage.
9. There are many different formats that can be used and you can find a format that is right for the particular item that you’re interested in. It makes sense that periodicals may have a different format from books, or dissertations, and so on. With the high packing densities that we are now getting on film and some of the new developments that are coming along, it is very likely that microforms might well be the answer to solving the problem of rapid access, not only to the bibliographic information but also to the material itself.

As to the future of microforms, there are a very, very large number of new entries into the microforms publishing business. I think that is an indication that there is going to be more heard about it and that more companies are coming out with these kinds of materials. There are other areas where microforms can help to solve library problems such as the long-standing question of what the libraries and industry together should do with the deteriorating book. There are things coming along now such as computers that print out directly onto microfilm. All these things are new developments which lead me to believe that you are going to see much more of microforms in the library in the coming decades.

There are problems. The major problem continues to be a lack of user acceptance. I was delighted to hear that in the early days they had trouble with reprints. I was delighted to hear that because it gives me confidence that eventually we will overcome some of these purely philosophical problems we have with you and with your patrons about the use of microforms. We realize that we in the microforms industry have not done the job we should have done in providing you with the equipment, providing the systems, and making it easy and fun to work with microfilm. That is coming. I can assure you that very soon we will have solved some of those problems.

In conclusion, when I was doing a little reading of the articles that have been written over the past years about reprinting and the future and touching a little bit on Carol Nemeyer’s point about how do the
reprinters see the future, I came across an article in which somebody from the reprint industry was quoted as saying that since the invention of movable type about 30 million titles have been printed. This person said, “You know there’s enough to go forever.” It’s going to take us a long, long time to reprint all those titles that people need. The reprint industry looks at it from the posture of the fly in the nudist colony: there are so many opportunities it doesn’t know where to begin. And librarians probably see themselves as the nudists with those pesky reprinters just buzzing around giving all kinds of trouble.

Discussion*

DUDLEY: Norman Dudley, UCLA. I would like to ask Mr. Garrett a question. About the statement that there is nothing unethical about announcing what you were going to publish if you are not sure you are going to publish it or have any idea when you’re going to publish it. That, in connection with the statement that there should be an association which would hear complaints. Since the major complaint I suspect that you would get would be the complaint relating to the fact that publications are announced which are not put out; and if it is true, if the industry at large feels that there’s nothing the least bit unethical about this sort of announcement, why bother to have a complaint board?

GARRETT: Mr. Dudley, I did not mean to indicate that the problem of announcing a title with no intention of producing it is not unethical. That is unethical. I meant to indicate that there is a problem of communication between the librarian and the reprinters and that this tactic which is used to gather information, market information, is caused basically by a problem which is within the industry. And that I think this problem can only be solved by better communication between the librarian and the reprinter and better communication within the industry itself. I think that the ethical problem lies within the industry. I don’t think the intention of the reprinter is to fool the librarian. The intention is honestly to find out what the librarian needs but with the condition that exists within the industry this is difficult to do so. Because it’s complicated as I said by this kind of negative force which is operating and it’s very clear to you that it’s unethical, yes. But the problem is that it’s not quite that simple. I think that in order to solve these problems we need to have a direct line, a direct link between librarian and reprinter, and between reprinters.

RUFFNER: I would simply like to indicate that I agree with Mr. Rapaport that we at Gale have been guilty of some of the practices that have been going on in the reprint industry in the past and so we share

* Text of discussion held following the morning session, with minor editing.
the guilt. I think many reprinters have. We have stopped doing it. When we say a book is in print, it’s in print. Now, as far as duplication is concerned I think there’s a little bit too much emphasis placed on that and I think very often duplication is desirable. We have brought out certain books which may be priced at $12.00 or $15.00. Genealogical Press has a different kind of marketing structure. They can sell that book for $8.00 or $10.00. I think this is wonderful and I think people like Dover who bring out high quality books for $2.00 or $3.00 that the conventional reprinters have to charge $15.00 to $20.00 for make these books available not only to libraries but to students. And so I think there should be more duplication. I don’t think there’s enough.

FELLER: Sig Feller, University of Massachusetts. I think you saw a copy of the little survey analysis that I did to compare reprinters doing the same kind of material with one another which showed a range of between under 2¢ a page and well over 4¢ a page. And as Mr. Rapaport said the costs are relatively stable for everybody of making the zinc plates and so on. So I was just wondering whether you think it’s invalid of me as a consumer to take the position that when a reprinter who has different production costs than, let us say, University Microfilms with its demand publishing, why I should not be a little suspicious anytime somebody is reprinting in quantity at a higher cost for a comparable product than University Microfilms is asking per page? I’m not addressing you specifically, Mr. Garrett. Anybody on the panel.

GARRETT: I might indicate that publishers sometimes have different prices simply because they anticipate the market differently. One publisher may think he can sell 150 copies and another 300 copies so obviously the publisher expecting to sell the lower number of copies has to charge more. As a matter of practice we avoid publishing something somebody else has done. There’s no point in it. There are too many things that need to be brought back into print and so we do not knowingly reprint something that somebody else has. There are too many other things that need to be done. But on the other hand I don’t think that we should get too excited if somebody comes along and, because they can run a larger edition, or because they have some economic muscle, or whatever it is, if they can make these same books available to libraries at a lower price, I think they should do it. I think we should encourage it.

FELLER: I should say that all of the publishers in my sample were roughly in the same category of publishing but I guess basically what I’m interested in is the answer to the question of why it should ever be necessary for a comparable product when you’re running off more than one copy, certainly you’re not going to go to press with less than 50 as a reprint publisher and, as we heard from Mrs. Nemeyer, it’s typically considerably more than that, why it should cost more per page, as happens very often I might add, than to do it by a xerographic process on a copyflow or a duo-page machine.
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GARRETT: If we reprint a 1,000-page book probably we have $3,000 invested in it, and I would ask Mr. Asleson to indicate what they might have invested in an initial printing. Perhaps if he could, his comments might be helpful.

ASLESON: Well, as I mentioned—and you certainly have come up with a sample that proves the point—our front-end costs are, in a book like that, a 300-page book—

PANEL VOICE: 1,000-page book.

ASLESON: 1,000-page book, we'd get 10¢ to 20¢ a page so we'd have $100 to $200 maximum in what we need to produce copies of the book. I think that there are many variables that can enter into it, and I don't know if in your survey you took this into account, but some of these reprinters are specializing in books with a lot of halftones, with a lot of maybe tip-in pages, foldouts, etc., and those things can raise when you go at it the way you did, taking an average price per page on a fringe product that can enter into it. Now you may have taken into account those variables, but in any event, the other thing I might say is that these people have been around doing this, some of them a lot longer than we have, and it may be that we're on the wrong track. Who knows, we'll have to see. That may be the real proof of the pudding right there.

NEMEYER: Two short comments, Mr. Feller. I think that you made one statement that you think costs are relatively stable. Some of the publishers who have undercut prices once they've seen a competitive product come on the market are printers. Some of them are publishers in another sense. And if the publisher is his own printer and does not have to pay the outside hungry printer there can be some very substantial savings. They can still either get out breaking even if nothing else, or come out with a small profit and just do away with the project. The second point I'd like to raise is that this is exactly an area where the bibliographical control situation is so hideous. Librarians, who are the final determinants of which one of those products should sell or might sell, have no way of really comparing the quality of these rival editions. Somehow we collectively have to arrange some kind of a bibliographical and evaluative tool that will perhaps review, we haven't discussed that today, but reviews of these books that will point out what the differences are. Is the paper different? Is the binding different? Are there end maps left out, put in? What's the new matter? You just can't tell from an author-title listing. They're very often not the same.

FELLER: Well, I think I took account of the more obvious variables. None of these publishers is a printer. It is not necessarily true that the smallest firms are asking the largest price per page. Gale is not going to go to press with 1,000 copies of something they only expect to sell 100 copies of. I don't like to get the feeling that you have to charge more per unit when you're going into a larger-scale operation. I think there are variables that have to be mentioned but I think the most
obvious ones have been taken out. And, for example, in the chart which all of the reprinters on the chart have got copies of and identified only themselves, the one that is second lowest in costing is the only one that has any significant number of colorplates. Someone suggested that possibly this printer is going out of business and perhaps he is. I don't know. But he's still there and he's doing a pretty good job.

GARRETT: Mr. Feller, I think that this is a very intricate area in terms of pricing but I think it's based on market expectations like the illustration I gave in my talk of the difference between selling 50 copies and 100 copies. Now that may not be a typical example but the figures involved are typical, and the fact that one publisher might sell 50 copies and another might sell 100 copies you know the total amounts are small, the percentages are very large, and that publisher who sold 50 copies more could, as I indicated, reduce his price by a third and come out with double the profit of the publisher who could only sell the smaller quantity. So it's very much a matter of market expectations, number one, in terms of setting a price to begin with. And then once the book is actually published and on the market and the publisher sees what sales are he then has a very much more solid basis to price his book. It's again a problem of communications. If the industry was better aware of the actual market for a given title prices could come down tremendously.

Panel voice: I think that the trade publishers have that problem too and they make their predictions, and they take their lumps, and they take their profits.

Panel voice: That's very true except that we're operating on a very different scale. When you have a potential market of, let's say, only 200 or 300 copies and you only sell say 50 or 100 the percentage of the potential market that you're actually selling is far greater or less than the market that the trade publisher is selling to.

Ash: Lee Ash, library consultant and member of the Reprint Committee of ALA. I'm always astounded in this group and somewhat annoyed at our apparent ignorance of what goes on in publishing. As was just mentioned, and I think rather unfairly, the trade publishers take their lumps and so forth, they are much bigger institutions for one thing. For another, the fact that they have tremendous losses too is apparent in the remainder market. Many of you picked up some fine titles that were published at expected sales prices. Now if they with all their experience don't know how to price a book, it seems to me that the reprint publishers have an even bigger problem. I wonder whether instead of our worrying about encumbered funds all the time, and it is a problem, I wonder whether we might not legitimize the prepublication announcement system by supporting the practice. If the publisher, the reprint publisher, would agree to a scale of lowering the estimated fair price perhaps even on a percentage basis, if he could say—"if we get a certain subscription up to a certain price we
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will publish it at this price. If we get twice this many it will be on a lowered scale.” I don’t see why we couldn’t do this on the basis of a date, say the end of a fiscal year, then thereby letting us know what our encumbered responses would be.

RUFFNER: I wonder if I might make a further comment to Mr. Ash’s statement. We have a newly established policy at Gale that anybody who loses any funds they have encumbered we will make up in books anytime the library wants it. Although I think this thing is probably behind us simply because we now only announce those titles that are available and try to be very, very specific about it and I think that any publisher who does not do that, particularly reprint publishers, will not be attending the convention next year in Dallas.

DE LA GARZA: Peter de la Garza, Library of Congress. We have not touched very much on the very hairy problem of bibliographic control. I would like to ask Carol Nemeyer whether she as part of her study made any check or gathered information about how much of the available material in reprint form is listed in say something like Books in Print. How much bibliographic control do we have right now? Can this be expressed in a percentage on the basis of your findings?

NEMEYER: I’m not in a position to give you the percentage. I have these figures, yes, bibliographical control figures vary heavily in my study. This is off the top of my head because I just couldn’t carry all these computer print-out things with me. I would just “guesstimate” that probably 75 percent of the U.S. titles are listed someplace but not necessarily all titles listed in any one place. Guide to Reprints is one of the better tools although it has great shortcomings in lack of editing and in the fact that it depends upon publishers’ submission of information. The Books in Print lists some, I’ll qualify that, lists many but not all U.S. reprints and it doesn’t list them in consistent ways. It’s very difficult to find out why some things are in and why some things are out. Books in Print as I understand it grows out of the Publishers’ Weekly, “Weekly Record” and the whole thing is tied in with Publishers Trade List Annual. Not all publishers, and this information will appear in my final report, nor all publishers submit to all bibliographies. The National Union Catalog I’ve looked at with some detail and I have found that, as I recall the figure, only 93 publishers submit information directly to Library of Congress. This is part of what I meant by publishers not knowing why they’re supposed to submit. A lot of them who issue very small editions have told me that they, to use their expression—“I’ll be darned if I’m giving my copies to the Library of Congress for free. Let them buy it.” I only found out this morning that apparently Publishers’ Weekly no longer wants the books sent to them. There’s a whole big mix-up with what kind of information goes to whom. I don’t know if that responds in total. I think that the bibliographical control situation is penurious and chaotic.
In a relatively short period, reprint publishing has progressed from being an adjunct of the antiquarian book trade to a position as a large-scale, self-justified industry, but attitudes and controls have not kept pace. There is evidence that reprints are amenable to conventional bibliographic control, and librarians and publishers must cooperate in improving it by bringing reprints into the publishing mainstream.

