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Arthur Hugh Chaplin

Katharine L. Ball, Associate Professor
Library School, Ontario College of Education
University of Toronto

The Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification is awarded in 1963 to Arthur Hugh Chaplin for his masterly preparation of the "Draft Statement of Principles" which showed creative insight into universal conditions of bibliographical entry and served as a basis for international agreement reached at the IFLA Conference on Cataloguing Principles, 1961.

Hugh Chaplin

It is always unfair to attribute to any one person the success of a general movement, but no one who has followed the progress of international co-operation in cataloging, which culminated in the Paris Conference of 1961, can fail to acknowledge the outstanding contribution made by Arthur Hugh Chaplin. His activities in this field started in 1954, when he was appointed Executive Secretary of the IFLA Working Group on Coordination of Cataloguing Principles. In this capacity he was responsible for collecting and summarizing existing material on anonyma and works of corporate authorship, the topics which had been assigned for study to the Working Group. His talent for selecting essential points and synthesizing the work of many people was revealed in the report of this project published in Libri in 1956.

At this time Hugh Chaplin was Deputy Keeper of Printed Books in the British Museum, in charge of the cataloging operations of that great library. He had come to the British Museum as Assistant Keeper in 1930.
after short periods in the University Libraries of Reading and Belfast. Although his mastery of modern languages is well known to those who have heard him in action as an interpreter, his honours B.A. from the University of London was in Latin and was followed by the Diploma of the School of Librarianship and Archives at University College, London. In 1959 he was appointed Keeper of Printed Books and is now in charge of the public services of the British Museum Library.

While the IFLA Working Group was studying the difficult and controversial points of cataloging in Europe, the American Library Association had embarked on a thorough revision of its cataloging code. Liaison between the two groups was maintained by correspondence, but a closer association was provided when Hugh Chaplin was invited to take part in the Institute of the University of Chicago Graduate Library School on “Towards a Better Cataloging Code.” The stimulation afforded by his paper and his participation in the discussions at the Institute and at the meetings of the Catalog Code Revision Committee provided great incentives toward closer relations between European and American catalogers. His ability to cut through a mass of detail to the essential points and his clear and well-reasoned statements of the European position greatly impressed his American colleagues. It was as an old friend that he returned to the United States in 1958 to take part in the Stanford Institute on Code Revision.

In 1959 the Council on Library Resources granted sufficient funds to assemble a small conference in London to explore the possibilities of success of a full-scale international conference on cataloging principles. The nucleus of this preliminary conference was the IFLA Working Group, and the organization was in the capable hands of Sir Frank Francis, the Chairman, and Hugh Chaplin, the Executive Secretary. The statements from which this conference worked and the accurate reports of each session bore the mark of Hugh Chaplin’s clear mind and sound judgment.

The success of these preliminary meetings encouraged the Council on Library Resources to support the International Conference, which was held in Paris in 1961. The Organizing Committee was appointed with Hugh Chaplin in the key position of Executive Secretary. The members of the Committee attended the McGill Institute in Montreal in 1960 and held several other meetings in European cities. An office was set up in London and excellent arrangements made for papers to be prepared on the main points of discussion. These papers were circulated and comments collected from all the countries participating in the Paris Conference. At this point Hugh Chaplin again demonstrated his outstanding ability to reduce a mass of information and opinion to concise, logical, and lucid form. The Preliminary Statement he prepared formed the basic working document for the Conference and was a really masterly achievement without which the Conference could not have reached such positive results. During the sessions his attention to detail was matched by his breadth of vision to ensure the smooth and amicable functioning of the entire Conference.
Until 1960 the winner of the Margaret Mann Citation had to be an American citizen and a member of the American Library Association. In the meeting at which these limitations were removed, one well-known librarian stated that the Citation would become the ‘Nobel Prize’ in the field. It seems fitting that the first non-American to gain this award should be Hugh Chaplin whose gifts and activities have been used to foster international agreement among catalogers.

NOMINATION FOR MARGARET MANN CITATION

Nominations for the 1964 award of the Margaret Mann Citation may be sent any time before the first of January, to the Chairman of this Award Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section of the ALA-RTSD. The nomination should be accompanied by a brief résumé of the achievement on which it is based.

The Margaret Mann Citation is awarded for “significant professional achievement in the fields of cataloging and classification.” The achievement may have been a notable publication, an outstanding contribution to the activities of professional cataloging associations, introduction of new techniques of recognized importance, or outstanding work in the area of teaching. The achievement or contribution should have occurred or culminated within the last five years. It is not necessary that the nominee be an American librarian or a member of the Section.

Esther J. Piercy, Chairman
Margaret Mann Citation Committee
Enoch Pratt Free Library
Baltimore 1, Maryland
IN AN ARTICLE appearing in the Fall 1962 issue of this journal, Mrs. MacQuarrie expressed the opinion that, "Eventually standards of performance should be established for technical services by size and type of library." It is our intent to present here—using data obtained in the Technical Services Division (TSD) of University of Denver Libraries—a detailed analysis that may contribute toward the setting of such standards.

The purpose of this project has been to determine, in TSD operations and aside from purchase price, the cost of placing a book on the shelves ready for use. The present study is limited to TSD procedures concerned with in-print non-fiction books only. Plans are under way to enlarge the project to include out-of-print materials, serials, gifts and exchanges, recataloging, and non-book materials. This should appear as a "Studies in Librarianship" under the University of Denver Graduate School of Librarianship imprint.

As a matter of background: University of Denver Libraries has considered itself a medium-sized facility, whose current holdings are 460,000 volumes. Over the decade of the fifties the Libraries went through the vicissitudes of, first, a sharply decreasing budget, then a rising one, with the resulting dips and rises in book budget and attendant harassments for order, cataloging, and preparations entities. The $55,695 for books in 1950/51 sank to $37,754 in 1954/55 and rose back to $47,041 for 1958/59 and $43,482 for 1959/60. For the start of a new decade, 1961/62, a tremendous boost to $138,024 was received. During the six periods mentioned, available staff was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Book Budget</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950/51</td>
<td>$ 55,695</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954/55</td>
<td>37,754</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958/59</td>
<td>47,041</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959/60</td>
<td>43,482</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960/61</td>
<td>84,231</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961/62</td>
<td>138,024</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Report on Work Measurement-Cost Analysis by a Seminar in Research Methods under the direction of Dr. Don Wynar, Ass't. Professor, Graduate School of Librarianship, University of Denver. Participants: Harold R. Malinowsky, William F. Hayes, Fred Schmidt, Jr., M. V. Donne.
During the same decade, regrouping of departments and rearrange-
m ents in the physical plant were made: marking, repair, and binding were
combined into one administrative unit; furniture was rearranged
and partitions removed for better work flow; and a Multilith for reproduction
of catalog cards was introduced. In 1958/59, the heretofore separate cata-
log and order departments were combined to form the present Technical
Services Division, but with, at that time, only one administrator. Shortly
after, use of a special request form and a multiple order form was initiated.
Then, feeling that all possible had been done in making maximum use of
available physical plant and equipment, and with the prospect of so great
an increase in book budget in 1960/61 ($40,749 over the 1959/60 figure
or almost 100%), TSD wished to take stock of how well its available per-
sonnel were being utilized. Thus, during 1960/61 a time and motion study
was conducted in that division. Personnel were briefed in the aims of the
study and provided with a Manual for Time and Motion Studies.2 The
manual is modeled after the one set up by W. O. Pierce for use in the
Public Library Inquiry.3 It contains definitions of each break-down of an
operation and instructions on filling out daily and monthly records. Sam-
ple diagrams are provided within the manual.

This report is organized in three sections, in the natural progression
in which a book is usually processed. In the course of our presentation we
have used the following terms which are applicable to all three sections—
order, cataloging, and technical preparations and supply:

(P) indicates professional duties; (C) clerical duties. Professional pro-
cedures are defined as those procedures requiring special knowledge
acquired through professional education, and clerical are those which call
for some special training, such as typing or filing, but require no profes-
sional library education. An unusual situation applies at the University
Libraries in the matter of clerical help, as Library School students are
employed as verifiers. They may reasonably be expected to have greater
interest in the work and consequently may do a more efficient job than
the average student assistant.

(D) represents direct time and cost figures (used where it was possible
to ascertain the number of work units per process); and (I) stands for
indirect time and cost figures, used for those processes which do not lend
themselves to simple computation; results for (I) were arrived at by divid-
ing total amount of time spent in each process by the total number of new
titles involved in the time period covered. It will be noted that time has
been measured in minutes and seconds; cost is computed in cents and
hundredths of cents. Administrative salaries are figured at $4.07 per hour,
professional at $2.85 and clerical (including student assistants) at $1.25.

Terms not common to all of the sections are explained with their par-
ticular agency. Care has been taken to depict all data for each department
as lucidly as possible and in a manner consistent with library terminology.
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Order Department

The Order Department is the administrative unit of the Technical Services Division which receives requests from faculty and other members of the staff, processes them, and orders all books for the University Libraries. Requests are first received by the Head of the TSD who quickly evaluates and sends them on to the Order Department; some, for varying reasons, are held for further judgment or are rejected. Verification by the order personnel is done first against the official catalog, then bibliographical aids (mostly the National Union Catalog) and, finally, departmental files, before ordering. All orders processed are fully verified.

Two files are kept for current material on order; one is an alphabetical file by main entry and the other is chronological by date of order. In addition, (for verification purposes) a current receipt file is maintained showing books which are currently in the cataloging processes, and a standing-order file is kept for incomplete sets and serials.

Department personnel receive all shipments of books, checking them for physical condition, and the invoices for correctness of title and edition. Slips are then pulled from the on-order files and placed with the books and processed for funding. The books with original request forms, work slips, and LC cards, if received, are then placed on cataloging shelves in three groups: (1) those that have LC cards physically present, (2) those with LC cards ordered but not received, and (3) those for which no LC cards have been ordered. Invoices are then prepared for payment.

There are two forms specifically designed for use in the TSD. First is a two-part request form, each part of which is slightly smaller than a postal card. This form was designed for faculty and staff to use in making requests for books and other publications. The left half provides for all of the usual imprint information plus price, number of copies, name of person initiating the request, fund to be utilized, LC order number, and verifier work space. The reverse of this portion has, for the verifier’s convenience and uniformity, spaces listing bibliographic tools and files to be checked. The right-hand portion is used for notification to the initiator of the request that the book has been received and where it may be located in the library.

The second form is a six-part multi-carboned order form (multiple order form) consisting of: a white original order slip to be sent to the publisher or jobber, a pink slip which is used for the on-order file and later for funding, another white slip for use as a cataloging work slip, a yellow slip for ordering LC cards, a second yellow slip for LC on-order file, and a heavier white card for use as a temporary official catalog file card. Each portion of the form has headings appropriate to its particular use.

Clerical personnel of the Department during the time and motion study consisted of a full-time secretary, two full-time clerical verifiers and one half-time (student) typist. It should be noted that professional labor costs were computed somewhat higher in this section due to the fact that these duties were then performed by the Head of the Division.
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The following table for the Order Department relates to only a three month period (February–May 1960) of the entire time and motion study.

### TABLE I

**SELECTION AND ACQUISITION (Direct)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths of Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (P) Selection of Books</td>
<td>1 30</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (P) Evaluating and Approving</td>
<td>0 54</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests for Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (C) Verification and Processing</td>
<td>11 48</td>
<td>24.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Order Requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (C) Typing of Multiple Order</td>
<td>6 33</td>
<td>14.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td>20 45</td>
<td>54.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DEFINITIONS OF WORK ACTIVITIES IN TABLE I

1. Selection of Books—Acting upon faculty and staff requests, considering them against present holdings and in relation to weak spots in the book collection, and initiating requests in neglected areas.

2. Evaluating and Approving Requests for Processing—Considering initially all requests and grouping them into (a) rush orders, (b) regular orders, or (c) hold orders. Other judgments particular to individual circumstances are also involved in this process.

3. Verification and Processing of Order Request—Stamping request with date received, establishing main entry from standard sources, searching for usual order information, checking against library holdings and processing files.

4. Typing of Multiple Order Forms—Including typing, separating, filing of the multiple form, and mailing appropriate copies.

### TABLE II

**SELECTION AND ACQUISITION (Indirect)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths of Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (P) Professional Reading</td>
<td>0 30</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (C) Maintaining Files</td>
<td>0 21</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (C) Correspondence</td>
<td>1 18</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (C) Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td>2 21</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DEFINITIONS OF WORK ACTIVITIES IN TABLE II

1. Professional Reading—Reading of reviews and announcements of newly-published items, keeping in mind the needs and limitations of the library.

2. Maintaining Files—Filling and maintaining good order in the secretarial files kept in the Order Department.

3. Correspondence—All routine correspondence relating to the selection and ordering of books.

4. Miscellaneous—All other less descriptive duties relating to the selection and ordering of books.
### TABLE III
**RECEIVING SHIPMENTS AND BILLING (Direct)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths of Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (C) Checking in Books</td>
<td>3 54</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8.11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFINITION OF WORK ACTIVITY IN TABLE III**

1. Checking in Books—Checking in of all books in accordance with seventeen steps, which are outlined in the manual, *Standard Operating Procedure for the Order Department*.