The subtitle of my talk today is placed in quotes because, as you may have already recognized, it is not original. It is from an essay which in turn is the title piece of a book by Herbert Gold. I find it an intriguing phrase, one that contains nice elements of paradox and irony which are somewhat applicable here. In its original context, you may remember, the phrase derives from Mr. Gold's definition of the classic television drama as being "... a happy story about happy people with happy problems." Now I won't presume to say that mine is a happy story, or even that we are happy people, but I do believe that in the current outpouring of reprints we have a happy problem.

I doubt if there will be much objection to my use of the term "problem," but my choice of the adjective "happy" may require some justification. To a certain extent I am reflecting a personal attitude and consequently will be giving a self-justification. But I am not so unique that I do not share characteristics such as length and kind of professional service with many of my colleagues here, and I suggest that they, along with me, are victims of a cultural lag. If my own experience provides an indicator—and I am assuming that it does—there is today a large, active generation of librarians whose careers span the pre- and post-reprint eras; and to a considerable and significant extent, the premises and concepts which govern our attitude toward the contemporary reprint are still those of twenty years ago and are thus part of the pre-reprint era.

The point I am trying to make here is especially relevant to the selection-acquisitions end of the technical services spectrum, although it is not without application to the cataloging process. If your professional memory extends over the time span I have mentioned, and if your experience includes acquisitions work, you know that today's reprint catalog is yesterday's want list. It might be more accurate to say
that yesterday's reprint catalog was last week's want list, because I suspect that one of the things bothering us is that we are not as sure about the titles currently spewing forth from the reprint presses as we were a few years back. And here, finally, is where I establish my happy problem syndrome: the joy, the satisfaction, of having easily available to us the kind of books and serials we had accustomed ourselves to scratch and scheme and strive for is being overridden by the anxiety, the problem, of constant choice; and more and more the choice seems to involve an item that once would never have come to decision because of its scarcity.

For all practical purposes the certainties are gone; the really sought after items—the ones we all agreed on, librarian and publisher alike—have all been reprinted. I am not saying that those agreements could not have been challenged in many cases, nor do I mean to suggest that only second- and third-rate books are now being reprinted; only that the old certainty is no longer present. When I attribute this attitude to librarians I am, of course, analyzing my own feelings and extending them to my colleagues. When I include publishers in this state of uncertainty I am deducing it from their advertising and promotion campaigns, and from their increasing tendency, perhaps even necessity, to undertake package programs in which the merit of an individual title is of less significance than its inclusion in a broad subject or topical area. This kind of package unit reprinting is not intrinsically without usefulness or value to libraries, but it can be disquieting for a librarian to realize that a single decision is going to deliver (over an extended period) scores or even hundreds of books, many of which seem to lack individual importance to people who are accustomed to item-by-item selection, however cursory.

Some of these packages, especially those that advance the concept of the instant library, have already reached the outer limits of absurdity, and their promotion gets more shrill in direct proportion to the pretentiousness of the project. If you question this, or doubt that Madison Avenue now passes right through the heart of library land, let me quote you a couple of sentences from my favorite prospectus:

The critical need for every library—regardless of its size or locale—is to function as a full-fledged research center.

And a little later:

It's pretty embarrassing not to be able to support basic research. Not having the reference material you need when you need it is striking evidence that your library is not all it could (or should) be.

Now this is an extreme example of what I believe is known as selling the sizzle instead of the steak, and while the project itself is probably not typical of the reprint industry, it is symptomatic. Certainly it is indicative of the direction in which we are headed and the atmosphere in which we will have to operate.
I have taken this preliminary excursion into history and prophecy because I think they bring perspective to the specific problems that accompany the handling of reprints, and because I believe that we will be more successful in resolving these problems if we frankly recognize that with respect to reprinting as we are considering it here, librarians are the beneficiaries and victims of a mixed blessing.

What, then, in more specific terms, are some of the problems that confront technical services librarians? I will not attempt to be exhaustive; indeed, I doubt if any one person could detail all the trials librarians have faced in dealing with reprints. Instead, I shall try to indicate some of the areas of difficulty, perhaps with occasional examples, and I shall follow the sequence the books themselves take, that is, selection, acquisitions, and cataloging.

I shall try to touch rather lightly on selection, partly because I do not want it to appear that I am trying to claim it for the jurisdiction of technical services, but mostly because much of what I have been saying about choice and decision pertains to the selection process. It is the area of library activity that is bearing—as indeed it should—a steadily increasing responsibility in the matter of reprints. The first wave of reprinting took care of the consensus items from the antiquarian sector; the second demolished Mudge-Winchell and similar authorities; and now words like “indispensable” and “monumental” no longer seem to have the same meaning. As I said earlier, the certainties are gone, yet the republication of the nineteenth century continues unabated. If librarians do not have solid standards of selection which they employ with self-assurance; if they succumb to the old lure of institutional self-sufficiency, a concept they have only recently and painfully begun to repudiate; and if, because of the reprint industry’s initial concern with making available obviously desirable antiquarian items, they allow a halo effect to cling to the current output, then our problems will not only persist but in all likelihood become less happy ones.

Of course the ideal situation—and I am sure my publisher friends will concur—would be selection before publication, really a restoration of the certainties I keep referring to. Although we seem able only to establish true consensus by purchase, we should be aware that each time we sponsor or endorse a “best books” list of any kind we are nominating candidates for reprinting, and perhaps we should give more attention to this established and familiar library method as a deliberate technique for choosing titles to be reprinted.

It is not fashionable these days to advocate traditional methods, but I shall risk it here because I think they have had promising results in some other problem areas, notably in acquisitions. Certainly one of the recurring difficulties has been in identifying what has been reprinted and who has done it. Since reprinting is truly international in scope and operation, conventional trade bibliographies organized by language have not been an effective control mechanism. But the last
few years have seen the emergence and, I think, the steady improve-
ment, of attempts at systematic bibliographical control of available and
even contemplated reprints. I am referring, of course, to the annual
Guide to Reprints and its complementary publication, Announced
Reprints; the Bibliographica Anastatica; and Ostwald's Nachdruck-
verzeichnis von Einzelwerken, Serien und Zeitschriften aus Allen
Wissengebieten. These publications still tend to disappoint us too fre-
quently when we are searching for specific information, but I think
they have done much—and hold the promise of doing more—to control
a field that has occasionally in the past wandered dangerously close to
chaos. At least now librarians and publishers alike have someplace to
turn for the first step in determining whether or not a title is avail-
able, or has been preempted.

They also help in identifying the announced reprint that never
seems to get published, a situation that makes budget planning and
management somewhat difficult, to say the least. Certainly the problem
has not been eliminated, but some control has been applied. Again,
the simultaneous reprint of the same title by rival houses—an occur-
rence I am sure agitates publishers even more than librarians—is mini-
mized if not eliminated by the existence of a centralized, bibliograph-
ical control system. We would all be better off if there were a single,
comprehensive control publication, but until this is achieved, if ever,
we at least have some kind of grip on reprint publishing. And I might
even point out that, for all its flaws, it is almost as good a hold as we
have on other forms of publishing.

One other nuisance area I might mention here, since it is subject to
elimination by this same control mechanism, is the practice of dealers
listing reprints without the publisher and place. Their reasons for
this are perfectly obvious and understandable, but the acquisitions
librarian is inclined to be annoyed and embarrassed when he learns on
delivery that he has occasioned, and maybe even paid for, a round trip
voyage for a title he could have secured much closer to home. This is a
small matter and of no great consequence except that it is one more
thing that tends to fix reprints in a distinct category when our com-
mon cause would be better served by getting them into the main-
stream.

And now—the moment you have all been waiting for—I come to
cataloging. What simile should I use here? Pandora's box? A can of
worms? The first is probably better, because if you recall the fable, you
know that although all the evils that flesh is heir to emerged from Pan-
dora's box, the very last thing that flew out was Hope, and this con-
soling note fits with my theme of happy problems.

In the past few months, without making any serious effort to can-
vass the field, I have collected several horrible examples of cataloging
problems from my immediate colleagues, and I have no doubt that my
collection could be doubled in size and scope merely by calling for con-
tributions. It is catalogers who are ultimately faced with some in-
credible bibliographical aberrations, and it is catalogers who must ultimately resolve and explain them in pithy notes that will fit around the hole in the bottom of a three by five card. It is a task that can drive the most patient to exasperation and beyond, and it is a task that is not made any lighter by the realization that frequently the need for it could have been eliminated quite simply at the point of production.

It is virtually impossible to verbalize specific examples of the kind of thing I am referring to, but let me try one if only to prove this statement.

The example is a seven-volume work. The reprinter has assigned his own series title to the work and included the seven volumes under a single series number. Then he has assigned a second series title to volumes 1, 2, 4, and 6, and given these a single number within this second series. Mention of the second series is omitted from volumes 3, 5, and 7, yet the entire work has a single personal author and a single title. I might also mention (although I have no idea if this has anything to do with the case) that the work appears to have been issued backwards; at least volume 7 bears the date 1968, and volume 1, 1969. Now there might be some reason for all this, but it cannot be fathomed from the book in hand.

Whether this example is clear to you or not, at least it will give you some idea of what I am concerned with or remind you of similar examples from your own experience. In either case, it is easier for me to generalize about these matters and let you supply the examples. Certainly your examples will include cases in which the original title page is omitted or in which no statement of the original edition is included in any form. Or worse yet, the original title page is present and a reprint title page or equivalent information is lacking. Sometimes two or more separate editions are fused into one reprint, or portions of separate works combined into a single one. Original series information may be omitted, or as in the case I cited, a new series created. Multi-volume sets are issued, part in original and part in reprint, at least until the original edition portion is exhausted and replaced by a reprint, which can give you two copies of a textual duplicate that are bibliographically distinct. The list could go on. I have not even mentioned how volume numbers can be altered or combined, or successor titles assigned retrospectively to predecessor volumes. But this should be enough to indicate the dimension and viscosity of a large, sticky situation.

Now it is true that these problems are of our own making since they arise from bibliographical standards created and adhered to by librarians. But the standards were not created out of whim or caprice; they exist for good reason, and we willingly go through some extraordinary contortions to maintain them. We recognize that there will be some occasions when scholarly or practical reasons require some departure from bibliographical convention; the intellectual content of a
book is still its reason for existence, not how easy it is to fit it into our catalogs. But it does not seem too much to ask of reprinters that they make themselves aware of the systematic requirements of libraries and become more sensitive to them.

A sense of tidiness tempts me to look for a cause or theme that is central to all these problems I have mentioned. If there is one I think it derives from the de facto recognition of reprinting as a segment apart from the main course of publishing. There are features that set it apart, of course, but I do not think these are significant enough to require a separate set of relationships between the reprint publisher and the librarian. The gap between reprinting and risk publishing has virtually disappeared, and separate standards of judgment, variant methods of acquisitions, and makeshift means of cataloging should disappear too. I have mentioned a couple of things which I think are helping accomplish this by pulling the reprint industry into the mainstream of traditional practice. I have not mentioned other efforts; for example, those that are aimed at regularizing the loaning of master copy.

Taken together, all these are hopeful signs. They indicate a frank recognition that reprinters and librarians need each other, that there are rational ways of reconciling the differences that plague us, and that our problems, in this sense at least, are happy ones.

Public Service Librarians and Reprints

ELEANOR DEVLIN, Head
Reference Department
The Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio

Public service librarians generally welcome reprints because they can give much better service to patrons through their use. They have some slight problems in the loaning of materials to reprinters, but the possibility of acquiring valuable titles, hitherto unobtainable, through hard copy reprints and microforms, far outweighs any problems. Academic and research libraries are the chief purchasers of reprints. Reprint houses offer almost any standard reference work, any worthwhile out-of-print title, catalogs of other libraries, periodical files, government documents, etc. The hard-copy format is good, and although microforms are less desired by patrons they are welcomed for their content. Public service librarians would like to see more communication between library and reprinter.

My role in this paper is to present the points of view of all kinds and conditions of librarians who work in the public service areas of their respective institutions. My own experience has been chiefly with
large research libraries and long-established and rich collections but
in an effort to give you a well-rounded set of opinions, I have consulted
with others whose experience has been different. I had hoped that if I
overlooked some salient points, members of the audience would rem-
edy that deficiency during our question-and-answer period. This was
not to be, and I can only assure you that if indeed there has been an
egregious omission on my part, it was unintentional.

In general, public service librarians welcome the spate of reprints
and the vastly increased opportunity to supply their patrons with
hitherto unavailable titles. Librarians of my generation can remember
the difficulties of replacing lost and worn-out titles, and the searching
for remainders and second-hand copies that when found often turned
out to be no more useable than the crumbling copies they were sup-
posed to replace. It was next to impossible to secure scarce and out-of-
print reference sources and our patrons’ research activities were car-
ried on at great expenditure of time and money through the slow
process of interlibrary loan and trips to other libraries. The present
state of affairs is vastly different and a source of satisfaction alike to
librarian and patron.

We do not have as much concern for the business and technical
aspects of reprint publishing, though of course budgetary considera-
tions are important in any area. However, circulation librarians and
interlibrary loan librarians often have a problem involving the loan-
ing of titles to reprint houses for reproducing. Questions arise con-
cerning what fees, if any, should be charged, and what stipulations
should be set regarding the care of the book and its prompt return.
Sometimes the problem lies in trying to identify the would-be borrower
who does not state clearly why he desires the title. Policy decisions on
these matters usually are solved higher up the administrative ladder,
but the practicalities involved crop up in the daily life of public ser-
vices librarians.

The real problem for us is what to choose. As our morning speak-
ers emphasized there is a plethora of offerings, running the gamut from
highly important to highly irrelevant. We may wonder why the same
title is offered by two or more publishers and sometimes why the title
is offered at all (it seems so marginal), but this is not our problem. In
a way it is an advantage because it gives a greater area of choice. In the
end we consider the age and character of our library and the nature of
our services and buy accordingly.

To come to specifics we will consider first the wants of the old and/
or large research libraries, public and private, academic and special.
These institutions usually have all the standard reference tools they
need, though they would frequently buy reprints for replacement or
for use as a second set. Examples might be the Handbook of North
American Indians and Evans’ American Bibliography. They are also in-
terested in the catalogs of unique collections and in special bibliogra-
phies. Sometimes the development of new programs will inspire them
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to buy national bibliographies of countries not previously of concern to them. For years, of course, these libraries have been purchasing all kinds of materials on microforms; and while patrons are not entirely happy using material in this format, they are perfectly aware of the great advantage to their scholarly research of the availability of these titles in their own home location. Examples that come to mind are the titles listed in the Short Title Catalog and the British Parliamentary Papers. The proliferation of offerings in these two areas of unique bibliographies and available microforms has been a great boon to research libraries, making bibliographic search and verification much surer and shorter and access to prime sources almost commonplace.

Perhaps the best outlets for the reprints of the standard reference sources and of titles for the general collections are the new and expanding college libraries. I am not entirely sure of my ground here, since my personal experience in this area is somewhat dated, but it seems reasonable that the building of basic retrospective collections must depend on these sources. In addition they will need such reference books as the American Catalog, Appleton’s Cyclopaedia of American Biography, and others. For those colleges moving toward graduate work and university status there will be a desire to acquire series formerly available in only the largest libraries, the aforementioned STC titles and the publications of the Camden Society and the Chancer Society for example, either in hard copy or microform. Here again, with so much to pick from, selection of pertinent materials is of the first importance.

The smaller public libraries have a modest interest in the reprint programs, confining their purchases to classics of a popular nature and titles listed in standard bibliographies, like the Essay and General Literature Index. Here, of course, they overlap with college and university libraries who would do the same.

It seems obvious then that it is the academic and research libraries that are the chief objects and beneficiaries of the output of the reprint trade. If we examine the kinds of materials that make up the bulk of this output we see how eminently useful they are and how much they fill long-standing needs. We may classify them as follows:

1. Catalogs of special libraries and special collections;
2. national bibliographies and other special bibliographies;
3. encyclopedias, handbooks, and other reference tools;
4. sets and series, such as government documents, periodical runs, society publications;
5. individual titles of lasting importance for building collections and filling gaps.

There is probably no important academic or research library in the United States that is without reprint titles representing one or all of these categories.

Turning now to the format of the reprints we find it generally good. The copy is usually legible and adequately bound. Occasionally the
print is too much reduced or too light, though the latter defect could easily be the fault of the original copy. Some have questioned the quality and durability of paper and binding, but it is only a question, not a criticism.

Here let me inject one minor grievance concerning the difficulty of buying single replacement volumes of multivolume sets. The publishers' reluctance to break sets is quite understandable and we can usually resort to copyflow, so the grievance remains minor.

Of more concern to public service librarians is the occasional lack of enough information to give the true bibliographic history of a title. Omission of the original imprint and copyright data can be misleading. An experienced eye can detect a reprint of a nineteenth century book both by its format and its content, but the unwary can be deceived. Of less concern is the supplying of original imprint data unobtrusively in a part of the book other than the title page. At least it is there and will be noted by the careful user. This criticism is aimed generally at reprints of individual titles, as the big sets and series are usually well known and easily recognized.

As far as the future activities of the reprint publishers are concerned, our chief ambition is to be better informed about what the publishers are selecting and what criteria they are using for such selection. We think there could be more consulting with librarians. We know that some consulting is done and that college and university faculty members are sometimes approached for that purpose, but there seems no recognizable and consistent pattern. Public service librarians are in a position to discover what patrons need and want and what libraries lack. As an example of librarians knowing what is needed, several librarians commented favorably on the development of collections of materials for black studies programs and wondered if any thought had been given to similar programs for other groups such as American Indians and Spanish-speaking groups.

One hates to mention the possibility of another ALA committee and perhaps a formal organization of communication is not the answer in an operation including so many libraries and so many publishers. At any rate, we made a good start in Detroit at opening our minds to each other. There is no doubt in my mind that librarians and reprinters need to be friends and colleagues if we are all to reap the full harvest of their abundant sowing.
Conference on Southeast Asian Research Materials, Puntjak, Indonesia, April 21-24, 1969

An abridged account of the proceedings and results of a conference on Southeast Asian research materials, held in Puntjak, Indonesia, April 21-24, 1969. The abridgment is designed to highlight the bibliographical and microform aspects of the conference.

A conference concerned with Southeast Asian research materials was held at the Puntjak Pass Hotel in West Java, Indonesia, from April 21 through April 24, 1969, under the auspices of the Association for Asian Studies, Inc. (AAS) and the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West. The host organization was the Indonesian Institute of Science (Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia).

Planning for the conference started in the Committee on Archives and Documents of Southeast Asia (CARDOSEA) which was a functional committee of the Southeast Asia Committee of the AAS. The CARDOSEA group was chaired by Dr. Robert Van Niel of the University of Hawaii. After the plans for the conference were already well developed, a reorganization within the AAS in late 1968 and early 1969 eliminated the Southeast Asia Committee and created an Interuniversity Southeast Asia Committee (ISAC). Within ISAC a new group was established to deal with research materials; this group combined the work of CARDOSEA with other interested groups and called itself the Committee on Research Materials on Southeast Asia (CORMOSEA). CORMOSEA, at its establishment in January 1969, assumed the responsibility for arranging the conference. Professor Fred W. Riggs of the University of Hawaii was elected Chairman of CORMOSEA. The CORMOSEA endeavors were supported from their inception by the Southeast Asia Development Advisory Group (SEADAG) which is funded by the Agency for International Development and administered by the Asia Society. Financial support for the conference came from SEADAG, the Asia Foundation, and the Office of Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Embassy in Djakarta.
CORMOSEA immediately appointed a planning committee for the establishment of “Southeast Asia Microforms” (SEAM), an international consortium to finance the microfilming of useful but inaccessible research material relating to Southeast Asia. Planning for SEAM had advanced sufficiently far so that it could be presented by Dr. Riggs for discussion at the conference in Indonesia.

The following Southeast Asian countries sent delegations to the conference: Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. Delegations from Australia, France, Hong Kong, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States were present. Invitations were also sent to Canada, Czechoslovakia, Brunei, Burma, Cambodia, India, Laos, UNESCO (Paris), the USSR, and the Republic of Viet Nam.

Results of the Conference

The conference dealt with the following major areas: (I) training of personnel, (II) acquisitions and bibliographic control, and (III) microfilm projects. It adopted resolutions in each of these areas which are given below, followed by some additional comments drawn from general discussion and/or committee reports. Under each roman numeral heading, the pertinent resolution is given under “A”; comments following the resolution are listed under “B.”

I. Training of Personnel

A. Recognizing the importance and need of professional training of librarians and archivists, the Conference resolved:

1. Advanced training for librarianship beyond the master’s level should be provided at the existing library schools within the region. For countries with no library schools, it is suggested that they take advantage of existing library schools within the region;

2. A regional training institute for librarians and archivists at an advanced level should eventually be set up, possibly under the auspices of the South East Asian Ministers of Education Secretariat (SEAMES), the Southeast Asian Regional Branch of the International Council of Archives (SARBICA), and the Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL);

3. Professional training of archivists in the region should be entrusted to SARBICA;

4. In-service training in archives at the technical and sub-professional level should be undertaken by the National Archives of Malaysia which has already expressed its willingness to provide such assistance;

5. The necessary technical and financial assistance should be requested directly by SARBICA, the National Archives of Malaysia, the Institute of Library Science of the University
of the Philippines, the School of Library Science of Chula-
longkorn University, and the Library School of the Univer-
sity of Indonesia, from regional and international organiza-
tions.

B. The Committee on training stated that "above anything else,
the strengthening of infrastructure, i.e., the training of librar-
ians and archivists, is of paramount importance..."

II. Acquisitions and Bibliographic Control

A. Recognizing the fact that with respect to the acquisition and
bibliographical control of library materials, the following prob-
lems were identified:
1. In various countries the book trade is not sufficiently de-
veloped to handle overseas orders;
2. Inadequate trade and national bibliographies, including spe-
cialized bibliographies, indexes, catalogues, etc., make it diffi-
cult to know what materials are currently available;
3. Booksellers are discouraged from handling orders for local
publications because of small editions, difficulties in receiv-
ing payments, and complicated export procedures.

The Conference resolved that:
1. In each country, a national coordinating committee on ac-
quisions and bibliographical services be set up if none
exists at present in order to:
a. encourage and initiate bibliographical projects to fill the
gap in existing bibliographical services;
b. coordinate bibliographical projects;
c. provide information on bibliographical activities and pub-
lications to a regional coordinating committee;
d. assist in the development of the book industry through
the appropriate national agencies, e.g., national book de-
velopment councils.
2. A regional coordinating committee on acquisitions and bib-
liographical services to be set up, consisting of representa-
tives from each national coordinating committee, which
would have the following functions:
a. to serve as a clearinghouse for information on acquisitions
and bibliographical work in progress or completed;
b. to arrange for exchanges of personnel to assist in the
 carrying out of bibliographical projects;
c. to obtain financial assistance from appropriate agencies
 such as ASEAN, UNESCO for bibliographical projects.
3. A regional group of librarians in South East Asia should be
formed, preferably as a branch of IFLA, which would:
a. organize regular conferences on Southeast Asian library
problems;
b. set up subcommittees to study and make recommenda-
tions on specific matters, e.g., library training, acquisitions, bibliographical services, etc.

4. News and information on the work of the regional coordinating committee should be made available through existing journals or newsletters, such as the newsletters of SEALG, COMAS, CORMOSEA, Asian Book Development Center in Karachi, UNESCO's *Bibliography, documentation, terminology*, etc.

B. The committee on this area recommended that encouragement be given in each country of the region to the development of a local acquisitions dealer equipped to handle foreign orders. It also recommended that library organizations in each country be asked to request that their government simplify export procedures for the benefit of institutions of higher education and scientific organizations.

III. Microfilm Projects

A. Recognizing the need for the preservation of research resources in microform and the advantages to be gained from national coordination and regional cooperation in this field, the Conference resolved to set up a national committee in each Southeast Asian country before the end of 1969 to discharge the following functions:

1. Determination of priorities for filming of open material;
2. Undertaking of the coordination of microfilming projects;
3. Dissemination of information about these activities and requirements through SARBICA at least once every six months;
4. Assumption of responsibility for contacting sources of aid;
5. Participation in periodic regional meetings under the auspices of SARBICA.

Recognizing the further advantages that may accrue from international cooperation, the Conference recommends:

1. The establishment of an international project for encouraging the microfilming of research materials on Southeast Asia held outside the region;
2. The dissemination of information which Mr. G. Raymond Nunn is collecting about the major collections of research materials on Southeast Asia;
3. The collection and dissemination of additional information in this field;
4. The pooling of resources and raising of funds to support microfilming projects on a worldwide basis;
5. The encouragement of exchange of research materials in microform on Southeast Asia between the region and countries outside the area.

B. It was the general sense of the conference that efforts within the region would be channeled through SARBICA, and that
efforts outside Southeast Asia through SEAM. Dr. Riggs suggested the setting up of an international advisory committee to advise on priorities, not with respect to material to be filmed which lay within the jurisdiction of the individual countries, but with respect to funding microfilm projects. There was discussion concerning the possibility of arranging payment through exchange of films or by payment in kind with unexposed film. The possibilities and problems of utilizing the facilities of UNESCO with regard to microfilming were raised.