### TABLE IV
**RECEIVING SHIPMENTS AND BILLING (Indirect)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths of Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (P) Following up Difficult Items</td>
<td>1 30</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (P) Approving Bills for Payment</td>
<td>0 30</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (C) Following up Overdue Orders</td>
<td>0 42</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (C) Unpacking and Sorting Shipments, Mail, etc.</td>
<td>3 00</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (C) Preparation of Bills for Payment and Recording Data</td>
<td>2 24</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (C) Correspondence, Miscellaneous, etc.</td>
<td>1 48</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 54</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFINITIONS OF WORK ACTIVITIES IN TABLE IV**

1. Following up Difficult Items—Including checking files to locate missing items or more difficult overdue orders, checking invoices and letters for further information, and deciding upon the action to be taken in each case.
2. Approving Bills for Payment—Examining the information presented by the staff, including the invoice, correspondence, and any other necessary information pertinent to payment of bills, and approving them.
3. Following up Overdue Orders—The pink portion of multiple order form for routine overdue orders is pulled, and a follow up form is sent to publishers at the end of one month for rush orders and three months for regular orders.
4. Unpacking and Sorting Shipments, Mail, etc.—Opening and sorting of mail and packages in accordance with the instructions given in the manual, *Standard Operating Procedure for the Order Department*.
5. Preparation of Bills for Payment and Recording Data—Including the processing of invoices for books and recording of budgetary statistics in accordance with instructions contained in the manual, *Standard Operating Procedure for the Order Department*.
6. Correspondence, Miscellaneous, etc.—Including correspondence concerning damaged shipments, incorrect shipments, and incorrect invoices, plus all other less descriptive duties relating to receiving shipments and billing.
### TABLE V
ORDER DEPARTMENT SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths of Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.* Selection and Acquisition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.* Selection and Acquisition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Receiving Shipments and Billing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*D- Direct; I- Indirect

**Cataloging Department**

The Cataloging Department is the administrative unit in the Technical Services Division which does the cataloging and classification for the entire library system. A divided catalog—author-title and subject—is for the public use, and an official catalog and shelf list are in the catalog department. The Dewey Classification is used, except in special subjects, such as education, where the Library of Congress scheme is used.

The following general procedure is used in the Cataloging Department. The books are distributed to the catalogers by broad subject division and may or may not be accompanied by LC cards, routing slips and faculty notice cards (right portion of request form). The cataloger checks the LC card, if there is one, against the book, noting discrepancies on a work slip. If there is no LC card, the book is located in the LC catalog. If no main entry can be found, then the cataloger does original cataloging.

After checking the book, the left-hand portion of the request form now in the in-process file is dated and initialed. This is an alphabetical file for books which have been sent to the Cataloging Department from the Order Department. The cards remain here until permanent catalog cards have been filed. The classification number and book number are assigned and added to the work slip. The cataloger then makes a temporary shelf-list card and files it in the shelf list. Unless the LC card is to be used unchanged, the cataloger prepares an official card or indicates any changes that have to be made on the LC card, including added entries.
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The title page of the book is marked with the call number and author-title designation. The book is then sent to Marking. The work slip goes to the typist who prepares the Multilith master which is checked by the cataloger and sent to the Reproduction Department. Upon return, the subject heading and added entries are typed in by the clerk. The cards are revised by the cataloger and filed on top of the rod in the public catalog by the clerical. A professional cataloger files the shelf list and official cards and revises the filing done in the public catalog.

The period of the time and motion study for the Cataloging Department was April–December, 1960, and April–June, 1961. The staff of the Cataloging Department consisted of three professional, three full-time clerical, and four part-time clerical assistants. In Table VII category 4—Administrative Professional—the salary was based at $3.26.

The following tables present the factors that were involved in the cataloging of one book title. Some of the procedures were changed during the time and motion study; however, this change did not affect the results of the tables.

**TABLE VI**

**PROFESSIONAL CATALOGING (Direct)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths of Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (P) With LC Cards</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (P) Without LC Cards</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>118.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (P) With LC Cards not here</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (P) Revising Cards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (P) Shelf Listing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (P) Typing Cards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFINITIONS OF WORK ACTIVITIES IN TABLE VI**

1. Descriptive and subject cataloging of titles with LC cards—Comparing card with book, making corrections, determining and establishing additional added entries, determining acceptability of subject headings, determining cross references, classification, and book number.

2. Descriptive and subject cataloging of titles without LC cards—Physical description of book; establishing main entry, added entries, subject heading, cross references, classification number, and book number.

3. Descriptive and subject cataloging of titles with LC cards not here—Procedure the same as in 1. except the book is compared with the LC Catalog entry. LC cards are available but the cataloger does not have them in hand.

4. Proof reading, determining if directions for shelf list and tracings have been followed, and checking of official card by person doing shelf listing.

5. Filing of permanent shelf-list card and final revision of classification and book numbers.

6. Typing official cards, temporary shelf list cards, and work slips.
The average of 1., 2., and 3. indicates the average time and cost of descriptive and subject cataloging of one title. The figures were determined by working with actual titles cataloged in each category. In order to find the average descriptive and subject cataloging costs of one title, it was necessary to find the percentage of all books cataloged that each of categories 1., 2., and 3. represented. This was found to be 69 per cent for 1., 19 per cent for 2., and 12 per cent for 3. The time and costs in each category were multiplied by these percentages. The results were added to give the subtotal or the average time and cost of descriptive and subject cataloging of one title.

### TABLE VII

#### PROFESSIONAL CATALOGING (Indirect)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (P) Recataloging and Reclassification</td>
<td>1 44</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (P) Cancellations</td>
<td>00 8</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (P) Maintenance of Catalogs</td>
<td>1 18</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (P) Administrative Professional</td>
<td>12 36</td>
<td>68.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (P) Miscellaneous Cataloging</td>
<td>3 00</td>
<td>14.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (P) Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8 36</td>
<td>40.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTALS**

27 22 138.85

**DEFINITIONS OF WORK ACTIVITIES IN TABLE VII**

1. Any step in descriptive and subject cataloging, making changes on title page of book and shelf list, and making work slip for clerical.
2. Pulling or stamping shelf list, stamping book, and making work slip to have stamp on cards changed or mark shelf list so set will be pulled and destroyed.
3. Occasional revision of filing in author-title and subject public catalog and maintaining current receipt and LC order files.
4. Planning of new policies, preparing reports, interviewing, instruction of new staff, conferences, staff meetings, and other necessary administrative professional duties. A detailed breakdown of these duties will be included in Studies in Librarianship.
5. Revising of LC subject headings, cross references, and LC schedules, certain searching of cards and books, correspondence, and any other non-stated professional duties.
6. Illness, vacation, rest periods, personal business and appointments.

Recataloging, reclassification, and cancellations have been included, since there are times when an old title has to be recataloged and reclassified as a result of working with a new title; and an older edition may be cancelled when the new edition is purchased. As can be seen from Table VII, the time and cost are small but in some libraries these figures may be much higher. The time of recataloging and reclassifying per new title was calculated by dividing the total number of new titles cataloged into the actual time spent recataloging and reclassifying. The same procedure was followed for cancellations. For the period of this time and motion study, 347 titles were recataloged and reclassified and 198 titles cancelled.
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### TABLE VIII
Clerical (Direct)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (C) Filing Cards</td>
<td>5 42</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (C) Pulling Cards</td>
<td>2 42</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (C) Making Card Changes</td>
<td>3 54</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (C) Typing Card Sets</td>
<td>4 36</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (C) Typing Multilith Masters</td>
<td>3 48</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (C) Typing LC Card Orders</td>
<td>00 30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (C) Filing LC Card Orders</td>
<td>1 00</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (C) Pulling LC Card Orders</td>
<td>00 30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. (C) Filing Current Receipts in Process</td>
<td>00 48</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (C) Pulling Current Receipts in Process</td>
<td>00 36</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTALS** 24 6 48.45

**DEFINITIONS OF WORK ACTIVITIES IN TABLE VIII**

1. Filing cards in the author-title, subject, and official catalogs.
2. Pulling cards from the author-title, subject, and official catalogs.
3. Making changes on the cards pulled from the author-title, subject, and official catalogs.
4. Typing sets, temporary shelf-list cards, and temporary cards for the public catalog according to instructions as shown on the work slip.
5. Typing Multilith stencils according to instructions as indicated in manual for typists.
6. For those orders that were not placed at the time the book was ordered; locating LC number, typing the order in duplicate, and sending the orders.
7. Filing LC order duplicates in the LC order file.
8. When LC orders arrive, pulling duplicates from the LC order duplicate file.
10. Pulling the current receipts from the in-process file according to temporary shelf list and giving the pulled current receipts to Head, Technical Services Division.

Table VIII shows that the clericals are not doing any pre-cataloging for the professional cataloger. This has been changed recently. Well-qualified and experienced clericals are now doing some pre-cataloging and some actual cataloging.

### TABLE IX
Clerical (Indirect)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (C) Sorting Mail</td>
<td>1 54</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (C) Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTALS** 5 6 10.25
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DEFINITIONS OF WORK ACTIVITIES IN TABLE IX
1. Sorting all mail that comes directly to the Cataloging Department.
2. All other work related to routine procedures in the Cataloging Department.

TABLE X
CATALOGING DEPARTMENT SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths of Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Cataloging</td>
<td>(P) 16 Min. 6 Sec.</td>
<td>76.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) 24 Min. 6 Sec.</td>
<td>48.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Cataloging</td>
<td>(P) 27 Min. 22 Sec.</td>
<td>138.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) 5 Min. 6 Sec.</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>72 Min. 40 Sec.</td>
<td>273.94 OR $2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mechanical Preparations and Supplies

The Marking and Binding Unit is responsible for the mechanical preparation of materials received by the library. After books are received by the Marking and Binding Unit, the personnel involved bind the book if necessary (paperbacks, etc.), type the required identification of the book on the card and book pocket, paste the card pocket and date—due slip inside the back cover, property stamp the book in a prescribed manner, mark the call number on the spine, shellac, and then route the book to the main or divisional libraries.

Catalog card sets are reproduced on an A.B. Dick Offset Duplicator (popularly known as the Multilith process) one day per week according to standard procedures. Card stock consists of medium-weight, 100% new rag, cream-white, pre-punched library cards purchased from Walker-Goulard-Plehn & Co., New York, in quantities of 100,000 units @ $3.90 per/M.

During the period of the study, non-professional personnel of the Marking and Binding Unit included one full-time clerk, who was in charge, and one half-time student assistant. The personnel of duplicating services consisted of a Multilith supervisor, who was responsible for the duplication of the card sets, as well as for the production of the two-part order request forms used by the Library; an assistant operator, and one student assistant. (In addition to the work performed for the Library, this Department was responsible for all other printing and duplicating work required by the University.

All major supplies used by the TSD are requisitioned by the Order Department through the University's Central Purchasing Office. Miscellaneous supplies are requisitioned through the Central Purchasing Office or through the University's warehouse if the supplies are on hand.

Volume 7, Number 4, Fall 1963
The Library has a miscellaneous budget number with a certain amount of money set aside for these supplies. Costs for depreciation, plant and equipment improvement, and utilities have not been considered in this study.

The following tables represent the costs involved in the mechanical preparations of new books and of supplies incurred during the period of the study (July, 1960–June, 1961)

### TABLE XI
**MECHANICAL PREPARATIONS (Direct)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths of Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (C) Mechanical Preparation and Processing</td>
<td>4 00</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (C) Multilithing of Card Set</td>
<td>0 48</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 48</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFINITIONS OF WORK ACTIVITIES IN TABLE XI**

1. Typing of card and pocket, marking of call number on spine, pasting card pocket and date due slip inside back cover, property stamping, shellacking, and routing to main or divisional library.

2. Multilithing at a rate of 75 sets of (8) cards per hour. Cost includes the labor of the Multilith Supervisor @ $2.20 per hour (3.66¢ per min.); of the Assistant Multilith Operator @ $1.41 per hour (2.35¢ per min.); and of the clerical assistant @ $1.25 per hour (2.68¢ per min.).

### TABLE XII
**MECHANICAL PREPARATIONS (Indirect)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths of Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (P) Decisions on Mechanical Preparations and Processing</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (C) Binding of New Books</td>
<td>0 48</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (C) Maintaining Records</td>
<td>1 00</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 00</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFINITIONS OF WORK ACTIVITIES IN TABLE XII**

1. Administration and supervision of book preparation which concerns marking, binding, routing and all other aspects involved.

2. Binding paperback titles in Gaylamount Pamphlet Binders and sending selected paperback books to bindery.

3. Maintaining records of the mechanical preparations involved and all other related work.
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### TABLE XIII
**SUPPLY COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply Units</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths of Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Materials for Marking and Binding</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Order and Request Forms and Miscellaneous Supplies</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. L. C. Cards</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Multilith Master</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Blank Catalog Cards for Multilithing</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bibliographic Subscription Costs</td>
<td>21.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFINITIONS OF SUPPLY UNITS IN TABLE XIII**

1. Cost of the following materials used in the marking and binding department: (Ordered from Gaylord)
   Magic Mend liquid adhesive, Gaylo general purpose adhesive, Magic mending tape, double-stitched binder, marking board, binding bone, electric erasers, white adhesive cloth, end paper, thread, thimbles, needles, bookcraft saw, pastecloth, glass paper weights, lacquer thinner, Gaylamount Pamphlet Binders, transfer paper (black and white), Spraylon, desk tape dispensers, Mystic tape (maroon, white, navy, blue, brown), Bookcraft folders, paste brushes, drill points, scissors, Gaylamount picture envelopes, electric stylus;
   (Ordered from Demco)
   Radiant White lettering ink, black India ink, Norbond library plastic adhesive, Fastape, Scotch plastic mending tape, removable blade steel erasers, book pocket strips (purchased in quantities of 5,000 units @ $2.35 per/M), Paramount book pockets (purchased in quantities of 50,000 units @ $5.90 per/M), pressure-sensitive call number labels (purchased in quantities of 2,000 units @ $2.25 per/M);
   (Ordered from Black Star Products)
   Flag-its (green, dark blue, orange, black, red, light blue)

2. Cost of the following supplies used in the catalog and order department: Multiple-order forms (purchased in quantities of 100,000 units @ $10.58 per/M from Moore Business Forms, Denver), two-part order request forms (printed by the Duplicating Services Department), practice cards—medium weight, pre-punched, blue and salmon (ordered from Gaylord in quantities of 1,000 units @ $3.45 per/M), catalog guide cards—buff-colored (Gaylord), tilted tab guides (Gaylord), non-glare celluloid protectors (Demco), regular, expanded, and special envelopes for multiple-order forms (Rockmount Envelopes, Denver);
   The following miscellaneous supplies (ordered through the central purchasing office and warehouse):
   Paper: onion skin, yellow, blue, green, pink, bond, letterhead, memo (long and short), carbon, adding machine, duplicating;
   Envelopes: long and short, interoffice; pencils, typewriter ribbons and erasers, stamp pads and ink, staples, paper clips, mailing labels, time sheets (for student assistants).