Some individuals expressed their concern over what they felt was the necessity for preserving the right of priority of access by local scholars over the needs of those from abroad. The topic of freedom of access provoked some lively discussion throughout the conference. The Singapore and Malaysian delegations said that their records were open after twenty-five years. The Indonesian delegate stated that records prior to 1816 are open in that they have already been inventoried and classified, but that records after that date are not open since they have not yet been inventoried and their contents known. There was general agreement on the need to microfilm records for preservation, aside from questions about exchange and distribution of such films.

Although the impetus for the conference had come from outside the region, it was clear throughout the conference that the delegations from the area itself wished to take the lead in guiding the deliberations of the conference and in setting up permanent committees composed of persons from the area to carry out its recommendations. This attitude augurs well for the healthy development of the library and archives professions in Southeast Asia.

Reports Submitted to the Conference

A number of reports were submitted to the conference, and they are appended in alphabetical order of the countries concerned: France, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and the United Kingdom. Because of limitations of space the papers have been considerably abridged and in several instances the original material has been rearranged. Emphasis has been placed on bibliographical material and on information on microfilm projects. Following the reports is a list of the authors and their affiliations.

In addition, there were oral reports presented on the resources in Australia, Hong Kong, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Mr. Monteil of France called the attention of the conference to the important Southeast Asian collections of the Buddhistic Institute of Phnom Penh, the Oriental Institute of Prague, and the Institute of the Peoples of Asia in Moscow.

The writer wishes to thank the following persons for their aid in the abridgment of the attached papers: Mr. Elmer H. Thogersen (Indonesia), Miss Rosalie D. Lucas (the Sianel article on the Philip-
pines), Miss Marilou P. Tadlip (the Quiason article on the Philippines), and Miss Crystella Kauka (the Anuar article on Singapore).

FRANCE

"Archives, Books and Documentation on Southeast Asia Available in France"—Vincent Monteil

1. Bibliothèque Nationale
   58 rue de Richelieu, Paris 2
2. Bibliothèque de l'Ecole Nationale des Langues Orientales Vivantes
   2 rue de Lille, Paris 7
3. Université de Paris à la Sorbonne
   Institut d'Etudes Islamiques et Centre d'Etudes de l'Orient contemporain
   13 rue du Four, Paris 6
4. Université de Paris à la Sorbonne
   Centre de Hautes Etudes Administratives sur l'Afrique et l'Asie modernes
5. Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Section Asie Sorbonne
   47 rue des Ecoles, Paris 5
6. Ecole Francaise d'Extrême Orient
   22 Avenue du President Wilson, Paris 16
7. La Documentation Française
   rue Lord Byron, Paris 16
8. Bibliothèque du Musée Guimet
   6 Place d'Iena, Paris 16
9. Bibliothèque du Musée de l'Homme
   Palais de Chaillot, Paris 16
10. Centre d'Etudes de Politique Étrangères
    54 rue de Varenne, Paris 7
11. Ex-Ministère de France d'Outre Mer
    Archives d'Indochine
    rue Oudinet, Paris 7
12. Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France
    23 quai de Conti, Paris 6

INDONESIA

"Public Documents in Indonesia"—Harsja W. Bachtiar

Indonesia has many archives which are not known centrally and, in many instances, state archival material is in private hands. In addition, there is archival material pertaining to Indonesia in Portugal, the U.K., and the Netherlands. Some public documents were transferred to Japan during the Japanese occupation and Dutch forces also transferred some significant documents to the Netherlands during the period of the Indonesian Revolution.

The main body of archival materials is preserved in the National Archives which started in 1892. The National Archives has published or is in the process of publishing the collection of contracts and treaties between native principalities in Bali and Lombok and the Dutch colonial government (1841–1938), between the Sultanate of Bandjermasin and various colonial powers.
(1635–1860), and between the Sultanate of Lingga, Johor, Pahang, and Riouw, and the Dutch East India Company (1784–1909).

Rare documents are also kept at the Central Museum Library, established in 1778. The library's collection includes publications on the natural sciences, cultural studies, ethnology, geography, law, literature, and linguistics. At present the Central Museum Library has about 350,000 volumes, including 9,814 periodicals and 660 different dailies, including quite a number of local dailies, particularly those published before 1942.

JAPAN

“Research Materials and Research Centers on Southeast Asia in Japan”—Yoshinobu Nakada and Yoshiyuki Hagiwara

The past decade has seen a much more active interest on the part of Japanese researchers in Southeast Asia. Most of the acquisitions on Southeast Asia in Japanese libraries in the recent period consist of either western works or local publications written in English or French. A fair quantity of Indonesian, Thai, and Vietnamese materials has been acquired by the National Diet Library and the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs (recently renamed the Institute of Developing Economies), but Burmese, Laotian, and Cambodian materials in their collections are still very few.

The important collections and research centers in Japan are as follows:

1. National Diet Library, Tokyo

This library has a fairly good collection on Southeast and South Asia in the fields of law, politics, economic conditions, sociology, history, and geography. It has issued the following: Union list of materials on Southeast Asia (1958, with two supplements in 1959 and 1960, respectively) and Materials on Asia and Africa; accession list and review (1963, monthly).

2. Institute of Developing Economies, Tokyo

The library of the Institute established in 1958 has one of the largest collections of materials on Asia and other developing areas relating to the contemporary scene. The number of volumes is about 72,000, and it has about 1,200 periodical titles and 90 newspapers. It has issued annual catalogs since 1959 and a decennial cumulation as well as for Asian countries. It has compiled several bibliographies, including union catalogs, which include Southeast Asia as an area of interest. It has microfilm copies of newspapers, trade statistics, and economic development plans of Asian countries.

Research reports as result of field work number about 500 titles, most of them in Japanese, however, some have been translated into English. It publishes two periodicals—(1) Ajia Keizai (monthly) in Japanese, and (2) Developing Economies (quarterly) in English. Its statistics division has been collecting trade statistics for Southeast Asian countries from 1946 to the present. Other statistics deal with population, agriculture, finance, and industry.

3. Center for the Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University

The Center was established in 1968 and the results of its field work research program have been published in its bulletin Southeast Asian Studies (in Japanese). Reports on annual symposia on Southeast Asia are published in English. The number of volumes in its collection is 3,000, with 60 periodical titles. It has the only copy of the Human Relations Area File in Japan.
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4. The Department of Oriental History, Faculty of Letters, The University of Tokyo
The branch on Southern Asian history was set up in 1957. Its published catalog (1965) lists about 2,500 volumes on Southern and Southeast Asian history. In 1966, the Society of Southeast Asian History was founded with this Department as the center.

5. Toyo Bunko (Oriental Library)
This is the best library on Oriental history in Japan with a collection of more than 500,000 volumes. Emphasis has been placed on East Asian material, but it has a fairly good collection on Southeast Asian history.

6. The Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
This Institute, founded in 1964, has sections on Thailand, Laos, Burma, Mon-khmer areas, Indonesia, and Oceania. There are about 13,000 books with 196 periodical titles in its collection which deals with linguistics and anthropology.

7. The Research Institute of Southeast Asia, the University of Nagasaki
The Institute was established in 1958 and its collection numbers about 30,000 volumes. It publishes bulletins and other material, including annual research reports and monograph series.

Other institutions involved in Southeast Asia studies are the Faculty of Letters of Osaka University with its Center for Indian and Southeast Asian Studies; the Economic Research Institute of Osaka City University; and the University of Yamaguchi with its Research Institute of East Asian Economy.

Of the numerous bibliographies listed on Southeast Asia only a few can be mentioned:
(b) The Research Institute of Humanistic Sciences, Kyoto University. Annual bibliography of oriental studies. 1934—
(c) Nakamura, Takashi, and others. Union catalogue of books and pamphlets in western languages on Southeast Asia kept in the principal libraries of Japan—social sciences and humanities. 1955.

The Society of Asian Political and Economic Studies publishes a quarterly bulletin, Aziya Kenkyu. Also through grants given by the Ministry of Education from 1957 to 1967 to various universities and institutes, annotated bibliographies of Asian studies in Japan have been prepared.

MALAYSIA

"The National Archives of Malaysia and the Preservation of Research Materials"—Alwi Jantan

The National Archives, founded in 1957, is located in Petaling Jaya, a suburb of Kuala Lumpur. It performs both archival and library functions. Besides government archives, it also collects some private and business archives. It has the responsibility for the planning for the eventual establishment of a national library. Apart from acquiring materials from within the country, efforts have been and are being made to obtain materials pertaining to Malaysia from foreign institutions either in the original form or on microfilm.
The government archives cover the period from 1700 to the present. Of archives prior to this period little has remained in the country in their original form. The total holdings now amount to 10,700 linear feet. The annual accession of these various archival materials is listed in the Annual Report of the National Archives. A ten-year accumulated accession list is under preparation for publication toward the end of 1969.

With regard to library materials, the main bulk consists of publications published in the country and delivered under the deposit law. Entries are printed quarterly in the Government Gazette and in addition they are published in the recently established annual Malaysian National Bibliography. Details of materials already available on microfilm may be found in its Microfilm Catalogue.

By far the most important undertaking of the National Archives was the founding in 1968 of the Southeast Asian Regional Branch of the International Council on Archives (SARBICA) with membership from Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam. SARBICA issues a journal, Southeast Asian Archives.

"The Research Collection of the University of Malaya Library"—Soong Mun Wai

The paper discusses Malaysian research materials mainly available in the University of Malaya Library. (The sources of Malaysian historical materials in general are very comprehensively covered in the publication Malaysian Historical Sources edited by Dr. K. G. Tregonning.)

Manuscripts.—The library has a fairly strong collection of manuscripts in their original form or in microform. Most of these are in Malay. There are more than a hundred manuscripts, of which a rather notable item is Nur al-Din's Bustan al-salatin, Bab I-V. The microform collection consists of over 200 items. The microfiche collection actually represents all the cataloged collection of Malay and Minangkabau manuscripts located in the Leyden University Library while the microfilm strips are of manuscripts from libraries in England, Belgium, and Germany. (A detailed description of these manuscripts is given in J. H. Howard's Malay Manuscripts.)

Record materials.—The largest collection of records on Malaysia outside the country is still to be found in the Public Record Office and in the India Office Library in London. A consortium, including Yale, Cornell, and California, microfilmed some of these records. The university is also a participant in another consortium organized by the University of Singapore Library to microfilm other records from the Public Record Office. Considered together, these two sets are concerned with the Straits Settlements, British North Borneo, Sulu, Sumatra, and Java, as well as Southeast Asia in general, including Siam.

Newspapers.—Of its collection of Malay newspapers, those of the prewar years are by far the largest single collection. A detailed listing of these titles has appeared in W. Roff's Guide to Malay Periodicals 1876–1941. A union list of local holdings of Malaysian newspapers has been prepared by Mrs. Lim.

Serials.—The library receives all current Malaysian serials, including all those listed in L. H. Harris' Guide to Current Malaysian Serials.

Bibliographic material.—A union catalog of the holdings of the libraries of the Universities of Malaya and Singapore is maintained by the library.
From time to time the library issues bibliographies and check lists. It also issues a monthly accessions list.

"The State Sarawak Museum Reference Library and Archives"—Benedict Sandin

The State Museum Reference Library and Archives is an integral part of the Sarawak Museum. Its library collection covers Borneo in particular and Southeast Asia in general in addition to other subjects connected with the Museum such as natural history, archaeology, anthropology, art, and crafts. Out of about 8,000 volumes, the Borneo collection amounts to about 800 volumes including some Dutch, German, and a few French publications. It is considered to be one of the best collections of Borneo books in the world.

The Museum publishes its own journal, the Sarawak Museum Journal and it has an exchange program with thirty-six countries for 463 periodical titles.

Under the local Newspapers Ordinance, 1958, and the Sarawak Museum (Deposit Library) Ordinance, 1961, it receives three copies of each local newspaper and other publications including government publications which consist mainly of departmental reports. At present the library holds two English dailies, the Sarawak Tribune (begun in 1946) and Vanguard (begun in 1964). One Malay newspaper, Utusan Sarawak (established in 1949 and originally published three times weekly, but now published daily since May 1968) and seven Chinese dailies are also held.

The main bulk of the archives collection consists of Brooke Papers principally covering the period 1868 to 1917, i.e., during the reign of the 2nd Rajah Sir Charles Brooke. These materials are under the following main categories:

1. copies of Second Rajah's outgoing letters, agreements, and orders (25 volumes);
2. monthly reports and outstation reports (19 volumes);
3. Treasury Ledger and Cashbooks (53 volumes);
4. sets of court case records from Simanggang, Botong, Sibu, and Baram (140 volumes); and
5. Borneo and Sarawak: Despatches from Secretary of State, 1929–1939 (16 volumes).

The above form the most important archives from outstation and other departments. They are in bound volumes and occupy about 70 lineal feet of shelving space.