3. Average cost of first L.C. card, taking into consideration the cost of those which have two or more cards to complete main entry.

4. Cost of Plastiplate Multilith stencils (purchased from Remington Rand in 90 box units—100 sheets per box, 5 stencils per sheet—@ $6.56 per/box).

5. Cost per set of 8 of medium weight, 100% new rag, cream-white, pre-punched library cards (purchased from Walker-Goulard-Plehn, New York, in quantities of 100,000 units @ $3.90 per/M).
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6. The figure quoted concerns the annual subscription costs of the following bibliographical tools directly concerned in the processing of books (the cost of purchasing the basic sets, i.e., the L.C. Catalog, is not included):

*American Book Publishing Record* (10 copies used as a review media); *Australian National Bibliography; Bibliob; Books in Print; Bookseller; British National Bibliography; C.B.I.; Deutsche Bibliographie; Fachbuch-Systematik; L.C. Catalog of Books; Subjects; National Union Catalog; P.T.L.A.; Paper Bound Books in Print; Publisher's Weekly; Reference Catalog of Current Literature; Subject Guide to Books in Print; Textbooks in Print; Whitaker's Cumulative Book List.

### TABLE XIV

#### MECHANICAL PREPARATIONS AND SUPPLY SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Time in Minutes and Seconds</th>
<th>Costs in Cents and Hundredths of Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Mechanical Preparations</td>
<td>(C) 4 48</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Mechanical Preparations</td>
<td>(P) 0 12</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>6 48</td>
<td>15.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

From the foregoing break-down table it will be noted that each phase of Technical Services has, to our knowledge, been dealt with in considerably more detail than in other studies which have been published to date. To produce complete figures for the Technical Services Division will require similar procedures in areas referred to earlier, i.e., out-of-print materials, serials, gifts and exchanges, etc.

Summarizing results from departmental figures indicated in the tables: all Order Department activities per book took 37 minutes, 54 seconds and cost $1.03 for professional and non-professional time; in the Cataloging Department a cost of $2.74 for 72 minutes 40 seconds resulted; Mechanical Preparations and Supply activities totalled 6 minutes 48 seconds at a cost of 56¢ per book. Table XV shows the overall total cost of preparing a new non-fiction title at the University of Denver Libraries to be $4.33.

In studying the tables, it is believed that some changes could be made, especially in the Cataloging Department. Procedures in the Order Department are usually defined quite clearly so that any increased efficiency

---
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Table XV

Technical Services Division
Final Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hrs.</td>
<td>Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Department</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging Department</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Preparation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

would be involved in the flow of work rather than in changing the type of work from professional to clerical.

Table VI indicates that the time for cataloging a new title with L.C. cards is much faster than original cataloging resulting in a lower cost. A further saving in descriptive and subject cataloging “without L.C. cards” and “with L.C. cards not here” could be realized by having well-trained clericals do most of the precataloging on work slips. This would include checking L.C. catalogs, comparing book with L.C. cards, checking subject headings, and verifying classification numbers. The catalogers would then check the work slip and make any needed additions. Furthermore, typing, revising, and shelf listing cards on the part of the professional staff could be eliminated to a certain extent by using a well-trained clerical to file cards on top of the rod and another to do the revising. Maximum use of clerical assistants could also reduce card typing by the professional librarian to a minimum.

This is all open for discussion, and any comments would be appreciated. There is definitely a need for re-evaluation of the duties of the professional cataloger and of the clerical assistant. In the University of Denver Libraries, well-trained clerical help is now being used for precataloging, revising, and cataloging “with L.C. cards.” The major portion of recataloging and reclassification of the Science collection into the Library of Congress system was done by this same personnel.

Important factors in the overall low cost per new title processed through the Mechanical Preparations Department have been the practice of examining the suitability of supplies prior to purchase and then their eventual purchase in quantities large enough to secure price advantages. The Department has now dropped the use of date-due slips, since a transaction type of charging is now used.

At this point no suggestion is being put forth that comparisons be made, as it is realized that it is impossible to know the methods of computing or all the cost factors which have been considered in the preparation of other published reports. However, in the past, final figures in some of these studies have ranged from $1.76 per volume in some public libraries to $7.00 in some of the larger university libraries.

No claim is made that the conditions of the study or its findings are typical of university library technical processing departments. However, it does provide points of reference on which to base other studies. Enough such studies performed in similar detail and studied comparatively, could eventually lead, perhaps, to the formulation of qualitative standards useful to all college and university libraries. With all library costs (books, personnel, maintenance, furniture, and supplies) constantly rising and with increasing demands being put on libraries in the teaching processes, few academic libraries can afford technical processes which are inefficient and of undue cost.

Knowing that the American Library Association is constantly working on the establishment of quantitative and qualitative standards in all possible phases of library operations, perhaps an attempt on their part to accumulate whatever detailed unpublished reports that may exist in various types of libraries would produce surprising results and help forward their work. University of Denver Libraries, for one will be glad to supply information for exchange purposes with A.L.A. and with other libraries.

REFERENCES


NEW BOOK SELECTION JOURNAL

Backed by a Council on Library Resources grant of $150,000, ACRL has established a monthly journal to assist in book selection. Although directed primarily to undergraduate college and university libraries with an annual book budget of $30,000 or less, it is expected to be of help to public libraries having similar book requirements.

Editorial offices will be in the Olin Library of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., and the publication will be edited by Richard K. Gardner, formerly Librarian of Marietta College in Ohio.

The date when publication will commence and the annual subscription fee will be announced.
Further Costs of Card Reproduction

HERMAN R. STORM, Supervisor
Catalog-Order Division
Madison Public Library
Madison, Wisconsin

IN THE FALL, 1962, issue of Library Resources and Technical Services there was published a short article on our card reproduction facilities, with cost figures. The Madison Public Library reproduces cards on a Multilith machine. We obtain our cataloging information and subject headings by subscribing to Library of Congress proofsheets. The information from the corrected proofsheet is typed on a 6 by 4 master; and this master is used to run off as many cards as are needed.

The earlier survey used figures for a two month period, selected at random. The present analysis covers a period of 12 months, the calendar year of 1962. This longer study was made to find out how long it would be before the machine paid for itself in savings on card reproduction alone—even though it is estimated that it is used for cards less than half of its total use.

This study is a comparison of the cost of LC printed cards and our own made by the Multilith process. Eight is the number used for an average set of cards. The LC cost for the first card is .07 cents and .05 cents each for the next seven, a total of .42 cents per average set.

During the period studied, 66,666 cards were made from 8689 masters in 231 1/3 hours. The breakdown of cost is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proofsheets</td>
<td>$ 87.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running time 231 1/3 hours @ $2.50</td>
<td>$578.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous, start, stop, cleanup, etc. 72 hours</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card cost, per 1000—$5.90 plus 5% waste</td>
<td>$413.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(69,999 cards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8689 masters (400 per box @ $7.50)</td>
<td>$162.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and solutions</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine depreciation ($1200. in 6 years, pro-rated)</td>
<td>$96.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine service and parts (pro-rated)</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$1,649.23 divided by 66,666 equals .02474 cost per card
.02474 multiplied by 8 equals .198 cost per set
8689 multiplied by .222 equals $1,928.96 savings per period.

The machine cost (in round figures) $1200. Thus for the year 1962 the card production alone was worth the price.
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West German and U. S. Book Costs as Comparative Factors in Book Budgets

Marietta Chicorel, Assistant Chief, Acquisitions Division
University of Washington Library, Seattle

In 1962 the R. R. Bowker Company began its annual publication of the "Cost of Library Materials Index" as an aid to librarians. The statistics were originally conceived as a project for Resources and Technical Services Division by William Kurth, assisted by various committee librarians such as Helen Welch, Frank Schick, and Avis Zebker. Over a number of years the Cost of Library Materials Index Committee gathered the figures which were published by the U. S. Office of Education, Library Services Branch in 1961. This Fall LSB will include a cost index of West German book prices as well. (For a summary, see Table I.) No determination has been possible as yet as to the number of libraries which used the compilation, or how and to what extent its information has been applied.

The cost study can be a useful and powerful tool if it is understood both in its simplicity, and in its wider ramifications. Since the publication of the data on West German book prices in the Winter Issue of LRTS, 1969, some factors common to both American and West German book prices can be pointed out on a comparative basis. The comparison is non-competitive, since a library which buys a German book does so for the sake of the book's content and not because it is less expensive than an American title. As a tool of communication, the book represents the work of man in every field of human endeavor; it expresses the insights of poets, novelists, artists, scientists, and researchers regardless of national origin. As such it transcends the economic aspects so that it does not become directly competitive on the world market in the way of other goods.

From a review of the index numbers which are computed for total cost prices annually, the over-all picture shows that in 1960 American libraries were paying $150.80 for the same number of West German books which cost $100 in 1954. A review of the American book price index for those years gives a different result. American libraries were paying $128.70 in 1960 for the same number of books they were able to purchase for $100 in 1954. For the American buyer, American book prices have increased at a lesser rate than West German prices. By 1961 American book prices rose and West German book prices fell sufficiently so that the percent of increase since 1954 for each met and crossed. American book prices rose to $142.80 while West German book prices fell to $141.60 for books which cost $100 in 1954. While it is the percentage of increase expressed in index
numbers which affects budget considerations, the actual book prices make
the West German book seem the better buy. Their average price was
$2.98 in 1961, whereas the U. S. average book price was $5.81. That is,
even though fewer West German books could be bought by American
libraries for their $100 in 1961 than in 1954, more West German than
American books could be purchased for $100 in 1961.

A 1961 library book budget request presenting a 42% increase over
the 1954 base would then be an attempt to preserve the status quo of
purchasing power, all other things being equal. To this increase must be
added other factors, some of which will be discussed below. The increase
in readership, due to the population increase and an accelerated combi-
nation of research-oriented teaching methods with a higher percentage of
college enrollment, is well-known. The total number of college graduates
has increased from 5 million in 1950 to 8.1 million in 1960. Increased
title production adds another dimension to budget increases besides those
of cost increases related to prices only. West German book imports to
the U.S. are great enough to make them important in many library
budgets.

Increased title production in Germany as well as in the U.S. broadens
the base from which librarians make their selection of books. In order to
keep a library's collection in tune with the thought trend and research of
today, current in-print book purchasing expands with the multiplicity
of areas in which these thoughts are expressed. Is it possible for a respon-
sible librarian to bypass worthwhile publications in sociology, for instance,
on the grounds that his budget allocation did not allow for the dramatic
increase of titles in that field? Cost increases to libraries are affected by
the overall increase in title production as well as by the expansion of
publications in important areas. The U.N. Statistical Yearbook, the
American Library and Book Trade Annual, and UNESCO's Basic Facts
and Figures give book production information which invites comparison.

Certain distortion-inducing factors remain to be adjusted in the future.
One such factor which we must take into account in comparing inter-
national book production data is that the reported figures indicate the
number of titles published, but not the size of the edition. Another is the
fact that West German reporting includes pamphlets and government
publications of 48 pages or less in its total. The tables on book produc-
tion in the American Library and Book Trade Annual and in the U.N.
Statistical Yearbook in their double entry tabulation and lacunae, reflect
the difficulties of their common source, the UNESCO Basic Facts and
Figures. In the West German Booksellers Association's annual, Buch und
Buchhandel in Zahlen, figures are calculated from this total production.
However, this annual also includes a table of book production based on
U.N. standards of 49 pages or more. Why this figure is not reported to
UNESCO instead of the greater one, I do not know. On that basis the
volume of West German and U.S. book production is almost equal.

By title count, West German book production has nearly reached its
post-World War I and pre-World War II size, which is to say, economic
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Title Production of Books of 49 Pages or More

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>West Germany</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>11,608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>12,391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>12,606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>12,359</td>
<td>13,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>15,382</td>
<td>13,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>11,984</td>
<td>14,876*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>17,508</td>
<td>15,012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>18,148</td>
<td>18,060**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information, 1963, p. 88, footnote 9, for categories omitted.


normality. This statement is not qualified in any way in the original context. It seems to me therefore that it cannot have been made on a per capita basis, since the population of prewar Germany was 69,314,000 in 1939 as compared to West Germany without Berlin of 54,015,000 in 1961. The reference seems to be solely to the productivity of West German book production, tacitly inferring that firms and equipment have been relocated in West Germany where they have regained their former level of productivity. In this connection it is interesting to note that seven pairs of firms publish under the same imprint in West and East Germany. The East German editions are recognizable only by the addition of VEB (Volks eigene Bücherei) after the firm name. The publishing houses Brockhaus, Harrassowitz, Reclam Verlag, Rütten und Loening, Teubner, and Thieme were taken over by the East German Democratic Republic without the owners' consent. To this list, according to Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel, Frankfurt, of January 15, 1963, also belong Niemeyer, Kiepenheuer, Quelle und Meyer, Fischer, and Hirzel. Only Insel Verlag has a legal agreement with East Germany for the use of its name.

Dr. Hans Wockener, editor of Buch since 1958, estimates that West German title production may not increase significantly in the years to come. The kind of stability achieved in 1959 is expected to continue. In 1961 the increase in West German title production was 3.7% over the previous year. The net gain in American book production was 20.3% above that of 1960. This figure marked an all-time high in American book production, until it was outranked by the 21% gain in 1962. While the number of publishers has increased by only 3.03% in the U.S. despite the striking increase in titles published, and despite mergers and inactive houses, the number of publishers has remained the same in Germany for the last five years. Expansion in the size of editions rather than in number of titles is the mark of a growth industry which has reached its full level of production.