Apart from the above the institution has complete sets of the Sarawak Gazette and the Sarawak Government Gazette, first published in 1870 and 1908, respectively. The Sarawak Gazette forms the most important source of information on the Brooke regime.

The 30-volume set of Simanggang Court Books, 1876 to 1930, have been indexed. There is also a collection of films, photographs, sound tapes, stamps, coins, and rare, old maps of Borneo.

**PHILIPPINES**

"The State of Retrospective Philippine Research Resources"—Miss J. M. Saniel

This survey discusses the Filipiniana collections of the Philippine National Archives, the Dominican order, the Archdiocese of Manila, the University
of Santo Tomas (UST), and the University of the Philippines (UP), as well as the papers of past Presidents of the Philippines.

In 1950, the National Archives was officially estimated as containing no less than 11,000,000 documents accumulated during the Spanish period as well as after 1898. The Asian Center of UP has issued a Prospectus listing the results of archive projects undertaken jointly with the Bureau of Records Management. A mimeographed index to each of the finished projects is available upon request to the Asian Center.

Part of the Dominican archives are housed at UST and the rest at Santo Domingo Church. While the National Archives collection belongs mainly to late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, those in the Dominican archives include Spanish documents from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Microfilms of a number of these documents have been deposited at the UST library. Consisting of manuscripts and printed materials, it is estimated that three-fourths of this collection deals with Dominican missions in the Philippines, while the rest cover Dominican activities in Japan, Formosa, China, and Vietnam. These archives are rarely open to lay persons; however, microfilms of a number of these documents deposited in the UST library are open to researchers.

The archives of the Archdiocese of Manila are found in part in the residence at Mandaluyong and in part at the Cathedral in Intramuros. The collection includes, among others, population statistics for the whole of the Philippines, except for the southern Philippines after 1948 when a separate archdiocese was created for that section of the nation. (Local parish records throughout the country complement the centralized records and, from the standpoint of access, are relatively easier to examine.)

Apart from the Dominican archives mentioned above deposited in UST, the UST Filipiniana collection includes rare books dating back to the seventeenth century. The bulk of the collection, however, belongs to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The collection contains files of important newspapers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A research arm of UST, the Institute of Philippine History, has been active in microfilming documents in the Philippines and in Spain.

While the Filipiniana of UST is concentrated on the Spanish period, the one at UP seems to have more of the American period. There is a Union Catalog of Filipiniana at UP. The university has also prepared indexes to periodicals as well as indexes relating to biography, portraits, short stories, poetry, and local history. Annotated bibliographies have been prepared on flora and fauna; Southeast Asian languages and literature in English; monuments, libraries, and museums; religion; costumes; and the Chinese in the Philippines.

There is no one depository which contains the papers of the former Presidents of the Philippines. The Quezon papers are in the National Library and the Magsaysay papers in the Ramon Magsaysay Center. The Macapagal papers are being worked on by him in his private museum. The papers of the other four presidents are scattered in different places.

"The National Library: Its Resources on the Philippines"—Serafin D. Quison

Outstanding among the collections of the Filipiniana Division of the National Library are the Rizaliana, the "Insurgent Records," and the Manuel L. Quezon papers. The Rizaliana collection contains about 200 manuscript items including the originals of his three most famous works. The "Insurgent Rec-
ords" on the 1898–1903 revolutionary period consist of 200,000 items in Spanish and Tagalog. These had been microfilmed by the U.S. National Archives before their turnover to the Philippines. The Quezon collection consists of about 180,000 items. The National Library entered into an agreement with the University of Michigan for the sorting, processing, and microfilming of these papers. Work began on the papers in 1967.

One of the important groups of papers to be microfilmed in their entirety are the General Correspondence Series, 1907–1913. The library has the official papers of Presidents Sergio Osmena and Manuel A. Roxas. However, the papers of these two past presidents represent only a small fraction of their entire collections and the great bulk is still in the possession of the surviving heirs.

The Department of Education turned over a massive array of unpublished, typewritten materials relating to the history and culture of the various provinces and municipalities in the country. There is a separate thesis and dissertation collection on the Philippines containing no less than 800 items drawn from both public and private institutions.

The map collection contains a few rare maps portraying the Philippines, Manila and the bay area, and Southeast Asia in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.

Among the growing collection of pictures is the Carlos Ronquillo collection of scenes on the Philippine Revolution.

The printed Filipiniana collection has grown from 1945 to a total of about 45,000 items or an average annual increase of less than 2,000 volumes.

Of the several collections on vernacular literature, one of special significance is the Carlos Ronquillo collection of about 2,000 items which include a large amount of linguistic and literary works in Tagalog as well as vocabularies and dictionaries in Bikol, Iban, and Visayan languages.

From the holdings of periodicals on the Spanish colonial period, the revolutionary period, and the American regime, the Publications Division has completed the microfilming of several periodicals, official gazettes, and newspapers. The first to be completed is the entire set of La Gaceta de Manila which disseminated the official documents and public notices from 1861–1898. Five other official journals and newspapers of the twentieth century are now available on microfilm.

The paper noted that the Lopez Memorial Museum, San Agustin Convent in Manila, and the Dominican Convent possess a great deal of potential research materials.

SINGAPORE

"Singapore I"—Mrs. Hedwig Anuar

National Library.—The history of the National Library, established in 1958 as the national and public library of Singapore, dates back to 1823, with the founding of the Library of the Singapore Institution.

The Library has a Southeast Asia Collection of over 13,000 titles, including a valuable Chinese collection on the Chinese in Southeast Asia. Its main emphasis is on Singapore and Malaysia, although all other countries of Southeast Asia are represented. Apart from printed works, the collection includes over 5,000 microfilms, mainly newspapers and archival materials, 800 maps, and over 600 prints.

Bibliographical control.—New or recataloged titles added to the South-
east Asia Collection are included in the Library's monthly accessions lists.

A quarterly list of the publications deposited under the Printers and Publishers' Ordinances is published in the Singapore Government Gazette.

The National Library now issues a biennial list of Books about Singapore and Malaysia, which is a select, annotated list of works in English.

A list of Singapore and Malaysian newspapers on microfilm is also available, while lists of microfilms, maps, and prints are also being prepared.

National Archives and Records Centre.—The national archives are housed in the National Library which exercised administrative control over them until the creation of the National Archives and Records Centre in 1967.

The main Singapore archives now include 4,200 volumes, most of which have been microfilmed. These date from 1800, the most important series being the Straits Settlements Records and the Colonial Despatches. Another 2,000 volumes consist of bulletins, annual reports, and electoral registers. In addition, the National Archives has about 1,500 maps and plans of historical interest, 880 photographs and miscellaneous material in the form of scrapbooks, as well as personal papers of various governors and administrators.

Bibliographical projects.—A Joint Standing Committee on Library Cooperation and Bibliographical Services (JSCLCBS) of the two Library Associations of Malaysia and Singapore has initiated a number of important bibliographical projects. The first was a Union Catalogue of scientific and technical serials in Malaysia and Singapore libraries which started in 1965 and which is housed in the National Library.

The JSCLCBS has worked out recommendations for the national bibliographies of Malaysia and Singapore. These bibliographies are planned to appear annually and will be uniform in coverage and arrangement.

Another major project of JSCLCBS is the compiling and publishing of an index to Malaysian and Singapore serials which will be issued annually. This is a cooperative venture, involving forty-two librarians from seventeen libraries in Malaysia and Singapore.

Annual lists of bibliographical projects in progress are published in Perpustakaan, the joint journal of the Library Associations of Malaysia and Singapore.

National Archives and Records Centre microfilm holdings in the National Library—Straits Settlements:

- Annual Medical Reports—1887–1895
- Executive Council Schedules—1920–1939
- Executive Council, Summary of Decisions—1930–1936
- Reference Books—1904–1920

"Singapore II"—Mrs. P. Lim Pui Huen

Singapore's research institutes and institutions of higher learning jointly hold an excellent pool of research material on Malaysia and Singapore in particular and on Southeast Asia in general. Information relating to current acquisitions may be obtained from accessions lists and lists of periodicals received and other special lists. Bibliographical access to all the collections as a whole will have to await the compilation of a national union catalog of Singapore libraries. A start has been made with the compilation of a Union Catalogue of Scientific and Technical Serials and a Union List of Malaysian and Singapore Newspapers.

The library of the University of Singapore is the largest research collec-
tion in Singapore, its book stock amounting to 480,000 volumes and over 6,200 current periodical titles. It has an extensive microform collection of 4,100 reels of microfilm, 32,400 microcards, 7,600 microfiches, 6,000 volumes on microprint, and the microfiles of the Human Relations Area Files. Its collection includes valuable historical source material from the Public Record Office, British Museum, India Office Library, National Archives of India, and the Algemeen Rijksarchief. It is filming its substantial collection of prewar Chinese newspapers published in West Malaysia and Singapore. It has published a Catalogue of the Chinese Collection, as well as a Catalogue of the Koh Siow Nam Collection which contains many items on the Chinese in Southeast Asia. G. K. Hall is publishing its Singapore/Malaysia catalog which will amount to a current and retrospective bibliography on the two countries. It publishes an Accession List, and it is in the process of preparing a Microform Catalogue.

Nanyang University was founded in 1953 and its library has over 160,000 volumes of which approximately 90,000 volumes are in Chinese, with 3,000 reels of microfilm. In 1968 it published a check list of current periodicals received, which listed about 800 titles; a monthly list of additions is also issued. The library's particular acquisition emphasis with regard to Southeast Asian studies is material relating to the Chinese in Southeast Asia and their relations with China. The university's Institute of Southeast Asia compiled an Index to Chinese Periodical Literature on Southeast Asia, 1905-1966 which not only indexes material held in Singapore but also in Taipei, Tokyo, and Hong Kong.

The Singapore Polytechnic was established in 1959 and its library holds 44,000 volumes and receives 900 periodicals. The latter are listed in its List of Current Periodicals, 4th edition, 1968. It issues a monthly accessions list. It is particularly interested in material relating to science and technology in Southeast Asia.

The National Museum was founded in 1849 and its collection holds 12,000 volumes. It receives 300 current periodicals pertaining to the archeology, prehistory, ethnology, and zoology of Southeast Asia.

The Botanic Gardens were founded in 1859 and has a library of 9,000 volumes and 200 current periodicals. It is an outstanding collection on the systematic botany, ecology, horticulture, and forestry of Southeast Asia and Melanesia; it includes the records of research done in these fields from 1800 to the present.

The Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, begun in 1968, has a collection of 2,300 volumes, 120 current serials and over 300 reels of microfilm. It issues a monthly accessions list.

The Economic Research Centre set up in 1965 is connected with the University of Singapore. Its collection numbers over 4,600 volumes and it has a substantial number of documents. A Quarterly List of Additions is issued. It has also sponsored four bibliographic studies by Joyce Challis on economic and social materials in Malaysia and Singapore.

The SEAMEC Regional English Language Centre was established in 1968 as one of the projects of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Council. Its library is a highly specialized collection on the English language, linguistics, and language teaching, holding over 3,000 volumes and 73 current periodicals. It also has over 200 items in the form of tapes, records, charts, and microfilms.

A subcommittee of the Joint Standing Committee on Library Cooperation and Bibliographic Services of the Library Associations of Singapore and
Malaysia has been set up to handle microform matters. Its membership includes the National Archives of Malaysia, the University of Malaya Library, the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, the National Library of Singapore, the University of Singapore Library, the Nanyang University Library, and the Sarawak Museum. It is attempting to allocate for filming all current and retrospective newspapers published in Malaysia and Singapore.

THAILAND

"The National Archives of Thailand"—Mrs. Choosri Swasdisongkram

The National Archives of Thailand, situated in the old National Library Building, was established in 1952 as an administrative division under the Department of Fine Arts. It contains the official files of the Royal Secretariat whose functions were taken over by the Government Secretariat in 1932. These records were of two kinds: those of the older periods, pleated books, usually called Black Thai books or White Thai books; and those of the later periods, files of ordinary paper because paper has become more popularly used in official affairs. The large amount of the official files which include the records of the reigns of the Fifth King of Bangkok (King Chulalongkorn, 1868–1910), the Sixth King (King Vajiravudh, 1910–1925), and the Seventh King (King Prajadhipok, 1925–1935) gave occasion to the founding of the National Archives.

Services available at the National Library to foreign scholars who are properly accredited include Xerox, photostat, and microfilm. Only a very small part of the records have been microfilmed, but requests for microfilming of the archives kept in both the National Archives and the National Library are always permitted for research purposes.

UNITED KINGDOM

"The Southeast Asia Library Group"—M. A. Jaspan

The Group, known briefly as SEALG, was established at a conference held at the University of Hull, England, on 5 April 1968. The foundation members of the Group were the British Museum, the University of Hull, and the Department of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London. Since then, membership has been extended to the National Science Library, the University of Kent, the Universities of Amsterdam, Hamburg, Heidelberg, Leiden, and Paris, the Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde, and the East-West Centre, Hawaii.