In order to make international book publishing statistics directly comparable, a committee of experts met in Paris on April 17-21, 1961, to draw up a proposal for formal recommendation by UNESCO. The proposal covered definitions for books, pamphlets, serials, newspapers, and
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publishing terms. After UNESCO member countries have had an opportunity to comment, the proposal will be placed before the general conference of UNESCO for final action. According to the Report of the Director-General of UNESCO which covers activities in 1962, the “General Conference, at its twelfth session, decided ‘that the international instrument (for this standardization) shall take the form of a recommendation to Member States within the meaning of . . . the Constitution’. Consequently, the Conference authorized the Director-General ‘to convene the special committee provided for in Article 10 . . . to prepare a draft recommendation for submission to the General Conference at its thirteenth session’.10

Figures according to UNESCO-recommended standards have been adopted to a greater or lesser extent by various countries. West Germany gives title production figures on the UNESCO basis in its own publication, but does not report them to UNESCO. The United States adheres to recommendations with the exception of Federal government publications, which are available but not compiled. One point which is not covered in the proposal, is that U.S. import figures are limited by the collecting agency, the Bureau of the Census, to “books both manufactured and published abroad and distributed in the United States by an American firm which holds exclusive distribution rights”.11

Available figures are not comparable, except by inference, of the relative spending by American libraries for U.S. publications with West German imports. The U.S. statistical breakdown of available book production figures varies from year to year. However, in 1959 it was possible to omit the same categories which were omitted in “The Cost of Library Materials” published by the U.S. Office of Education, and recently issued by the Bowker Company,12 and in LRTS on West German book prices.13 Based on these omissions, American libraries spent $81,000,000 in 1959 on American publications.14 The categories of university press books, subscriptions, book clubs, paperbounds, juveniles under $1, and textbooks have been omitted. The omissions account for 23.8% of the total estimate, based on industry sales. In 1961 a rough estimate of the over-all library market put the figure at $136,122,000 total,15 or a 28% increase. If we assume that the corrected increase according to selected categories has kept pace with this figure, then a comparison with the increase in West German imports is possible. (Table II.) West Germany constitutes the second largest source of imported books after Great Britain. In 1961 the U.S. spent $3,775,792 for the import of German books. This figure is based on the official German government tables,16 and differs dramatically from the U.S. government evaluation. The discrepancy between this amount and the $1,989,728 cited as book imports from West Germany stems from the definition used by the Bureau of the Census, as described earlier. As a market for West German books, as well as for periodicals, the U.S. ranks third after the natural market in Austria and Switzerland. With an import figure of 11.8% of the total West German book export, comprising DM 15,162,00017 it is safe to assume that librarians repre-
senting institutions of various kinds are responsible for the major part of this amount. The fact that many libraries deal with European agents accounts for the difference in U.S. and West German government statistics.

Unlike other commodities, in the case of books the size of the export is not a function of economics. It is true, though, that exports are a significant factor in the economics of trade because they tend to expand the market. According to West German government statistics, book imports to the U.S. increased by 50.8% between 1959 and 1961. The percent of increase in spending by American libraries for West German books was twice that for U.S. publications during this two-year period. Over the span from 1953/55 to 1961 American libraries spent approximately 191.6% more on U.S. publications, and 634.8% more on West German publications.

A study of "Cost of Library Materials: Price Trends of Publications" being published in Library Statistics by the U.S. Office of Education in the Fall of 1963, will show cost increases according to selected categories. It will be seen that West German titles in Science, Art, Law, History, and Juveniles show an appreciable increase. Despite these rises, other subject areas experienced a decrease which accounts for the over-all decline in the Cost Index. Literature, as a subject, has been reduced to nearly the 1954 level, with an increase to double its title production in 1961.

With this proven increase in interest in West German publications by

| TABLE I |
| COST OF LIVING AND BOOK PRICE INDEXES FOR WEST GERMANY |
| 1954 = 100 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of Living Index</th>
<th>Book Price Index in DM</th>
<th>Book Price Index in U.S. $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954 ............ 100</td>
<td>1954 ............ 100</td>
<td>1954 ............ 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955 ............ 101.1</td>
<td>1955 ............ 118.1</td>
<td>1955 ............ 116.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 ............ 104.3</td>
<td>1956 ............ 125.3</td>
<td>1956 ............ 123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957 ............ 106.6</td>
<td>1957 ............ 140.0</td>
<td>1957 ............ 138.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958 ............ 109.9</td>
<td>1958 ............ 160.7</td>
<td>1958 ............ 150.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959 ............ 111.0</td>
<td>1959 ............ 146.0</td>
<td>1959 ............ 141.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 ............ 112.6</td>
<td>1960 ............ 146.0</td>
<td>1960 ............ 141.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961 ............ 114.1</td>
<td>1961 ............ 146.0</td>
<td>1961 ............ 141.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COST OF LIVING AND BOOK PRICE INDEXES FOR THE U. S. A. |
1954 = 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of Living Index</th>
<th>Book Price Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954 ............ 100</td>
<td>1954 ............ 100*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955 ............ 101.9</td>
<td>1955 ............ 113.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 ............ 103.4</td>
<td>1956 ............ 125.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957 ............ 106.9</td>
<td>1957 ............ 138.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958 ............ 109.9</td>
<td>1958 ............ 150.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959 ............ 111.0</td>
<td>1959 ............ 142.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 ............ 112.6</td>
<td>1960 ............ 143.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961 ............ 113.7</td>
<td>1961 ............ 142.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*At an assumed price of $4.07 for the 1954 base year.
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American libraries, it is well to keep in mind a particular library's needs when applying these findings to its budget. The value of the study lies in its application, tempered by understanding of its shortcomings and merits.

### TABLE II

**BOOK IMPORTS FROM WEST GERMANY TO U. S.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>$**</th>
<th>Increase in $</th>
<th>% Increase in $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>2,156,000</td>
<td>513,861</td>
<td>(-44,502)</td>
<td>(-8.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1,975,000</td>
<td>469,359</td>
<td>240,891</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2,986,000</td>
<td>710,256</td>
<td>46,288</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>3,179,000</td>
<td>756,538</td>
<td>1,275,788</td>
<td>168.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>8,522,000</td>
<td>2,032,326</td>
<td>372,715</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>10,052,000</td>
<td>2,405,041</td>
<td>352,438</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>11,501,000</td>
<td>2,757,479</td>
<td>1,018,313</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

3,261,931

634.8%

*Source: Buch und Buchhandel in Zahlen, Börsenverein des Deutschen Buchhandels.

**Computed on the current exchange rate for each year. Source: Federal Res. Bull.
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A Question of Completeness

Marietta Chicorel, Assistant Chief, Acquisitions Division
University of Washington Library, Seattle

The East German National Bibliography's five year cumulations have recently come under attack for failing to give an accurate picture of publications listed, and even for omitting some publications altogether. This is of interest to Acquisitions librarians to the extent to which they rely on this publication. It is also of socio-political interest insofar as the type of bias is disclosed which is operative here. The complete "open letters", rebuttals, and lists of publications involved can be found in Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel, Buchhändler-Vereinigung, GmbH., Frankfurt, April 11, 1963, pp. 581-587.

To summarize, the discussions began with an open letter to the Frankfurter press in which Günther Rühle pleaded for funds to support the West German National Library. He particularly stressed the work of the Library in compiling a national bibliography, which is all the more necessary since the East German Library suppresses and distorts titles in its reporting. He cited two examples, one of which was a speech made by Beria in 1952 which was deleted from the 1951-55 cumulation after Beria's liquidation. Helmut Rötzsch answered indignantly for the Deutsche Bücherei, Leipzig, asserting that no omissions or wilful distorting of title abbreviations existed in the East German Bibliography. To this the well-known book dealer, Werner Dorn, replied in the form of an essay in which he substantiated and enlarged the original charges of distortion with well-documented proof.

He did not lay the blame on the librarians who compiled the bibliography, but on the party system which subordinates these aspects of librarianship to its political aims, with all their changeability. Each of the 17 examples cited has the communist state as its subject. Of those where subtitles were omitted, the following citation is an example:

[Besuch d. Bundeskanzlers in Moskau.]
WV 1955, H. 52, Nr 111; DB 1951-1955, S. 211
DN, A, 1956, H. 17, Nr 108; DBV 1951-1955, S. 204

Of those omitted, only Beria's speech appeared originally in the weekly bibliography, the rest were never listed at all. The absurdity of two national bibliographies competing with each other is mitigated only by the fact that because of the larger staff available to the East German Library, its five year cumulation appears about a year ahead of its competitor. Its limitations are another example of the state of affairs in Soviet territory.
On Ephemera: Their Collection and Use

RICHARD C. BERNER, Curator of Manuscripts
University of Washington Library, Seattle

UNIVERSITY and research library acquisitions policies should be geared, in part, to the methods of the intellectual disciplines they are intended to support. This statement may appear as a truism to many, particularly as acquisitions policy relates to published materials, for in this area collecting may tend to be comprehensive and faithfully reflect research needs. The principle is, by and large, practiced by most institutions possessing sufficient financial resources to enable them to build research collections of published materials. However, the acquisition of these materials reflects library support of intellectual disciplines and methods at only one level, and reflects it for the most part (I suspect) without knowing it. The theoretical implications of such library support tend to be ignored and the librarians, consequently, are inclined to restrict too severely their role in developing research collections.

Often research libraries must collect the actual raw material from which publications, as such, are produced and added to our knowledge. To do so, they must become involved in the total research process, and, in fact, key their collecting in the process to the methods of the social scientist, historian, and humanist. The relations between historical method and collecting of raw material for the historian's use is demonstrated in this article, as a case in point.

Source materials as viewed by the historian are of two broad types, primary and secondary. Primary source materials are created by the actual participants in any event or development. They include manuscripts, printed and processed or near-print items of an ephemeral nature and the more typical ephemera (leaflets, pamphlets, broadsides, and the like), and government documents. Newspapers, because of their contemporaneity, are also regarded as a primary source. Normally, manuscripts and ephemera pose, for the librarian, the most difficult problem of acquisition.

Secondary sources are, for the most part, published items written by non-participants after the event, and are inherently retrospective. By one historical method the historian will explore these before he begins to use systematically the primary sources that bear upon his subject. By his survey of secondary sources he familiarizes himself with the subject at one level: what is known about it formally at a given time. He learns what else needs to be known, he asks questions and establishes working hypotheses. He is then ready to use primary sources; which of these he uses...
first will depend on a number of factors unique to his particular topic and the nature of the sources available (and their coverage). These factors will not be discussed here. We can assume that he plunges in, usually with the desire to modify historical interpretation in the light of new evidence and fresh considerations. Or, more important, he may select a subject which has been ignored despite its significance. From these primary source materials he will hopefully fulfill his ambition: to tell how things really happened.

If the librarians and archivists have done a responsible job of collecting, there will be an abundance of well organized manuscripts and ephemera available. But how were they acquired? Or if not yet acquired, how can they be?

As slighted as manuscripts are by librarians, they are at least paid homage, for their importance to historians is relatively uncontested. But not ephemera, for they tend to be dismissed as ‘junk’ mail, to be, for a moment of glory, enshrined in a vertical file that is periodically weeded of items for which there is little or no current demand. Often they are received in response to a request by the library that it be placed on the mailing list of a particular corporate body. But experience with mailing lists probably will show conclusively that the privilege does not assure the receipt of all ephemera produced by the organization. The privilege is convenient but deceptive; it is unreliable. Are there other methods for acquiring such materials, ones that assure fuller historical documentation of a given event? We have found that there are. To illustrate I will discuss the experience of the University of Washington Library in collecting manuscripts in the field of electrical power development in the Pacific Northwest, and show how ephemera can be collected systematically as part of a manuscripts acquisitions program, and why its collection should be a prime objective, not merely a by-product activity.

Hydroelectric power is one of the great natural advantages of the Pacific Northwest; its optimum utilization has been of economic concern throughout most of this century. The economic, technological, and scientific features are distinctively modern, and their impact on politics and economics and their challenge to public administrators is of vast importance. Much of the politics of the region cannot be understood without referring to the enduring controversy between the advocates of publicly-owned power and those advocating private ownership, and to those with different schemes for public development. Policies in administering the water resources of the Columbia River Basin are affected by all of these factors, political and non-political alike. Influence on these policies tends, more and more, to be the focus of the respective partisans, for these policies have inter-regional (California intertie and a national power grid) and international implications (U. S.—Canadian boundary waters) as well as effects within the Pacific Northwest itself. It is clear that the University of Washington Library had and has now a special responsibility to collect the files of as many of the parties concerned as possible; and in cases where their acquisition was impractical or impossible, it was necessary to
coordinate services (in this instance with the National Archives branch in Seattle, the Bonneville Power Administration in Portland, and Tacoma Power and Light).

The library had begun collecting in this one field in 1959, by arranging with Seattle City Light to receive the files of James D. Ross.* Since then the Manuscripts Section of the University of Washington Library has arranged with the following agencies to be the official depository of their files: Seattle City Light, Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee, the Northwest Public Power Association, and Washington Public Utility Districts' Association, the latter two groups advocating publicly-owned power and charged with the task of formulating goals, handling research and publicity, and coordinating efforts among their member organizations.

We have learned from collecting and processing these files that *ephemera* form an indispensable part of the documentation needed for researchers who are to tell how things really happened and how the present is unfolding.

What kind of ephemera? Well, much of that which is usually regarded as such, but in addition much that falls somewhere between manuscript material and classical ephemera (pamphlet, leaflet, or broadside material). These marginal ephemera are normally processed material in the form of circular letters, house organs, news releases, minutes of meetings, periodical, technical or special reports, speeches, resolutions, convention proceedings, colloquia and the like. Attention is seldom given to this material by most libraries, yet it is vital to the researcher interested in showing the linkages between political action and public policy, historically or contemporaneously. Without this material, the historian's task of relating the events of his study must remain more speculative than it should, for precise chronology and interconnections depend heavily upon such documentation. With a complete file of circular letters, minutes, and the like he can trace a line of development with greater certainty. True, much will not be determined positively even from this type of material, but the basic relationships can be established. It is to manuscripts the researcher must turn to learn the more subtle aspects of his problem. But manuscripts are often more fragmentary (in a documentary sense) and many times do not provide the consecutiveness that is required. Newspaper reports help in this, but ephemera of the type mentioned lie closer to the participants in an event, and for that reason, more truly reflect their motives, their interplay, and culmination in an actual policy. Manuscripts (correspondence, memoranda, etc.) of course are nearest the participants and, when available, they can reduce the speculative element in historical research to its minimum, and when they are less consecutive than they should be, serial and other ephemera produced by corporate bodies, in shaping thought and defining policies, can help fill the void in an integral manner.

* Seattle City Light's first superintendent, 1911-37 and the first administrator of BPA, 1937-39; Seattle City Light and Superintendent Ross were two of the mainstays of the national public power movement in the 1920's and 1930's.
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Papers of the Washington Public Utility Districts' Association will illustrate the point. The Association, since its formation in 1938, has produced and still produces a number of serial-type of ephemera in processed and 'slick' forms, as well as separate items. To my knowledge practically none of this has been systematically collected by any library, for much of it was issued primarily for internal use. Our task is to collect it. For example: minutes of meetings are now mimeographed for internal circulation (many of the early ones are in manuscript form). A Commissioners Letter was produced in serial form during the first ten years, first in mimeographed form, later in slick form. Public Power News began in newspaper tabloid form, but has been mimeographed and now appears in a slick edition. Mimeographed ephemera of non-serial type are represented by news releases, reports, articles, and various forms of campaign literature reflecting the formation of public utility districts or some aspect of the controversy between the advocates of publicly owned and privately owned power. One can see from these illustrations the interdependence of material and how this interdependence makes it a logical extension of a manuscripts collecting program.

The Library's manner of collecting it has been threefold: to become the official depository for the Washington Public Utility Districts' Association and thus receive its office files and all of its ephemera; to contact people who have been active in the organization for their personal files, including the above mentioned ephemera; and to become the official depository for various public utility districts in western Washington. Washington State University is following a similar policy for public utility districts in eastern Washington.

From this initial interest in collecting manuscripts and ephemera relating to hydroelectric power, it was logical to broaden the scope to include water resources generally. As the official depository for Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee manuscripts and ephemera (including processed publications) we have become interested in ephemera produced by comparable agencies: the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee and Northeastern Resources Committee. They are all sending us current and back files of their materials. We are also contacting private organizations, analogous to trade associations, and pressure groups. The central principle of acquisitions is clear: to fan out from a strong core collection in every direction that is a logical extension of it; in a phrase: to build on strength.

It is clear that the overall objective in this collecting program is to have the research materials represent as fully as possible the whole web of activity of these participants in history-making. Many private power organizations have their own archives, many of which may be opened to researchers, ultimately, if not now. The fact that they are presently operating tends to restrict access to their files in a way that is not true of public power bodies. However, if he is denied access to all the documentation he feels is desirable, the researcher must then stretch his imagination and be a little more speculative, but he will at least find it possible to tell more truly how things really happened.
Some mention should be made of the private collector of ephemera as a potential source for the institutional repository. Often people will collect everything they can lay hands upon if it ties in with their interests: theater programs, dissident political movements—an endless list of topics. Rich collections can be obtained from such persons, collections that could not otherwise be obtained by the repository.

Lest the reader receive the impression that the author recommends the collection of all ephemera, let it be made clear that collecting should be selective; it cannot reasonably be otherwise. Selectivity should be on the basis of the institution's educational and research objectives. However, selection should be conceived in broad terms that anticipate the future and that are dynamic in the sense that much initiative should come from the library in formulating these goals.

**CATALOG CODE REVISION: CHICAGO 1963**

The Steering Committee of the CCS Catalog Code Revision Committee met in Washington in May and at Chicago prior to and during the ALA Conference. Also the full Committee met July 12-13. Noel Sharp and Philip Escreet of the (British) Library Association were able to attend the July meetings of both Committees; and Hugh Chaplin of the British Museum was able to attend one July meeting of the Steering Committee.

Sumner Spalding, Editor of the Code, presented the committees with a revised version of the chapter on headings for corporate bodies and an initial version of a chapter on headings for persons. Much interest centered in the compromise rule providing an exception to the general approach to entry for corporate bodies. This exception would allow entry under place for “institutions” in such a way as to result in least cost of change to the Library of Congress and other research libraries. The Library of Congress submitted an alternate version of Mr. Spalding’s rule. After lengthy discussion, the Committee decided to postpone a decision till the British Committee had also had a chance to prepare its own version of this rule. Broadly speaking, the British representatives presently prefer to follow the Paris Statement (entry directly under name for all corporate bodies) more closely than either the Spalding or the LC version of this rule would allow.

In the personal names chapter perhaps the most significant feature approved by the Committee calls for entry under an anglicized form of name which has replaced in conventional English usage the form used by the author—e.g., entry under “Horace” rather than entry under “Horatius.”

The CCS Executive Committee and the Steering Committee agreed to change the time table. Originally Mr. Spalding was to submit a completed draft to the CCS Executive Committee at Midwinter 1964; this draft will now be submitted at the St. Louis Conference in the summer of 1964. The code will include rules for description; Bernice Field’s CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee in this country and a British LA committee under Mary Piggott are working on this section.

Mr. Spalding will attend a meeting of the British Committee in the Fall, and it is expected that there will again be British delegates to the Midwinter meetings of the Committee.—Paul S. Dunkin.
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THE BOROUGH FATHERS of Englewood Cliffs, N. J., must surely be proud of themselves. The prestige of their fair community has been given a boost, free of charge, such as few communities could afford to foster had they to hire a PR firm to spread their name in the “right” circles. I understand that Englewood Cliffs, N. J., is largely a bridgeside residential suburb for upper middle class commuters to New York City and other nearby industrial centers. The residents have, perhaps, some justifiable claim to a high level of education, but what other American “bedroom suburb” of fewer than 2,000 inhabitants, lacking any educational facility more pretentious than a good high school, has become internationally known as a center from which knowledge is spread around the world? What engineer in Manila or Cairo has not refreshed his grasp of some phase of his work using a book published in Englewood Cliffs, N. J.? Nor are the borough fathers likely to be upset that more (ahem) “popular” works bring the name of Englewood Cliffs, N. J., to an even wider public. At present some 650 new title-pages appear each year, thousands of copies of each bearing the euphonious name, rich with its implications of suburban quiet and pleasant scenery.

Far be it from me to object to the harmless practice, sanctified by the heavy weight of tradition, of including the publishers’ geographic location on the title-pages of their books. And if this time-honored practice once required the house of Prentice-Hall to print “New York” in each of its publications, it now presumably demands that the location of the major part of its operations away from the metropolis be similarly recognized. But while holding no personal brief against a locality which doubtless offers inducements besides more room for expansion and lower property taxes, I am seriously beginning to question why thousands of librarians should continue the free advertisement of Englewood Cliffs, N. J., on tens of thousands of catalog cards.

I hope the borough fathers of Englewood Cliffs, N. J., and the house of Prentice-Hall will forgive me if I seem to have treated them a bit roughly, but I think they well serve to illustrate a few of the problems which have led me, with that strict impartiality which befits librarians generally and catalogers especially, to have serious second thoughts about the inclusion of any place name as a matter of principle in the imprint.

Local Autonomy

RONALD HAGLER, Assistant Professor
School of Librarianship
The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, B. C., Canada

Library Resources & Technical Services
transcribed onto a modern catalog card. Catalogers have, after all, taken over unquestioningly many elements of bibliographic description from traditional methods of book identification whose ends are not entirely the same as ours. Perhaps more to the point, the importance of tradition and continuity in the practice of cataloging, which rightly tends to make instinctive reactionaries of us, has led us to carry the solutions of the bibliographer’s past needs over into the cataloger’s present, and rapidly changing situations—sometimes with reason, sometimes not.

**Priority of Imprint Elements**

Admittedly, the place where a manuscript exists is, and always has been, a vital element in its identification. Even the place where it was made is a very useful bit of information if it can be ascertained. As so often, through one of those historic analogies which are never clear afterwards because they were so natural at the time, the place of printing, then of publication, of a printed work became as fixed an element in its description as a location was in the description of a unique manuscript—but without quite the same sanction of reason.

Priority of Imprint Elements

Admittedly, the place where a manuscript exists is, and always has been, a vital element in its identification. Even the place where it was made is a very useful bit of information if it can be ascertained. As so often, through one of those historic analogies which are never clear afterwards because they were so natural at the time, the place of printing, then of publication, of a printed work became as fixed an element in its description as a location was in the description of a unique manuscript—but without quite the same sanction of reason.

An argument could be raised, of course, for identifying a printed work by place in the earlier period of printing, especially for as long as Europe shared a common language of scholarship. As long, too, as publishing, bookselling, and printing were largely confined to one or two practitioners in each city, whose names were not too well known outside their local areas, and whose functions in the dissemination of the printed word were not differentiated or well defined, the place name may justifiably have been considered a more useful part of the work’s description than the name of one who might have been either one of many printers, one of many booksellers who handled it on contract, or even the silent partner who put up the capital. But as for the still-too-often-seen citation including this kind of imprint: “London, 1956”—well! Long do we adhere to our traditions!

Fortunately, American cataloging practice, at least, had its origins in an era when even “Philadelphia, 1789” was manifestly insufficient for complete identification, and the name of a publisher, by then well defined as to his duties and accepted as the ultimate source of the book for ordering purposes, was accepted in principle as almost as important an element in the required imprint. “Almost”, yes, but not quite, as I interpret the Library of Congress’ current Rules for Descriptive Cataloging. Else why would the order of priorities be so obvious in rule 3:10:C?

If the place of publication is not known, the place of printing is used as the probable place of publication; if neither is known, the place is represented by the abbreviation “n.p.” for “no place.” Lack of a publisher is not indicated.

**Who Is the Publisher?**

Perhaps it is right that a Canadian librarian should call attention to the increasing illogicality of the present use of place names in bibliograp
phical description for library catalogs. In a country where the vast majority of all books sold are imported from either the United States or Great Britain, but where virtually all of these imported books are technically “published” in Toronto for the Canadian market, the whole issue of a place name printed in the book becomes doubly confused. As I have pointed out elsewhere, with specific examples, there are books published in Toronto in which that place name appears on the title-page, in which it appears on the verso of the title-page among the various addresses of the originating British or American publisher, in which it appears on a label pasted to the original title-page (or, for that matter, almost anywhere else a shipping clerk may happen to open the book to paste it), and in which it does not appear anywhere. There are even books bearing the place name “Toronto” on their title-pages, by way of company address only, which are not published in Toronto and are, indeed, legally excluded from the Canadian market.

This Canadian situation is not merely a local peculiarity, but a symptom of an irrevocable publishing trend. Quite a number of houses, both British and American, now advertise the international span of their corporate activities by noting all their world-wide addresses either on the recto or the verso of their title-pages as a matter of principle, regardless of whether or not they have market rights in each country named for the individual work bearing these addresses. The crux of the problem of imprint in current bibliographical description is the meaning of the word “publisher”. One might as well face the fact that this word had a single, stable, and fairly clear meaning for only a couple of centuries, and that it is rapidly becoming as hybrid a word in this twentieth century as it ever was in the fifteenth, although in an entirely different way. Recent Library of Congress catalog cards show that catalogers have not yet come to grips with their own avowed principles in this matter.

LC card 62-2619 (abbreviated)
Oosterwal, Gottfried.
People of the Tor . . . Assen, Van Gorcum [1962, c1961]
293p.
Imprint covered by label: New York, Humanities Press.

LC card 62-1798 (abbreviated)
Cadogan, Sir Edward Cecil George.
Before the deluge . . . London, J. Murray [c1961; label:
Hollywood-by-the-Sea, Fla., Transatlantic Arts]

LC card 62-2231 (abbreviated)
Morgan, Ronald Ernest.
Circuit training . . . 2d ed. London, G. Bell [1962]
c1961; stamped: distributed by Sportshelf, New Rochelle, N.Y.] [sic]

Publishing Now International

The basic problem of which this format difficulty is a symptom is the growing internationality of publishing. To illustrate: A work might be
accepted as manuscript from its author by a British house. It is therefore “published” in Britain. Two hundred years ago, this would have been the end of it. Any copies imported into other parts of the English speaking world would have come from the same publisher as copies sold in Britain, and would probably have been part of the same edition. The local importer or bookseller might or might not have pasted his label to the flyleaf or even to the title-page, but he would not have called himself the “publisher”, nor is he likely to have been such in the legal sense. And in any case, the work was identifiable as a British publication, and the place name “London” in a bibliographical citation to it had some real meaning in relation to its intellectual content as well as to its physical origin.

Today, however, a British work so published in Britain stands a good chance of being separately “published” in other parts of the world. If it is a popular work, an American house, independent of the British originating publisher, and even without reference to him if negotiations are carried out directly with the author’s agent, will publish the work under its own imprint, and have its edition domestically manufactured. An indication in bibliographical terms of the work’s British origin will probably be nowhere found in the American edition. Certainly, the name of the originating publisher on the other side of the Atlantic is but rarely found within the book in hand, no matter what type of contractual arrangement led to the separate American publication, whether simultaneous or delayed. And whatever has been said here is equally applicable to British editions of publications originally American.

Labels, Rubber Stamps, and Publication History

A less popular work often provides an even more checkered publishing history. If originally published in Britain, its American “publisher” might be a house which only imports copies of the British printing. These may be supplied with a different title-page bearing the American imprint, but this is not necessary—a pasted label or a rubber stamp may be the only internal indication that a second “publisher” has been at work. This is the situation which is at present causing the Library of Congress catalogers to come to grief, as shown in the above examples. Few catalogers anywhere seem to have worried about the logical consequences of supplying a place of publication other than that printed on the title-page. Or, to get back to the original question raised above, who in fact do we want to call the “publisher”? The common situation in Canada, and one well-known elsewhere as well, is for legal publication within the country of an imported work, to go unrecognized within the book. No label, no rubber stamp. No easy way of determining the national distributor of the work. Finally, many technical and scientific publishers and university presses, whose books are too well known (and in too limited demand) to require such niceties as labels or cancel title-pages, “publish” identical physical copies of their works through what are for the most part only selling outlets scattered throughout the world. These are the houses which most often list all their addresses, and often their agents, on the recto or
the verso of their title-pages, thus giving the cataloger the welcome opportunity of "paying his money and taking his choice" of the place names given—that is, as long as they are all on the recto of the title-page, where the cataloger thinks they belong.