Since its foundation three, one-day conferences have been held in Hull and London. SEALG publishes a half-yearly Newsletter, and a Survey of Library Materials. Membership in the group is free of charge and has thus far been granted upon application.

SEALG is concerned with the exchange of materials and information on books, manuscripts, and serial publications on Southeast Asia. With regard to the acquisition and preservation of written materials in the countries of Southeast Asia, SEALG is anxious that the difficulties experienced in the past and present should be alleviated by means of a well-conceived cooperative program. SEALG agrees that a microform program is necessary, but would prefer this to be carried out through the aegis of existing regional library associations, such as SARBICA (Southeast Asian Branch of the International Council on Archives), rather than establishing a costly administrative ma-
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chinery staffed largely by expatriates. It would also prefer that microform materials thus produced should be made generally available rather than become the subject of priority rights vested in a closed shop.

"The University of Hull Centre for Southeast Asian Studies"—M. A. Jaspan

The Centre for Southeast Asian Studies of the University of Hull in the U.K. was established in 1962 and has concentrated on the Philippines and Cambodia. In the first few years of its existence, the emphasis was mainly on research and the training of specialists in the economics, geography, history, and political study of the region. It publishes "Hull Monographs on Southeast Asia."

The Centre conducts at least one annual international meeting of Southeast specialists and receives numerous visiting scholars from the countries of Southeast Asia, Australia, the U.S.A., and Continental Europe.

There is a consolidated collection of books and serial publications on Southeast Asia in the University Library, with about 9,000 volumes, as well as a small but growing manuscript collection in both indigenous and western languages.
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The section of the National Union Catalog: Pre-1956 Imprints containing the main and added entries for the Catholic Church constitutes one of the largest bibliographies in book form of the publications issued by the administrative, legislative, and judicial organs of the Catholic Church. Included are issuances of the chancellories, commissions, and congregations; collections of and individual papal bulls; encyclicals, epistles, registers, treaties, reports from papal legates, and other official documents. As a record of pre-Vatican II Catholic liturgical publications, the liturgy and ritual file, with approximately 10,000 entries, is likely to remain unique. This section lists, for example, 344 different editions of the Missale Romanum, about 800 Books of Hours, and 580 different rituals. The file of subheadings serves both as an index to the user and as an orientation guide for the cataloger.

In recognition of its special interest and to make possible the purchase of this corpus of bibliographical material by libraries that can not afford the complete catalog, the section on the Catholic Church is being made available as a separate, self-contained volume. Scheduled for publication in October 1970, the 576-page volume printed on permanent/durable paper will be available from the publisher (Mansell, 3 Bloomsbury Place, London, W.C. 1 A2QA) for $35.00 plus postage.

DURABLE LIBRARY CATALOG CARDS

With the publication of American National Standard for Permanent and Durable Library Catalog Cards, Z85.1-1969, libraries have, for the first time, a method of ensuring that their catalog cards will last as long as, or longer than, the books in their collections.

The new standard will prove particularly useful to research libraries, which ordinarily require an index file that will last indefinitely under heavy use. Card stock meeting the performance requirements of the standard can be used not only for new cards, but also for replacing those which have deteriorated through use or other causes.

Z85.1-1969 is concerned only with performance. It does not specify materials to be used in making card stock. Thus the standard places no restrictions on the use of the new materials that may be developed, as long as they conform to the requirements for durability set forth in the standard. The standard's specifications include card dimensions, caliper, hole size and location, and the thickness of stock. Also included are requirements for the finish, surface, color and erasability, acidity and grain of stock, folding endurance, and residual chemicals.

The standard was developed by American National Standards Committee Z85, Standardization of Library Supplies and Equipment, under the sponsorship of the American Library Association. Forrest F. Carhart, Jr., director of the Library Technology Program of the ALA, is chairman of the committee. The work of the Committee was based on research carried out by the Library
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Technology Program with funds made available by the Council on Library Resources, Inc.

CANADIAN AND BRITISH LIBRARIANS TO SERVE ON DEWEY DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION
EDITORIAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Margaret E. Cockshutt, Associate Professor in the School of Library Science, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada, has been appointed for a six-year term. Miss Cockshutt has been active in the fields of cataloging and classification in Canada; she compiled Basic Filing Rules, published in 1961, and prepared an extensive paper on the Seventeenth Edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification in 1965. Miss Cockshutt replaces Edwin B. Colburn, formerly Director of Indexing Services, H. W. Wilson Company, who had served on the Committee since 1958.

Joel C. Downing, Deputy Editor of the British National Bibliography, of London, England, by special arrangement will represent the Library Association for a three-year period. The British National Bibliography is arranged in classified order using the Dewey Classification. Downing is presently chairman of the Library Association's Dewey Decimal Classification Subcommittee. These two members will bring viewpoints that should result in increased usefulness of the Dewey Classification in foreign countries.

In addition, Clare E. Ryan, Head of Technical Processing, New Hampshire State Library, has been appointed to a three-year term as the continuing American Library Association representative. Miss Ryan replaces Virginia Drewry, formerly Library Consultant, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia, who had served on the Committee for twelve years.

A fourth new member, Betty Croft, Head Cataloger, University of Illinois Library, will fill a one-year vacancy that was created by the resignation of Pauline A. Seely, formerly Director of Technical Services, Denver Public Library, Denver, Colorado. Miss Seely, after eleven years on the Committee, resigned when she became Assistant Executive Director of Forest Press, Inc. on May 1, 1970.

Besides the new members, the present Committee members are Doralyn J. Hickey, School of Library Science, University of North Carolina; Frances Hinton, Chairman, Free Library of Philadelphia; John A. Humphry, New York State Library; Mary Louise Mann, formerly Metropolitan School District, Washington Township, Indiana; Marietta D. Shepard, Pan American Union; and William J. Welsh, Library of Congress.

Constituted as a joint committee of the Lake Placid Club Education Foundation and the American Library Association, the Committee advises Forest Press, Inc., publisher of the Dewey Decimal Classification, on editorial matters.
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IN THE MAIL: BOOK FORM CATALOGS

Summer 1970: ADDENDUM, page 341

Following the first sentence on page 341 of the Summer 1970 issue of *LRTS* it should have been stated that:

The development of the questionnaire and the survey was carried out by the Book Catalogs Directory Subcommittee under its chairman, Miss Paula Kieffer. The general outline of the tabulation and the extent of elements covered by it emerged from the review sessions of the entire Book Catalogs Committee.—Ritvars Bregzis.

Summer 1970: ADDENDUM, page 349

It should be noted that Fairfax County Public Library includes monographs in its book catalog. The Library also publishes a film catalog using the sequential card system in cooperation with the Suburban Washington Library Film Service libraries—Alexandria Library, Arlington County Library, and Montgomery County Library.—William L. Whitesides, Director, Fairfax County Public Library, Fairfax, Virginia.
The following abstracts are based on those prepared by the Clearinghouse for Library and Information Sciences of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC/CLIS).

Documents with an ED number may be ordered in either microfiche (MF) or hard copy (HC) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. Orders must include ED number and specification of format desired. Payment must accompany orders totaling less than $5.00. For orders totaling less than $3.00, add $0.50 for handling.

Documents available from the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Virginia 22151, have CFSTI number and price.


Institution (Source): Rutgers, the State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, Graduate School of Library Service.


Related documents are ED 022 504, ED 028 810, and ED 028 811.

The broad objective of this investigation was to explore the potential and applicability of automatic methods for the indexing of drug-related information appearing in English natural language text, and to find out what can be learned about automatic indexing in general from the experience. More specific objectives were the development, implementation, and valuation of an indexing algorithm which will enable the computer to assign index terms to documents automatically. This final project report describes the automatic indexing method that was developed in which index tags for documents are generated by the computer. The computer scans the text of periodical articles and automatically assigns to them index terms with their respective weights on the basis of explicitly defined text characteristics. A machine file of document references with their associated index terms is automatically produced which can be searched on a coordinate basis for the retrieval of specified, drug-related information. A statistical evaluation of the output of the indexing algorithm and information concerning the system's ability to respond to specific queries are given.

Association of New York Libraries for Technical Services. ANYLTS' Cost Projections and Suggested Phase-In Schedules; A Report to the Board of Trustees. December 1969. 46p. ED 039 007. MF $0.65, HC $3.00.

Related document is ED 038 992.

This report, along with the separate report by Drake Sheahan/Stewart Dougall Consultants entitled “Book Processing Facility Design” should clear up two unfounded assumptions that (1) the actual processing of 2,500,000 volumes cannot be done at one location, and (2) the printing times required are too unrealistic to be handled on the computer peripheral equipment. The Drake Sheahan/Stewart Dougall report indicates that 2,500,000 volumes can be processed more efficiently in one location than is now being done in nineteen different locations or than could be done in six different
locations. Cost projections in this document are based on data in that report. Estimates of computer print-times indicate that all the reports which must be handled, as well as all the cards which must be produced, are well within the capability of the equipment contemplated. The assumptions and methodology used to project unit costs are included.


Institution (Source): Syracuse University, New York, School of Library Science.
Sponsor: Office of Education (DHEW), Bureau of Research.

The Library Education Experimental Project (LEEP) involved the establishment of a computer-based laboratory for library science students, utilizing the Library of Congress MARC (Machine-Readable Cataloging) magnetic tapes. Assignments in several classes (reference and bibliography, cataloging, and technical services) involved the use of these tapes and special purpose programs at the Syracuse University Computing Center. With the aid of these computer programs, over two hundred students in eight different courses (repeated for three semesters) were able to search and retrieve catalog records for current literature, to process their own cataloging assignments, or examine the characteristics of the Library of Congress cataloging. The laboratory's usefulness was evaluated by the students and the faculty at the end of each semester. The entire laboratory (computer program, data bases, class assignments, user manuals, etc.) has been fully described to other library schools at a special institute and via a newsletter and report series. Appended are the results of a survey of program languages and computing facilities available to library schools and a bibliography of LEEP publications.

Book Processing Facility Design. December 1969. 76p. ED 038 992. MF $0.65, HC $3.00.


Related document is ED 039 007.

The Association of New York Libraries for Technical Services (ANYLTS) was established to develop and run a centralized book processing facility for the public library systems in New York State. ANYLTS plans to receive book orders from the twenty-two library systems, transmit orders to publishers, receive the volumes from the publishers, print and attach pockets, print and insert catalog cards and book cards, apply spine labels, overjacket book covers, and ship processed books by library to the library system. The recommended processing operation will require a physical facility containing 18,800 square feet and is estimated to cost $56,640 per year. At a projected rate of $10,000 per man year (1976) and an average work force of sixty-six employed; labor will cost $650,000 per year. Equipment investment is estimated to be $221,000. The processing operation recommended is a manual system supplemented by two labor-saving mechanical devices.

Cady, Glee; et al. System Scope for Library Automation and Generalized Information Storage and Retrieval at Stanford University. February 1970. 152p. ED 039 153. MF $0.65, HC $3.00.

The scope of a manual-automated system serving the forty libraries and the teaching and research community of Stanford University is defined. Also defined are the library operations to be supported and the bibliographic information storage and
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retrieval capabilities to be provided in the system. Two major projects have been working jointly on library automation and information retrieval since 1968. One is the Bibliographic Automation of Large Library Operations on a Time-sharing System (BALLOTS) funded by the Office of Education, and the other is the Stanford Physics Information Retrieval System (SPIRES), funded by the National Science Foundation. The creation of a production system for library automation (BALLOTS II) and a generalized information storage and retrieval (SPIRES II) requires the continuation of a comprehensive system development process. This process has six phases: (1) preliminary analysis; (2) detailed analysis; (3) general design; (4) detailed design; (5) implementation; and (6) installation. The document represents the main output of the preliminary analysis phase encompassing the definition of goals, description of the user environment, analysis of the existing system, selection of the system scope, and establishment of gross technical feasibility.

Cooper, Marianne and Thayer, Candace W. Primary Journal Literature of Physics. December 1969. 35p. ED 038 996. MF $0.65, HC $3.00.

Four hundred ninety-one primary journals covered by "Physics Abstracts" in 1965 have been studied and their basic characteristics analyzed in terms of sponsorship; distribution by country, language, frequency, and coverage by secondary services other than "Physics Abstracts"; and the number of libraries holding each journal.


Institution (Source) : R and D Consultants Co., Los Altos, Calif.

Sponsor: Office of Education (DHEW), Bureau of Research.

A related document is ED 022 517.