The trend is evident. Precisely because it was the extreme localization of publishing in the early period of book production (up to as late as 1850 in the English-speaking world) which made the place name a useful element in identification, this now rampant tendency toward the internationalization of publishing and bookselling would seem to be the chief factor in defeating the purpose of continued use of place names in cataloging. This internationalization may not be so strongly felt in the major book production countries which are more self-sufficient in their publishing activities; but it is becoming pronounced within the book trade of any single language area, and is particularly so in the English-language book world. Even American libraries do not escape it. Considering again the works represented by the three Library of Congress cards cited above, is it not just as likely that an American library keeping an account with a foreign supplier would acquire from abroad the original editions of these, rather than the "American" editions which differ only in respect of a pasted label?

A Rule—But for Which Situation?

By what authority, and for what reason, does the cataloger depart from or add to the printed title-page to indicate the addition of this label if his library happens—probably by pure chance—to acquire the copy which bears it? The authority in the Rules for Descriptive Cataloging is presumably that most inconclusive rule, 3:15C.3, in which the nullifying omission is the lack of a definition of "title page information". As so often, only a few vague examples mark a devious path toward the spirit of the rule: perhaps this is the reason why the three cards quoted vary so greatly. So much for authority. What about the reason? The only visible one, failing the missing definition, is the spirit of the last paragraph of rule 3:10A, to which I shall return momentarily; but even there the wording, "named . . . on a title page . . ." can easily be so interpreted as to deny any possible connection with an added label or stamp.

The cataloger may not be able to observe a very clear definition of the word "publish", but at least he should try to adopt a consistent definition. In the complexity of today's international publishing arrangements, it is naïve to think that one can have one's cake and eat it too, without complicating the long-suffering 3 x 5 catalog card beyond all reason. Therefore I am not criticizing the fact that the descriptive cataloger shows an irreducible minimum of interest in the niceties of the international publication history of the work he is cataloging. To take any greater interest in it would indeed be a problem and a challenge worthy of his attention, but its fruits would belong in a critical bibliography rather than in a library's card catalog. Nevertheless a Canadian humbly begs permission to suggest that it is typical American provincialism, as evident in some sec-
tions of the present Library of Congress Rules for Descriptive Cataloging, which leads to the present state of uncertainty as to just what part the publishing history of a work does play in our cataloging practice.

Rationalizing the Rule

Why, for example (to remain only with the very narrow point of the use of a place name), if we profess only to describe adequately the physical book in hand, should we allow the issue of plain description to be obfuscated by an explanation such as this, from the first paragraph of rule 3:10? "The place of publication, particularly if it is not a large publishing center, may suggest a probable local viewpoint of the author." This explanation is surely to stretch an accidental convenience into a cause, and were there no better reason for using the place name (the only other reason even suggested is, vaguely, "identification") this would be reason enough to have dispensed with it long ago. The point is that even this accidental convenience is now largely a myth. At the risk of seeming vindictive toward poor Messrs. Prentice-Hall, may one ask if Englewood Cliffs, N. J., should convey a warning of "probable local viewpoint"? There may have been a time when "Manchester" or "Princeton" really placed a work as the product of sectional interest, but when Hollywood-by-the-Sea, Fla. is part of the American imprint solely for somewhat out-of-the-way British titles, quite often ones with a noticeable British regional tenor, the argument no longer holds water.

This same half-hearted feeling, never clearly expressed, that some further need beyond simple description of the physical volume in hand should be satisfied through descriptive cataloging, appears to be the reason for at least two further statements in the Library of Congress rules: (1) "The description may also require that the nature and scope and the bibliographical history and relationships of the work be explained." (3:1; a statement almost consistently ignored because it is usually difficult of application), and (2) "If a city in the United States, with or without an American publisher, is named in a secondary position on a title page containing a foreign imprint, it is included in addition to the foreign imprint." (3:10A) This latter rule is essentially the same as in the Library of Congress' "supplementary rules" printed with the American edition of the 1908 Joint Code. It seems successfully to have withstood the drastic move in the 1940's away from transcription of more of the title-page than is really of first importance.

As a national library concerned with the bibliographical control of all books published within the United States, the Library of Congress has perhaps justifiably included in its catalog information concerning the American publication of a work, even when that publication is virtually a pro forma matter. Catalogers at the Library of Congress presumably recognize why they follow this nationalistic rule, and perhaps fastidious American catalogers outside the Library of Congress also have some justification for adhering to it, particularly if they try to integrate their own practices completely with the demands made by the use of Library of
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Congress cards. But it is amazing how many catalogers even outside the United States have no notion why this paragraph of rule 3:10A exists, but follow it verbatim when for them it can make no sense. Furthermore, even the spirit of the rule can have little application outside a major publishing country. Is the Canadian librarian, by analogy, to supply "[Toronto]" on his catalog card for any imported book he purchased from its Canadian publisher? (He would not, of course, had the same book come direct from a British or American jobber, thus bypassing the Canadian "publisher").

Meanwhile, even within the United States, the publishers' tendencies toward even the elimination of place names on title-pages, coupled with the rise of the already mentioned vagaries with respect to the use of international addresses in the imprint, have reduced the practical value of this use of the place name from the somewhat haphazard value of negative evidence, which is all it ever had, to practically nothing.

Suburbs Help Becloud the Issue

The cataloger is still firmly, and wisely, committed to basing his catalog card on the information contained on the title-page of the book in hand. Only when an essential bit of information is not there, does he seek it elsewhere. The date of publication is one essential element with which catalogers are suffering—but that is matter for another discussion. As for the place name, one can no longer trust even the printed title-page with complete assurance. Perhaps it will be this practical fact as much as all the more complex theoretical considerations already mentioned which will in time lead to a change in our attitude toward its use. Thus, if "Englewood Cliffs, N. J." appears on a book's title-page, it is transcribed onto the catalog card without question, despite the fact that the house of Prentice-Hall has retained its old New York City office, which might almost as easily be defended as the actual place of publication. On the other hand, The Macmillan Co. retains "New York" on its title-pages as the only mentioned place of publication, while almost as much of its operation as of Prentice-Hall's has been moved to the suburbs.

What, in fact, constitutes the suburbs or the metropolis any longer? If we cite "Toronto" as the place of publication, do we mean the city of Toronto or the corporation of Metropolitan Toronto? The house of McClelland and Stewart no longer includes a place name on the title-pages of its publications, whether on the recto or the verso. Yet the Library of Congress, and probably most Canadian catalogers, have dutifully supplied, in brackets of course, "[Toronto]" to this day, despite the fact that McClelland and Stewart has had no offices in Toronto for almost ten years. They are situated in North York, farther from the city limits of Toronto than the house of Collins. But the latter house has chosen to print in its publications its suburban address, "Don Mills, Ont.", and it is so located on our catalog cards. Both these suburban places, incidentally, are within the limits of Metropolitan Toronto.

And what about the university presses? Is it really necessary to supply...
the obvious "[Chicago] University of Chicago Press" for a growing number of similar cases? Is it necessary even when the truth is not so obvious, as is the case with the Melbourne University Press, which admits on the verso of its title-pages that it is located in "Carlton, N.3, Victoria"; or Canada's federal Queen's Printer, whose office is in Hull, P.Q., rather than in the capital. One could go on and on with examples, but having agreed that it is not a part of a cataloger's task to enquire into the publication history of a work unless the title-page is most misleading, must we really exercise ourselves over the logical consequences of the rule which states, "If a place or publisher that is not the first named is distinguishable by type or position, or otherwise, as the actual or principal place or publisher, it is given in the catalog entry . . ." (9:10A; my emphasis, again, on the words which provide the convenient loophole through which all concern over principle can evaporate)?

What has all of this demonstrated other than the growing complexities attendant on the use of place names on catalog cards? Their use was no longer straightforward even when the present Library of Congress rules for descriptive cataloging were formulated, and with the prospect of revision of these rules before us, catalogers must at least be aware of this. The trends which will eventually force a change in our attitudes about the value of the place name are beyond any cataloger's control. The growing internationalization of publishing and the disintegration of former conventions with regard to the typographical placement of the place name on the title-page will in time lead to the same kind of re-thinking of principles which has recently led to the Library of Congress' decision to specify new interpretations of rules for the choice of main entry for conferences, etc., because of a remarkably similar set of circumstances to those under discussion here.

One Possible Solution

Whether a sweeping change from present practice will ever be desirable for all types of libraries, when such a change will be acceptable as a result of the perennial conflict between changing conditions and the cataloger's very desirable demands that continuity of practice be somehow sacrosanct, and what form a change will take, can hardly be predicted at this point. But suppose we investigate, if only superficially, the simplest possible remedy to the problems cited, namely dropping the place name completely from our catalog cards: a remedy long since resorted to by the Wilson Company and many public libraries.

First we must answer honestly the question, "Are we interested only in the description of the physical book in hand?" I submit that for this purpose, the name of the publisher alone is now, and has long been, satisfactorily and unequivocally descriptive. Smaller American libraries, especially public and school libraries, have long acted on this assumption because their purchases represent the output chiefly of well-known American publishers; but is the assumption not valid also for the library acquiring materials from publishers in many countries? A publisher of any repu-
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tation at all is listed in many adequate directories of publishing houses now available, so that further identification by place—which we have noted is at best a partial identification for the many houses of international stature—is unnecessary except in those few instances of unrelated houses bearing the same distinctive name (e.g. Macmillan, Putnam). Of course such houses must be geographically identified, but treating them as exceptions, rather than as a reason for a rule unnecessary in the vast majority of cases, will have the desirable effect of emphasizing the lack of relationship between such homonymous pairs of houses, rather than the undesirable contrary effect of the present practice, namely that of needlessly disguising the truly international character of such houses as most university presses and scientific publishers.

"To Identify and to Characterize"

Or are we not yet willing to settle for simple identification? It is true that more has traditionally been expected of the imprint statement on a catalog card. But have the expectations always been valid ones, and have they been validly answered? Take the location of the publisher for ordering purposes, for example. Remembering that unlike the bookseller's or publisher's catalog, the library's catalog is made for time and not just (or even primarily) for the present, is it useful to include an item of information which bears no guarantee whatever of current validity, even when it is put onto the catalog card? The spate of mergers, name changes, dissolutions, and changes of location now confronting at least the English language book world, make it even more advisable now than for a long time past to check the most current information on a publisher's status and location for ordering purposes, rather than a catalog entry devised as a means to identify a physical object, not its source. This is another piece of cake that one cannot both have and eat at the same time. The identification of the possible nationality of a really obscure publisher is one of the more valid uses one might make of a place name, especially if the language of the text is not a reliable indication of the place of publication; but the readily available tools of international bibliographical control have improved immeasurably since the days when one often had to start groping toward an identification from separate and highly specialized bibliographies. The obscure publisher would indeed seem to offer the only serious justification for the present practice of geographic identification, but just how indispensable the latter is will have to be determined by those who use the information at present. It remains true that improved directories and bibliographical services will steadily diminish even this value of the place name.

Then there is the Library of Congress' hope that a place name may, at least sometimes, help to "characterize" a work, to use the terminology of its rule 3:10. A place name might indeed identify, for example, a German work as either Communist or Federalist propaganda, but surely librarians, of all people the stern defenders of the rights of ideas to speak for themselves, should be the first to prevent a possibly "innocent" book from
being "labelled" by the appearance of an incriminating "Leipzig" on a catalog card which otherwise maintains such impartiality that not even a descriptive annotation is allowed to impair it.

One Rule or Two?

The present article has been only the most basic inquiry, chiefly along theoretical lines, into a situation which will require much further thought and discussion. The long standing practice of the Wilson Company and of many smaller libraries in abandoning the place name has shown that it is not as "essential" a part of bibliographic description as it is still thought to be by some. To justify the dropping of the place name merely as "limited cataloging" or as a "short cut," or by saying, "Well, it's all right as long as we are a small library and have only American-published books" is defensive, negative thinking, not at all what is required under the circumstances.

It is evident that there is some reason for division of current practice among different types of libraries in this matter, and perhaps what we really need is a code for descriptive cataloging which allows, even specifies, variations among types of libraries, just as the proposed code for main entry does. Mr. Osborn's comment of twenty years ago, that not every book need be cataloged as it were intended for the Library of Congress, is perhaps a point even more validly taken today since more catalogers appear to have forgotten that standardization to Library of Congress practices may not be the only means to economy and operational efficiency in cataloging.

Yet, even within the context of the present single and rather rigid code, one can make the point of this discussion by recalling another gem from the same timeless article of Andrew Osborn 2, namely that descriptive bibliography can have but small place in economical and efficient modern library cataloging. My submission is that present publishing practices are making the traditional "place of publication" statement a concern of descriptive bibliographers, not of modern library catalogers.
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The University of Detroit Libraries have issued a second edition of their Library Guide for Faculty, a 34-page pamphlet which describes clearly and briefly the organization of the libraries and the collections. It includes outlines of how to use the catalog, the reference collection, periodicals, public documents, etc. Copies may be acquired (at 50 cents each) from the University of Detroit Library, Detroit 21, Michigan.
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Automating Cataloging Functions in Conventional Libraries*

Paul J. Fasana, Cataloging Coordinator
Information Sciences Laboratory
Itek Corporation
Lexington, Massachusetts

Introduction

Two years ago, Itek Corporation was awarded a contract by the U. S. Air Force to study automatic processing of large volumes of technical information. Prime objectives of the study were:

1. Examine the methods currently used by the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratory (AFCRL) Research Library to control monographs, serials, and technical documents.
2. Investigate the feasibility of a total system of mechanized processing routines.
3. Achieve compatibility of the Research Library with machine systems in other information processing centers.

Detailed studies and flow charts were made of acquisitions routines, cataloging activities, circulation methods, and technical report distribution.