The main problem considered in this project is whether it will be possible for civilization to cope with the increasing quantities of archival information that must be stored in libraries, and if so, whether traditional methods of identification and access will prove adequate for the task. It is concluded that unless the storage, transmission, and retrieval of information in library archives is automated, there is no hope of keeping pace with the exponential growth of libraries. Part one explores the problem of determining the relationship of library growth to the growth of those components of civilization that support and use libraries. Part two analyzes cost factors in maintaining and updating card catalogs. It was found that simple situations do not require automation, but that complex ones, which appear unavoidable for most large libraries, demand automation on economic as well as on access grounds.

Edelman, Hendrik. Shared Acquisitions and Retention System (SHARES) for the New York Metropolitan Area; A Proposal for Cooperation Among METRO Libraries. 1969. 29p. ED 039 906. MF $0.65, HC $3.00.

A study of the needs and potential of the Shared Acquisitions and Retention System (SHARES). Some preliminary recommendations are: (1) appoint a senior project officer; (2) organize a permanent machinery to coordinate acquisitions of expensive or bulky purchases among member libraries; (3) develop microfilm projects; (4) apply for funds from New York State, the federal government, or from foundations to enable the purchase of materials considered to be essential for the region or the nation; (5) study the necessity of support for specific subject collections; (6) develop long-range plans with regard to cooperation in acquisitions and possibly cooperative and/or centralized processing and (7) New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency (METRO) should contact libraries in its geographical area to take responsibility for the retention of last copies of certain types of material or of material in defined subject areas.
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Institution (Source): California University, Berkeley, Institute of Library Research.

Sponsor: California State Library, Sacramento.

Related documents are ED 036 305, ED 036 306 and ED 036 307, volumes I, II, and III of this report.

The CSL Serials Control System is aimed primarily at satisfying control and retrieval requirements of serials data for subscribers to the California State Library Processing Center (CSL-PC). The primary objective of the system is to provide a method of serials control which will be very flexible both in terms of input requirements and output capabilities. The system is also designed to accommodate the varying degrees of complexity which will occur in serial collections of different size and scope. The system is designed to function as an aid to serials librarians in maintaining control of their basic files in terms of ordering, subscription renewal, expected arrivals, claiming, binding, and holdings inventory. The machine portion of the system is designed to be compatible with emerging state and national standards. To further this goal a machine record has been constructed which strongly resembles the standard machine record for monographs (MARC) developed by the Library of Congress. Included in this report are sections which cover: (1) a general introduction; (2) technical design; (3) the conversion requirements for the CSL-PC serials records; and (4) a subscriber's guide which provides a detailed discussion of each data element used in this system.


A comprehensive, unannotated listing of important English language materials about, or related to, machine-readable cataloging (MARC), from the King report up to October 1969. Citations of a few materials published later have been added because of their considerable and primary interest. The United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom are the geographic limits. Citation sources included: (1) "Library Literature," (2) "Annual Review of Information Science and Technology," (3) "The Information Bulletin," (4) "Bibliography of Library Automation," and (5) miscellaneous bibliographies owned by the Library Education Experimental Project (LEEP).

*Instruction Manual for Catalog Production*. February 1970. 29p. ED 039 004. MF $0.65, HC $3.00.

Institution (Source): Ohio College Library Center, Columbus, Ohio.

An instruction manual for using the catalog production system developed by the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC). The manual has a threefold purpose: (1) to define the pack—describes the objective of the Catalog Profile Questionnaire and how to complete it, (2) to delineate request procedures—gives the membership various procedures to follow when asking for catalog cards from OCLC, and (3) to describe the precoded punch cards—contains a detailed explanation for completing the precoded punch cards. This catalog production system is capable of handling the individual needs of a member library which is likely to have a number of receiving catalogs, such as public catalog, official catalog, or shelf list within its system.


In 1967-68 the operating expenditures of the 2,370 college and university libraries covered in the survey totaled approximately $510 million. Of that total, $189 million
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or 37 percent was spent on books and other library materials, and $275 million or 54 percent was spent for salaries and wages. Binding and rebinding accounted for 3 percent of the total; all other operating expenditures, for 6 percent. Aside from microform holdings, some 305 million volumes were held by the libraries at the end of 1967-68. Over 2.5 million periodical titles were being received, while the number of serial titles other than periodicals was slightly more than 1 million. Of the 49,500 nonhourly personnel, 17,400 or 40 percent represented librarians, 5 percent were professional staff other than librarians, and 55 percent nonprofessionals. The assistance provided by students and hourly personnel amounted to nearly 32 million hours. The overall library expenditures taken as a percent of total institutional expenditures for educational and general purposes (including organized research) was 3.7 percent.


Institution (Source): Canadian Library Association, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Written specifically for school libraries, the principles given can be applied to any library system which houses books and other media together and has a single, unified list of holdings. Following some general rules for descriptive cataloging, the cataloging principles are given for such nonbook materials as: (1) filmstrips; (2) slides; (3) transparencies; (4) microforms; (5) pictures; (6) charts; (7) motion pictures; (8) phonodiscs; (9) phonotapes; (10) models; and (11) games. A knowledge of book cataloging and basic cataloging is presupposed. It is emphasized that the subject analysis systems chosen by a particular library for its print collection should be used for all media. As there is no consensus among librarians and audiovisual specialists regarding the proper terms to be applied to many media, a glossary of media designations is included in an attempt to standardize terminology.

Sherman, Don and Shoffner, Ralph M. *California State Library: Processing Center Design and Specifications. Volume I, System Description and Input Processing.* April 1969. 259p. ED 036 305. MF $0.65, HC $3.00.

Institution (Source): California University, Berkeley, Institute of Library Research.

Sponsor: California State Library, Sacramento.

Related documents are ED 036 306, ED 036 307, ED 036 308.

The scope of the California State Library-Processing Center (CSL-PC) project is to develop the design and specifications for a computerized technical processing center to provide services to a network of participating California libraries. Immediate objectives are: (1) retrospective conversion of card catalogs to a machine-form data base, compatible with MARC II; (2) continuing conversion of current cataloging to machine-form data base, compatible with MARC II; (3) incorporation of MARC II tapes, distributed by the Library of Congress, into the Center's data base for use in cataloging support; (4) production of book form catalogs; and (5) control of technical processing associated with serials, including ordering, check-in, claiming, binding, accounting, and holding lists. Following a definition of the scope of the project, future developments are discussed in a survey of plans and accomplishments of other cognate projects in the area of cooperative library networks. This report also includes: (1) the system description, an overview of system files and system logic for all operating functions; (2) a discussion of production and control, which focuses on the problem and recommended procedures of production and control of source documents during the conversion process; and (3) the conversion program.
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Institution (Source): California University, Berkeley, Institute of Library Research.
Sponsor: California State Library, Sacramento.

Related documents are ED 036 305, ED 036 307 and ED 036 308, volumes I, III, and IV of this report.

As part of the report on the California State Library Processing Center (CSL-PC) design and specifications, this volume covers: (1) file maintenance, a discussion of updating system files with new entries and MARC tapes; (2) authority verification, the correction and standardization of subject headings and author names; (3) the filing system for a book catalog, an analysis of bibliographic filing rules with a recommendation for computer implementation; (4) the format for a book catalog, containing specifications of entry formats and page layouts for book catalogs; and (5) the processing center organizational design, a description of the preliminary organization of the processing center and keying instructions.


Institution (Source): California University, Berkeley, Institute of Library Research.
Sponsor: California State Library, Sacramento.

Related documents are ED 036 305, ED 036 306 and ED 036 308, volumes I, II, and IV of this report.

As part of the report on the California State Library Processing Center design and specifications, this volume is a coding manual for the conversion of catalog card data to machine-readable form. The form is compatible with the national MARC system, while at the same time it contains provisions for problems peculiar to the local situation. This coding manual accommodates monographs only (as presently defined by MARC), but it is compatible with the serials system now being developed. Again following MARC, this manual deals only with works in the Roman alphabet. The "Anglo-American Cataloging Rules" have been used for identification and definition of catalog data, and the coding attempts to be consonant with these rules, as far as possible. The arrangement of the manual follows the division of the catalog card data into three fields: the A-Fields (which refer to the "body" or upper part of the card); the B-Fields (for notes, tracings, and other data in the lower part of the card); and the I-Fields (for added description). Each of these sections has its own introduction. Within the sections the arrangement is in alphabetical order by code letter. There is an initial section on general editing instructions that apply to all fields.


Assesses the programs of the Shared Acquisitions and Retention System (SHARES) project during its early phases of development. Emphasis is placed on the limited shared acquisitions and retention programs that SHARES has undertaken during its first year. Recommendations include: (1) development of beginning program of cooperative acquisitions; (2) emphasis on the development of richer resources (shared acquisitions) rather than emphasis of the more negative aspect of loss of infrequently used resources (shared retention); (3) cooperative purchasing of resources; (4) formation of a coordinating committee to advise and guide SHARES in resource development; and (5) production of a directory of unique resources available in the metropolitan area.
REVIEWS


Library Research needs all the friends it can get. Despite professional sanction, academic certification, and government support, much of what passes for research in librarianship is only a variation on the normative survey. For the most part, we seem unable to take advantage of the experience of other research-oriented disciplines, and to accumulate our own experience. Our literature continues to reflect work that is fragmented, parochial, and hyperspecific. Although there are library research courses offered in three-fourths of our accredited library schools, there are very few libraries which support a research position.

What is largely missing, both from the practicing librarians and the librarian-researchers, is an effective recognition of the need to build on and draw from the experience of scholars in the social and behavioral sciences. Reader in Research Methods for Librarianship edited by Mary Lee Bundy and Paul Wasserman should facilitate that recognition.

Aiming to help the reader "to genuinely perceive the nature of scholarship and its relationship to the goals of librarianship," the editors have culled twenty-eight articles (abridging only one) from the research literature of the social and behavioral sciences. Reader in Research Methods for Librarianship edited by Mary Lee Bundy and Paul Wasserman should facilitate that recognition.

The arrangement is straightforward. After a general "Introduction," the next three chapters cover "Conceptual Approaches," "Design," and "Methodology," underscoring for example, the importance of predictability, the nuances of the relationship between theory and practice, and the function of the hypothesis in research. The last two sections—"Research in Action" and "The Environment of Research"—are a potpourri of case studies, reminiscences by well-known practitioners of research, and policy statements, notably "Privacy and Behavioral Research," an important guideline from the President's Office of Science and Technology. Appendices include two bibliographies, three sample interview instruments, and an alphabetical list of contributors. There is no index.

Readers and anthologies must be evaluated on grounds such as the degree to which they fulfill the objectives stated by the editors; whether the juxtaposition and arrangement of pieces originally separated sheds new light on the subject; and whether the convenience is worth the cost. Not all of the contributors are of the caliber of David Riesman, Robert Merton, C. Wright Mills, and William F. Whyte, but with most choices, the editors have succeeded in insuring that the careful reader will perceive something of "the nature of scholarship," at least as it is practiced by prominent social scientists.

The second part of the objective—the perception of the relationship between scholarship and the goals of librarianship—is too much of a bur-
The deterioration of library materials, constant since libraries began, has accelerated to alarming proportions in 1969. Researchers have predicted that all paper-based records of this century, as well as those of earlier years, face imminent ruin. Without new and effective efforts for their preservation, most will not be usable in their present form in the next century. These are the opening lines of the introduction of this collection of papers on the “Deterioration and Preservation of Library Materials”, the topic chosen for the thirty-fourth annual conference of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago.

The first paper by Edwin E. Williams, associate librarian of Harvard University, gives the history of the problem. Not until the late W. J. Barrow made his startling predictions on the speed of the deterioration of our paper records and the Council on Library Resources made funds available for research and further studies has a real beginning been made in the search for solutions. The names and positions of the other authors demonstrate their competence to discuss the technical aspects of preservation. Bertie L. Browning, senior research associate, Institute of Paper Chemistry, discusses “The nature of paper”; others include Carl J. Wessel, chief scientist, John I. Thompson & Co.: “Environmental factors affecting the permanence of library materials”; George T. Eaton, assistant division head, Applied Photography Division, Research Laboratories, Eastman Kodak Company: “Preservation, deterioration, restoration of photographic images”; Joseph J. Thomas, vice-president and research director, S. C. Warren Co. (a division of Scott Paper Co.): “Alkaline printing papers: promise and performance” (Discussion by Greer Allen, manager, University of Chicago Printing Department); Leonard Shatzkin, vice-president for manufacturing, research, and development, McGraw-Hill Book Co.: “Publishing on permanent papers” (Discussion by Forrest F. Carhart, Jr., director, Office for Research and Development, and director, Library Technology Project, American Library Association); Harold W. Tribolo, manager, Department of Extra Binding, and hand binder/conservator, R. R. Donnelley & Sons, Co.: “Binding practice as related to the preservation of books” (Discussion by Kenneth W. Soderland, associate director for preparations, University of Chicago Library); Richard Daniel Smith, Fellow, University of Chicago, Graduate Library School: “New approaches to preservation” (Discussion by William K. Wilson, chief, paper evaluation
The need for trained conservators is great. There are not enough people in the field, nor are there adequate training facilities. These papers are important in showing progress being made in current research as well as indicating future areas of exploration. Librarians will have to continue to work closely with scientists, publishers, printers, binders, and others if they wish to leave usable records for the scholars and historians of the future.—Frances R. Ladd, Head, Catalog Department, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York.


The annual seminars of the Documentation Research and Training Centre in Bangalore consist of papers by faculty and students of the Centre, as well as librarians and documentalists in other parts of India and from abroad. Usually there are several central themes, though sometimes the seminar concentrates on one. While application studies are primarily directed toward the Colon Classification and Indian library experience, the seminar is not strictly limited either geographically or intellectually to these.

The general area, subject analysis for document finding systems, includes several student papers on various subjects, such as engineering, public health, psychology, and an area of physics. These follow a general pattern, giving a historical approach, list of significant discoveries as selected by the student, and formation of a pattern of organization for the subject. A group of papers relating to classification follow, some of which deal with problems in the Colon Classification in great detail. The longest paper in the book is one in this field by A. Neelameghan and M. A. Gopinath on "Subjects Presenting Relation Between Two Subjects, with Particular Relation to Phase Relation: Case Study." The third part of the general area on subject analysis covers computers and also subject headings. The two most interesting papers in the Seminar are here: "Postulate-based Subject Heading for Dictionary Catalogue System" (by Neelameghan and A. Bhattacharyya) and "Subject Heading and Document Finding System" (by S. R. Ranganathan). The former discusses the formation of subject headings from classification by permutation instead of using syndetic method, while the latter is a provocative and highly challenging article on getting subject headings from class numbers by chain procedure, as well as relationships to computerization. "Document finder" is what Ranganathan calls a computer when it is applied to information or other library purposes.

The main interest in the second major area, quantification and librametric studies, is Ranganathan's paper, "Librametry and Its Scope." This deals with statistical calculus for library science. "Librametrics" is the word he has coined equivalent to sociometrics, psychometrics, econometrics, and so on. Other papers in this area are not particularly appealing to American readers.

The third major area, manage-
ment of translation services, covers a topic of vital concern in India where there are some eighty languages in use. Various types of services and experiences are discussed.

The final section is a progress report for the DTRC Research Cell. It consists of three papers covering cataloging research, classification research, and librametry. The first is intriguing, especially because it carries a different viewpoint from that with which most of us are familiar. Librametry comes closer to our systems analysis than strictly statistics.

In general, the English in the seminar papers is clear and there are few typographical errors. A detailed knowledge of the Colon Classification is needed to appreciate fully some of the fine points discussed in papers relating to this discipline. The organization is good, usually consisting of definition of terminology (something American information science writers should copy), scope of paper, body of paper, abstract, and references and/or bibliography. Very often, however, there is no summary or conclusion, and in some of the papers this would help the reader grasp what the author believes is significant in his work.—Phyllis A. Richmond, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Brief Notice

The cataloging rules of 1967, the ninth edition of Sears, the seventeenth unabridged and ninth abridged edition of Dewey, the use of centralized services, and the use of more recent books for illustrations and examples—all are reflected in this new edition of an old standby. Also there is a new publisher; Scarecrow succeeds ALA. Typography is, therefore, somewhat inferior, and reproductions of catalog cards—e.g., LC cards with their type variations—leave something to be desired. It is intriguing that in the heyday of the computer and centralized processing a publisher believes there is still an honest buck to be made with a how-to-do-it book for small library cataloging.—PSD


This is intended as a textbook "suitable for that part of the Library Association part I paper 3 syllabus which deals with the subject approach" (p. 9). Clearly and thoughtfully it erases that always somewhat hazy line which we have traditionally and firmly drawn between the study of subject headings and the study of classification. There are four parts: Theory of information retrieval systems; Pre-Coordinate systems; Post-Coordinate systems; and Future prospects (including classification research and—of course—the computer).—PSD


This pamphlet is based on the results of a questionnaire sent in December 1965 to 120 addresses in thirty-two countries for which there were replies from 75 agencies in twenty-one countries. Contents include a summary of the replies and a discussion of the usefulness of international distribution of cards and the contribution which international standard-
ization of rules and some form of "cataloging at source" could make to such distribution. The goal of the pamphlet is praiseworthy, but 1965 was a long time ago. In this country, for instance, we have seen, among other things, NPAC, MARC, the proliferation of commercial and cooperative cataloging, and the revival of "cataloging at source." This "manual" is useful largely as a historical document.—PSD


The title of such a compilation as this raises a question of basic optimism: Should it be "Advances" or "Progress" or something neutral such as "Annual Review"? Also there is the problem of timeliness; the "Preface" is dated April 1969. Can a book hope to "keep up" in so rapidly moving a world as ours? In any event, this is an interesting review; somewhat uneven, perhaps, but probably later volumes will emphasize areas treated lightly in this one. Of particular interest in technical services are: George Piternick's thoughtful remarks on the machine and cataloging, Connie R. Dunlap's study of mechanization of acquisitions, Kelley L. Cartwright's critical survey of mechanization and filing rules, and Helen Welch Tuttle's plea for standards in technical services cost studies including the usual plug for TSCOR (Technical Services Cost Ratio).—PSD
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For complete facts and figures, write us.

We’re not suggesting that a book catalog will make your library rich. But the way costs are going it could be the only thing in your library keeping it from growing poor.

2500 Schuster Drive, Cheverly, Md. 20785
For a well rounded printing, storage and filing program use . . .

PERMALIFE®

TEXT • BOND • LEDGER • COVER • BRISTOL

The complete papers for the complete program

PERMALIFE is acid-free and is absolutely dependable. A life of several hundred to a thousand 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, BOND and LEDGER 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
NEW YORK CHICAGO LOS ANGELES

STANDARD'S
THOROGRAPHIC
PAPERS

STANDARD'S
THOROGRAPHIC
PAPERS
MCRS means Micrographic Catalog Retrieval System. And Micrographic Catalog Retrieval System means that you can get books in the hands of your patrons faster, easier and more economically.

MCRS is a rapid-access information retrieval system which:

☐ Reduces LC search time to under two minutes and cuts main entry search time in half.

☐ Keeps you ‘Depository Library current’ without requiring any filing of Depository Cards or Proof Slips.

☐ Eliminates filing errors by eliminating filing.

☐ Is so easy to operate that any staff member can begin to do effective searching after only a few minutes of instruction.

☐ Offers the capability of speedy economical in-house card production.

If you would like to know more about how the MCR System can speed technical processing in your library and save operating costs at the same time, use the convenient coupon below.
The French Lieutenant’s Woman
The Mouse on Wall Street
Pop Corn & Ma Goodness

are notable

The American Library Association presents three annual pamphlets that stimulate reading interest among adults, young adults, and children.

Notable Books 1969  36 titles
Notable Books Council, Adult Services Division, ALA

Best Books for Young Adults 1969  22 titles
Committee of the Young Adult Services Division, ALA

Notable Children’s Books 1969  64 titles
Book Evaluation Committee, Children’s Services Division, ALA

- all titles annotated
- suitable for imprinting
- folded to fit a #10 envelope

- leaflet format for distribution
- stimulates interest in current books and library use

- 50 copies—$3.00  
  100—$ 5.00  
  1,000—$37.50
  
  250—$11.00  
  5,000—$175.00  
  2,500—$90.00

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
50 East Huron Street • Chicago 60611
NEW EDITION OF AID HAS 90% MORE TERMS

AID-3 is a strikingly new work that promises to be even more valuable than its heavily consulted predecessors. This reliable reference source contains over 80,000 entries, almost twice as many as the second AID. Since page size has been increased to 8½" x 11" with two columns to the page, nearly four times more terms are scannable on each page. Issues of *New Acronyms and Initialisms*, supplements to AID-3, are planned for 1971 and 1972; each issue of *NAI* will add about 12,500 new entries. (Supplements are paperbound; $15.00 each.)

COVERAGE OF SPECIALIZED FIELDS MORE EXTENSIVE

The great advances made recently in such fields as data processing, aerospace technology, and military affairs have prompted the creation of numerous acronyms for new projects and equipment. The Apollo moon flights, for instance, introduced many new terms which were unknown when the second *AID* was published five years ago. These include BIG—Biological Isolation Garment; LOI—Lunar Orbit Insertion; and SRT—Sample Rock Container. Examples of other fresh material in AID-3 are the Motion Picture Association ratings (X, GP, etc.); the official Post Office two-letter designations for states; and the abbreviations for hundreds of religious orders.

"PREFABRICATED" TERMS GAIN POPULARITY

If they are to be successful, current projects, movements, and other types of activities must be quickly identified by the public. To achieve this end, eye-catching acronyms are often coined first and then fleshed out with more-or-less appropriate words. AID-3 presents many new examples of this type of acronym. For example, from the fields of ecology and conservation come such terms as GOO—Get Oil Out; YUK—Youth Uncovering Krud; and ENACT—Environmental Action. The great sex education debate has given birth to MOMS—Mothers for Moral Stability; SOS—Sanity on Sex; and POSSE—Parents Opposed to Sex and Sensitivity Training.

ENTRIES REFLECT CONTEMPORARY CONCERNS

All of modern man’s interests, aims, and problems are represented in the many new entries in AID-3 that refer to social and political groups and developments. For example, the flourishing Women’s Liberation Movement has fostered such groups as NOW—National Organization for Women; POWER—Professionals Organized for Women’s Equal Rights; andOWL—Older Women’s Liberation. Those opposed to the Movement have banded together to form such organizations as THEN—Those Hags Encourage Neuterism; WOW—Women Our Wonders; and MOM—Men Our Masters. These sample entries indicate the timely, essential nature of the vast amount of information contained in AID-3.

---

**Acronyms and Initialisms Dictionary—New Edition**

Available Immediately . . . xvi + 484 pages . . . $22.50
Subscribe Now for New Acronyms & Initialisms (1971 & 1972) . . . $15.00 each
All orders sent on our thirty-day free examination plan

Gale Research Company
BOOK TOWER • DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226
Contemporary Authors

THE BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHICAL GUIDE TO CURRENT AUTHORS AND THEIR WORKS

* 24 VOLUMES NOW IN PRINT
* 3,000 SKETCHES ANNUALLY
* CUMULATIVELY INDEXED

* A TOTAL OF 22,000 SKETCHES
* EARLY VOLUMES NOW FULLY REVISED
* NO DUPLICATION AMONG VOLUMES

* ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION $25.00

For the past eight years Contemporary Authors has drastically reduced the research problems of librarians, teachers, students, and general readers who have sought bio-bibliographical information on today's authors. Researchers from the junior high school to the university level consult CA first for concise, orderly details on writers whose works are being published, read, and discussed currently.

More than 75% of the listings in CA are not to be found in any other commonly used bio-bibliographical reference. Thus, CA is essential for up-to-date facts on thousands of minor, unrated, and first-time writers as well as major authors. Even authors listed in other biographical dictionaries are usually covered more thoroughly in CA.

CA tries to include as many legitimate authors as possible, rather than excluding all but the most famous. Living writers of fiction, general nonfiction, juvenile books, poetry, drama, biography, history, non-technical textbooks—in fact, all authors with commercially published works in English, except technical writers—are within the scope of CA. To insure maximum accuracy and interest, sketches are based on material secured directly from the authors themselves through questionnaires and personal correspondence.

Each sketch in CA includes complete personal and career data (covering pseudonyms, family background, present address, jobs and positions, memberships, awards and honors, etc.) plus these distinctive features:

Unabridged Bibliography: Lists all books written, edited, and compiled by an author, as well as those to which he has contributed, regardless of the number of titles

Sidelights: Comprised of the author's personal comments plus a cross-section of critical opinion; information in this section gives insights into the author's achievement, personality, writing habits, and interests

Critical and Biographical Sources: Includes books and articles which contain further details on an author's work and life

Work in Progress: With probable titles, publishers, and completion dates

Because the sketches are coherent, lively, and free of annoying abbreviations, they stimulate young readers' interest in authors and encourage the use of reference books. The volumes are bound to stand up well under constant use. Volumes 1-8 (originally published 1963-54) have been thoroughly revised, updated, and expanded, checked by the authors, and bound in two volumes (1-4, 5-8), each in one straight alphabet.

ALL THE VOLUMES ARE IN PRINT AND AVAILABLE IMMEDIATELY
BOOKS ARE SENT ON GALE'S 30-DAY FREE EXAMINATION PLAN

GALE RESEARCH COMPANY • BOOK TOWER • DETROIT, MICH. 48226