The Research Library at Lawrence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts, is organized to serve the AFCRL scientific community. The Laboratories perform basic research in the physical sciences, particularly geophysics and electronic communication. The Research Library's collection comprises some 180,000 monographs and bound journal volumes, over 3,200 journal subscriptions, and 270,000 technical reports. Annual acquisition rate is 2,500 monographs, 30,000 issues of journals and 25,000 technical reports.

This paper discusses design and development work done on the Research Library's monograph cataloging routines. It describes:

1. Machine-interpretable natural format—an encoded bibliographic format which in printout is compatible with existing library records.
2. Itek Crossfiler—a digital machine designed and built to automate cataloging routines, in this application used in conjunction with one or more tape typewriters.

* The work described in this paper was performed under contract AF 19(604)8438 for the U. S. Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories, Bedford, Mass., and represents the efforts of the entire Itek Project Team who participated in the contract.
3. A machine system for cataloging automation—a number of processing routines centered around the Crossfiler, having as its ultimate objective a total systems integration of technical processing activities.

Background

Many large libraries and information centers increasingly are faced with problems in the production of bibliographic records. Every item acquired by a library must be cataloged and integrated into the library's existing collection. Cataloging involves performing several related routines to create a number of bibliographic records. These records in turn are filed in various catalogs and authority files and used to identify and control each item in the library's collection. The single most important record made in the cataloging process is the "unit catalog card."

The unit catalog card is a master record of bibliographic information known about an item. Specific information is extracted from it to make sets of secondary bibliographic records called catalog card sets.

Each 3-by-5-inch card in a catalog card set contains all the unit card information, plus a distinctive heading made by extracting an item of information from the body of the unit card. These added entries are used to provide additional access points to a particular bibliographic item.

Libraries make catalog card sets in several ways; two of the most common ways in technical libraries are:

1. Manually typing each card in the set
2. Typing headings on duplicate unit cards

In both instances, original information contained on the unit card must be retyped, which in turn requires proofreading, correcting, etc., and the sole product of the typing is a visible record which can only be used in a manual file.

After intensive study of the AFCRL Research Library's processing routines, it was decided that the production of catalog cards was a critical point in the work flow. Since it is a typical medium-sized library, solutions of its problems are applicable to libraries in general. Therefore, a generalized approach to library automation was formulated and the initial step in the approach planned around this cataloging activity.

Systems engineers often fail to give proper consideration to an important and seemingly obvious point in approaching the problem of automation in an established library or information center. A great deal of effort has been expended by librarians in analyzing and organizing the materials acquired and in creating a card catalog to control and interpret the collection. The possibility of replacing either the human intelligence required to analyze materials or the card catalog itself with a computer or any other kind of machine is unlikely. The initial design for a mechanized library must be compatible with the existing system and seek to supplement, rather than replace, traditional library routines. The automated
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system must allow for gradual change-over from manual to machine routines until the most efficient degree of automation for that particular library has been achieved. The machine system described in this paper attempts to satisfy these basic requirements.

In this machine system, catalog card and machinable record production are combined by using a tape typewriter. This allows the Library to maintain the continuity and integrity of its card catalog and present work flow, yet take an initial step towards automation. From a single input typing, the Library now automatically produces:

1. Catalog card sets with distinctive headings for use in its card catalog, and
2. A machine-interpretable record to be used in a machine file for a fully automated system.

Machine-Interpretable Natural Format

Before any store of information can be automated, two basic machine requirements must be satisfied. Information must be machine-accessible and machine-interpretable. Making information machine-accessible is simple, requiring only that data from written or printed records be translated into a machinable form (i.e., paper tape, magnetic tape, or punched cards). This is accomplished by using such devices as key punches and tape typewriters.

Making information machine-interpretable is more complex, requiring considerable preliminary planning and analysis. In the past, machine interpretability has been achieved in one of two ways:

1. By fixed-symbol coding, where each item of information is tagged with a special symbol; each symbol is used to signify one type of information (e.g., Δ = title-page information; ‡ = subject information; etc.).
2. By fixed-field coding, where particular kinds of information are associated with a fixed position in the machine medium; each position is used to signify one type of information (e.g., columns 20 through 30 = subject information; etc.).

Neither method is completely satisfactory. In the first method, a special symbol must be devised and used to identify every type of information to be encoded. The generation of these symbols becomes extremely complex when many different kinds of information are to be distinguished. A library catalog card, for example, contains 90 or more distinguishable types of information (e.g., class number, book number, title, imprint, etc.). In addition, the symbols themselves are difficult to generate since the number of printing codes available on standard key-input equipment is severely limited (47 printing codes for IBM equipment, and 88 printing codes for tape typewriters). Fixed-symbol coding of data creates additional problems in printout. If the symbol codes are not printed out for each item of information, proofreading routines become cumbersome, requir-
ing continual reference to some master record; if they are printed, the symbols create a cluttered record which reduces legibility.

In fixed-field coding, the amount and form of information included is critically affected by the constraints of the media being used. For example, the IBM card has 80 columns and only one printing character is allowed per column. Catalog cards contain from 300 to 500 characters, which means that if all information is to be printed in full, there will be a minimum of four punched cards for every catalog card. This means, usually, that information is drastically abridged in order to save punched cards. In either case, a dedicated field is the basis of machine identification; therefore, that field must always be reserved for that type of information on every card regardless of whether a particular item has that information. In catalog cards for example, less than forty percent of the books cataloged have series statements. In fixed-field coding this position would have to be left vacant for more than sixty percent of the cards.

In both methods of making information machine-interpretable, processing of information for input is complex and places a great many restrictions on both the cataloger and the input keyer.

The machine-interpretable natural format combines the best features of both methods, resulting in an encoding method especially suitable for library purposes. Natural typing manipulations (i.e., carriage returns, tabulate shifts, and spaces) are used to delimit and identify data, thereby avoiding the rigidity of fixed-field coding. These typing manipulations are formalized in the format and are called "boundary markers." Information is recorded in a fixed sequence, thereby avoiding the complexities of fixed-symbol coding. These features reduce input keying routines to the level of ordinary typing, thereby reducing the usual cost of input processing.

Figure 1 shows an example of a library catalog card translated into the machine-interpretable natural format. This bibliographic adaptation is designed to fulfill three basic requirements:

1. To simulate the appearance of the conventional catalog card.
2. To allow interfiling compatibility with existing card catalogs.
3. To encode bibliographical data for machine manipulation and interpretation.

Two devices are used to structure the format and identify the nature of the data: sequential position (or the sequence of paragraphs) and boundary markers. In the following sections a detailed description is given of the bibliographic format showing how these devices are used.

**Sequential Position**

Four paragraphs are used in the format, being distinguished by combinations of carriage returns, tabulate shifts, and spaces. Paragraphs are typed in a fixed sequence. Each paragraph is defined so as to correspond with a block of bibliographic information on a Library of Congress card. (cf. Figure 1).
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Brandt, Conrad.


552 p. 24 cm. (Russian Research Center studies 6)


Harvard Univ. Library for Library of Congress

Fig. 1. Examples of Library of Congress catalog card layout and Crossfiler machine-interpretable natural format.

Within each paragraph there are a controlled number of statements which are distinguished by a series of three spaces. Within statements, there can be any number of phrases, which are separated by two spaces.

The following is a brief identification of the four paragraphs used in the format, showing paragraph and statement sequences: (cf. Figure 1).

1. Call number paragraph
   a. Class number statement
   b. Author number statement
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Tracing and Non-tracing Mode

Of the ten statements distinguished in the encoded format, only four are used for tracing purposes: 2a, 4a, 4b, and 4c. These statements are said to be in the "tracing mode." When processed on the Crossfiler or a computer, a tracing is automatically made for each complete phrase included in each of these statements. All other statements are in a "non-tracing" mode, and no tracings are pulled from them. Figure 2 shows a

---

*Fig. 2—Crossfiler-generated catalog card set*

---
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catalog card set produced by the Crossfiler, with the tracings automatically pulled and reformatted.

**Boundary Markers**

Cards, paragraphs, statements, and phrases are separated and distinguished by conventional typing operations, which serve both as normal punctuation in the printout and as machine-interpretable boundary codes in the punched tape record. The boundary combinations are reserved for these uses exclusively:

1. Cards are introduced or separated by a sequence of at least five carriage returns.
2. Paragraphs are separated by a sequence of one carriage return and two tabulate shifts.
3. Statements are separated by a sequence of three spaces.
4. Phrases are separated by a sequence of two spaces.

Figure 3 shows the encoded format with the boundary markers used to define cards, paragraphs, statements, and phrases.

---

**Fig. 3**—Crossfiler machine-interpretable natural format showing typing manipulations used as boundary codes
**Permuting and Abridging Tracings**

Two special characters are provided to permute and abridge any statement in a tracing mode. The permuting device is a nonprinting symbol that rearranges and pulls an additional heading for any statement (or phrase) in a tracing mode. This symbol is used most frequently in the title statement to create shortened tracings or catchword titles. Figure 4 shows how the permuting bar is used to create additional tracings.

The semicolon is used to abridge any statement in the tracing mode, and frequently in the descriptive paragraph to set off incidental title-page information. Figure 4 shows how the semicolon is used.

**The Crossfiler**

The Crossfiler* is a computer-like device designed and built especially for cataloging automation, based on the concept of the machine interpretable natural format. Its primary function is to read, interpret, and manipulate bibliographic data from a properly-formatted punched paper tape, which represents a unit catalog card, to produce a paper tape representing a set of diversely-headed catalog cards. It does this by processing the punched paper tape representation of a unit catalog card and punch-

* Input tapes can be processed either on general-purpose computers or the Crossfiler; this paper will describe Crossfiler processing routines primarily.

---

Abridged title

```
Symposium on advances in electron metallography
```

Permuted titles

```
Electron metallography
```

Fig. 4—Abridged and permuted title entries automatically generated and reformatted by Crossfiler
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ing out a secondary tape representing a completed catalog card set. The expanded output tape is then loaded into a tape typewriter and typed out on continuous-form card stock.

The unexpanded input tape may be re-used to produce other library records, such as accessions lists, book-form indexes, book-pocket information, circulation records, etc. Since the tape format is designed to be compatible with general-purpose digital computers, a mechanized retrieval file is automatically accumulated as a by-product of the cataloging activity.

Operation of the Crossfiler is extremely simple, requiring only that input tapes be loaded into the reader and start buttons be pushed. The machine then automatically processes the original tape document to produce an expanded output tape.

**Machine System For Cataloging Automation**

A number of input processing routines have been developed to be used with the Crossfiler and its encoded format. The following description represents a practical application of this machine system and is presently being implemented in the AFCRL Research Library:

1. A specially designed worksheet (see Figure 6) is inserted in every book being processed before it passes to cataloging. The cataloger transcribes bibliographic information into the appropriate blocks of the worksheet. Completing the worksheet amounts to format translation, since the worksheet is designed to sequence and position blocks of bibliographical data for the encoded format.
2. Completed worksheets are then passed on to the tape-typist who transcribes the data from the worksheet. The necessary format boundary codes are inserted into the tape as part of the typing routine.
3. Initial typing is done on continuous form paper. Copy is read and corrected, and necessary corrections are made in the paper tape, which is then ready to be processed on the Crossfiler.
4. Corrected tapes are expanded by the Crossfiler, and these tapes are typed out on Flexowriters using continuous card stock, with top and bottom cuts and side perforations. Original input tapes are stored for future use.
5. Catalog card sets are assembled and sent to be filed in the appropriate catalogs.

**Cataloging Costs**

It is difficult to give exact cataloging costs for the machine system described above, since the system is still undergoing testing. However, statistics accumulated during the experimental phase indicate that significant savings in terms of time and money will be realized once the system is fully operative. In the following sections, a number of statistics are presented and discussed, showing how and where these savings will be effected.
Fig. 5—Crossfiler system: catalog card production
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOUNDARY</th>
<th>DATA FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCCCC</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Main entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTT</td>
<td>Title and Title-Page Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>Imprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTT</td>
<td>Collation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTT</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>Added Entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>Series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6—Worksheet for monograph cataloging
Catalog Card Production Costs

The clerical cost of preparing and filing a catalog card in the AFCRL Research Library is approximately 20 cents per card, or $1.40 per card set (an average of seven cards per set). This figure is based on using Library of Congress cards and includes the cost of ordering, materials, typing headings, proofing, sorting, and filing. It does not include any cataloging costs. The cost per card in the machine system is 12 cents per card, or 82.5 cents per card set. This includes the cost of typing, materials, sorting, and filing. (See Chart 1 for a detailed breakdown of these figures.) This figure does not include machine or overhead costs.

MACHINE COSTS

The machine system for catalog card production as described is amenable to both computer and Crossfiler application. However, since the Crossfiler was built for location within a library and operation by unskilled personnel, it does a limited number of functions at a lower cost and with greater efficiency than a general-purpose digital computer. In the following sections the machine costs for both applications are computed and compared.

It must be stressed that the cost figures quoted are approximate and must be considered as being merely indicative of what the real cost would be.

CROSSFILER COSTS

The 12 cents per-card cost figure for Crossfiler-produced cards quoted above does not include machine costs. The Crossfiler is a prototype machine; it is impossible, therefore, to give an exact cost figure for this first model since the research and development costs would have to be included. The feasibility of producing commercial Crossfiler models is being studied, and preliminary estimates indicate that the price of production models will be in the twenty-to-thirty thousand dollar range. This figure does not include the price of the tape typewriter. If one uses $25,000 as an approximate price, the cost per card for a library to produce card sets for 14,000 titles per year would be increased 2.4 cents per card, making the total cost per card 14.4 cents, the total cost per card set 99.3 cents. (See Chart 2 for a cost analysis of Crossfiler produced cards.) This figure represents using the Crossfiler at about 15% of its total processing capacity, or an actual processing time of one hour per day. This means that a single Crossfiler could be used by several cooperating libraries to handle their total cataloging load, thereby reducing the initial machine expense for any one library.

COMPUTER COSTS

Computer costs are usually figured on the basis of rental time rather than purchase. The cost, therefore, will vary from one computer service to

* A variety of tape typewriters are currently being marketed, ranging in price from $2,100 to $5,000.
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another. The following cost figures are based on a rental charge of $75 per hour, which is an average cost for a medium to large sized computer. The rental charge does not include the cost of writing the computer program or the cost of a technician to operate the computer. Since these costs are variable, they have not been used in computing the following costs.

The tape representation of several thousand card sets were made using a PDP-1 computer.* The average processing time per card set was 1.5 minutes, or 100 card sets in 2 hours and 30 minutes. The cost per card set was computed to be $2.70 in this experiment, or 39 cents per card. It should be stressed that this figure represents the cost for a particular kind of computer and should be used only as a rough comparison figure. (See Chart 3 for a breakdown of this figure.)

**OTHER OPERATING EXPENSES**

The same amount of time is needed to type out expanded tapes produced either on the Crossfiler or computer. A run of 100 card sets takes approximately 10 hours to type out on a tape typewriter, averaging 6 minutes per card set. Typing out of cards on the tape typewriter is an "unattended" clerical operation. This means that the typist loads the punched paper tape into the tape typewriter and is then free to do other work. The only additional attention required of her is to check the cards occasionally as they are being typed and then to burst the continuous-form card stock into card sets. These routines require about 30 minutes per 100 card sets. The clerical operating expense for this operation is, therefore, negligible.

**CARD HANDLING TIME**

The machine system promises to effect an appreciable savings in terms of card handling time. At present, the Library spends an average of 32 minutes of clerical time to prepare, process, and file a card set of LC cards.

The clerical handling time for machine-produced card sets is cut in half. The amount of time required to process, prepare, and file a card set using the Crossfiler is approximately 17.5 minutes. This time includes initial input typing, proofing, processing on the Crossfiler, and filing. The savings in time is primarily a result of cards being immediately ready for filing once they have been typed out on the tape typewriter.


**Additional Features**

The potential worth of the machinable input record produced as a by-product of the machine system has not been discussed in this paper. However, this machinable record can be used to produce a variety of bibliographic products. A number of applications using the Crossfiler are presently being experimented with. These include:

1. The production of announcement and accessions lists by automatically abridging and rearranging input records for various output printing formats.

---
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2. The production of control records for bindery routines and circulation activities.
3. The production of intermediate data to be sorted and published as book-form catalogs with alphabetical indexes.
4. The production of selective lists according to input category codes or class numbers.

A number of applications using a computer are also being experimented with, including:

1. Generation of a machine-searchable file to produce demand bibliographies.
2. Automatic compilation of printed subject bibliographies with various indexes (i.e., author, title, subject, etc.)

CHART I
TIME-COST ANALYSIS FOR CATALOG CARD SET PRODUCTION BY MANUAL AND MACHINE METHODS IN THE AFCRL RESEARCH LIBRARY*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Manual Methods</th>
<th>Machine Methods**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using duplicate (LC) cards</td>
<td>Typing complete card sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering routines for Library of Congress cards (includes receiving and checking)</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>960 min (16 hrs)</td>
<td>32¢ per card set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing of headings on LC unit cards to make card sets (includes time for proofreading, correcting)</td>
<td>840 min (14 hrs)</td>
<td>28¢ per card set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand typing of first unit card (does not include time for proofreading or correcting)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proofreading of hand typed unit cards</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Manual Methods</th>
<th>Machine Methods**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using duplicate (LC) cards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand typing of card sets from original unit card</td>
<td>TIME: N/A</td>
<td>TIME: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COST: N/A</td>
<td>COST: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proofreading of hand typed card sets</td>
<td>TIME: N/A</td>
<td>TIME: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COST: N/A</td>
<td>COST: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of the tape representation of a complete card set</td>
<td>TIME: N/A</td>
<td>TIME: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COST: N/A</td>
<td>COST: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing out of card sets on tape typewriters from machine generated punched tape</td>
<td>TIME: N/A</td>
<td>TIME: 6 min per card set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COST: N/A</td>
<td>UNATTENDED OPERATION; COST NOT COMPUTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Library of Congress cards</td>
<td>TIME: N/A</td>
<td>TIME: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 3&quot; × 5&quot; card stock</td>
<td>COST: 56¢ per card set</td>
<td>COST: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Continuous form card stock</td>
<td>TIME: N/A</td>
<td>TIME: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COST: 30¢ per card set</td>
<td>COST: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorting and filing (per card set)</td>
<td>TIME: 9.1 min</td>
<td>TIME: 9.1 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COST: 30¢</td>
<td>COST: 30¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>TIME: 27.1 min</td>
<td>TIME: 23.5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per card set)</td>
<td>COST: $1.46</td>
<td>COST: 82.5¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures are based on processing 100 card sets, with an average of 7 cards per set.
** Machine costs and times are the same for Crossfiling and computer application except if noted otherwise.

- 364 -

* Library Resources & Technical Services
CHART 2
COST ANALYSIS OF CROSSFILER PRODUCED CARD SETS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of total Crossfiler processing capacity</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>12.5%</th>
<th>6.25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number cards produced in 1 year</td>
<td>806,400</td>
<td>403,200</td>
<td>201,600</td>
<td>100,800</td>
<td>50,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of card sets produced in 1 year</td>
<td>115,200</td>
<td>57,600</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine cost per card</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final cost of machine produced cards</td>
<td>$12.3</td>
<td>$12.6</td>
<td>$13.2</td>
<td>$14.4</td>
<td>$16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final cost of machine produced card sets</td>
<td>$82.7</td>
<td>$86.7</td>
<td>$90.9</td>
<td>$93.3</td>
<td>$116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figured on using a Crossfiler exclusively for card set production. Based on a $25,000 machine cost and 10 year depreciation.

CHART 3
COMPARISON OF COMPUTER AND CROSSFILER PROCESSING TIMES AND COSTS FOR CATALOG CARD SET TAPE PRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crossfiler</th>
<th>Computer*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input reading speed</td>
<td>110 characters per second (cps)</td>
<td>200 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output punching speed (paper tape)</td>
<td>110 cps</td>
<td>66 cps**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average processing time required to produce one tape representation of a catalog card set</td>
<td>1 min (or 60 per hour)</td>
<td>1.5 min (or 40 per hour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total annual processing capacity</td>
<td>115,200 card sets (based on a 240 day work year)</td>
<td>Not computed; see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per card set</td>
<td>82.5¢ (see Chart 2)</td>
<td>$2.70 (based on a service rate of $75 per hour)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures are for Digital Equipment Corporation's Standard 4-K PDP-1, with disc memory.
**High speed printing equipment is available and used with many computers, but these devices are capable of printing in upper-case letters only.
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THE ENACTMENT of Public Law 579 of the 87th Congress on August 9, 1962, represented a complete revision of legislation under which, beginning as early as 1857, certain libraries had been designated as depositories for Government publications, to provide permanent collections of these publications throughout the United States for the convenient use of the public. The basic depository legislation prior to passage of the 1962 law, had been that included as part of the General Printing Act of 1895, with such notable amendments as a 1913 law which provided for continuance of a designated depository for as long as it fulfilled the legal requirements, and the Appropriation Act of 1922, in which there was inserted a provision that only those publications selected by depositories could be sent to them. A portion of the 1895 law that was little known and regarded as of no particular importance for years thereafter, suddenly assumed significance in 1933, when a newly-enacted law required actual payment by all Government agencies to the Post Office Department of the postage cost of their mailings. The provision in question was, of course, that which provided that publications should be distributed only to such depositories as should signify a willingness to pay the cost of their transportation.

At the time the new Depository Law went into effect, the Office of the Superintendent of Documents was providing Government publications printed by the Government Printing Office to 594 depository libraries within 24 hours after they were off the press. The additional designations provided by the new law** made possible a maximum of approximately 734 additional depositories, or an ultimate total of about 1328. We estimated that, in the first year, there would be about 100 additional designations.

On September 18, 1962, the Public Printer sent a letter to the heads of all departments and independent agencies of the Government request-

* Paper read at the program sponsored by the RSD/RTSD Public Documents Interdivisional Committee, Chicago, July 15, 1963.
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ing that each designate an official familiar with its publishing programs to work with us in implementing the provisions of the new depository law. In that letter, the requirements of the law were pointed out, particularly that whereby the departments and agencies would be called on to furnish to the Superintendent of Documents depository copies of certain of their publications not produced by the Government Printing Office. We specified that our Office would not have the additional resources that the administration of the expanded program would require before fiscal year 1964, and that we were requesting the additional resources for the estimated first year’s expansion in our budget submission for that year. We felt that this information might be useful to the departments and agencies in adjusting their budget requests for the forthcoming year, where they would find this necessary.

As a result of this request, we established liaison in each department or agency with a contact with whom we have begun the effort of identifying and grouping the publications not being procured by the Government agencies from the Government Printing Office that would appear to come within the scope of the new law. As you can appreciate, we have had many questions from these representatives, as well as others in the agencies, for clarification of the meaning of some of the provisions of the law. Although this has frequently meant only giving our understanding, we have done our best to help them, just as we have tried to do in the case of a considerable number of similar requests received from librarians. Representatives of Government agencies have seemed particularly concerned about what the implementation of this expanded program might do to their intra-agency reproduction programs. We were not surprised to discover that some of them regard this as a rather difficult responsibility that the Superintendent of Documents is placing on them and have presented counter arguments to us as to the effect it would have on their existing programs.

A random analysis of a few of the observations presented by individual agency representatives points up some of the problems that they are trying to solve. One pointed out that his agency produced printed matter in three reproduction centers and that, in addition, dozens of posts produce periodic material. The estimate given was 243,000 pounds a year, but it was stated that “the inclusion of monographic material might well triple this estimate.” He added that “the greater part of this literature is produced in some 40-odd languages—many of them exotic.”

One of the most surprising reactions to me was that of the department which seemed to solve the problem very simply, by stating that its publications are made available to the public by the Office of Technical Services and “it seems only logical that that system be extended to depository libraries.” As we know, publications of the Office of Technical Services are among those exempted as cooperative publications, from the distribution provided by the Depository Law.

Another agency pointed out that certain of its reports are of limited and special interest, “have a short life,” and are prepared primarily for
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programmatic use, which does not warrant large printings. A number of agencies wanted to know whether the published material referred to in the Act can include material issued as micro-forms, as well as printed matter. There seems to be some confusion about the depository program evidenced by agencies which are now operating their own depository systems, which include, in some instances, the selection of certain libraries as regional depositories.

One department, commenting in detail on our request that non-GPO publications be listed in series or general categories, replied, "The Department issues hundreds of thousands of publications, most of which do not fall into clearly defined categories. The screening of these publications would necessitate the inspection of each one individually and the determination of its application to the general public or lack thereof. It is believed that any practical review and accumulation of data in this connection must necessarily be accomplished on a graduated basis over a period of time if the results are to be meaningful. Your request would necessitate the reprinting of all publications selected, in the amount of perhaps 1200 or more copies. In many cases, this print run would represent a quantity several times the original run as required by this Department. There are no mechanics within the Department for funding this unbudgeted expenditure."

On the other side of the picture, it has been gratifying to note that in some instances the departments or agencies did what I had hoped would be the initial result, and identified a number of series which would seem to come under provisions of the new law. In several cases, reference was made to the fact that the number of copies of this material produced in the departmental plant was limited because the material was included in the Federal Register. In other cases, ability to supply the extra depository copies required was limited by the statement that the work load of the agency might mean that some time would probably have to elapse after issuance before the agency would be able to provide us with the additional copies.

There are several things that we have been able to do at the Government Printing Office, apart from the contacts with the other agencies. First, the instructions to depositories have been revised to reflect the changes made by the new law, and a copy sent to all depository libraries. A special notice of the changed provisions regarding disposition of publications was also sent to them. This, we have been informed, was timely and helpful, as there was some uncertainty about the five-year disposal provided for libraries served by regional depositories and some feeling that it applied to all depositories. At the request of the Joint Committee on Printing, we also revised for it the Committee Print on Government Depository Libraries.

In the light of the definition of coverage provided in the new Act, we have been reviewing the publications printed by the Government Printing Office which have not been made available for depository distribution to determine whether any of these would have "public interest or educa-
tional value.” As one result of this review, we are planning, in the near
future, to survey all depository libraries as to their interest in the series
While these have been considered in the same class as Military Specifi-
cations and of interest only to contractors bidding on Government supplies,
the Standards do contain information about the structure and testing of
materials that might well be of interest to engineering students and
others.

A feature of Public Law 579 about which I have always been most
optimistic is that which provides for the designation of certain depository
libraries as regional depositories. There have been 17 designated to date
with three more in process of completion, and the smoothness with which
this provision has been implemented has been notable. The fact that we
have had more of the answers to the questions that arise in this operation,
due to the voluntary regional arrangement in which we had cooperated
with our friends in Madison, Wisconsin, and Albany, New York, has un-
doubtedly, been a factor here. In addition, I have been impressed by the
sincerity of those under-taking this responsibility and their reasonable
approach to the problems we are jointly trying to solve. We had a mini-
mum of confusion because of an erroneously-held view by a few interested
in their libraries becoming regional depositories, that it was only by
achieving this status that a depository could qualify to receive the non-
GPO material when available, but this has been cleared away and we see
no serious problems ahead in the designation of the regional depositories
provided for by the law.

An often-discussed development of much future promise occurred in
January of this year, when the Advisory Committee to the Public Printer
on Depository Libraries was designated. The selection of members was
made from a list of names which had been suggested by the American
Library Association of those possessing the qualifications to make a con-
tribution in this field. I am more than happy with those chosen, as they
include persons with whom I have worked and whose advice I have sought
in the past on other problems. The members of this Committee are:
Edwin Castagna, Paul Howard, Carma R. Leigh, Roger Ff. McDonough,
Benjamin E. Powell, Rae Elizabeth Rips, and Thomas S. Shaw. Miss
Germaine Krettek, the A.L.A. Washington representative, will act as an
observer to the Committee.

The foregoing developments since the passage of the new Depository
Law have taken place on the assumption that the additional resources
required by our Office in implementing its provisions would be made
available and that we will be able to begin actual distribution to the
additional depositories designated, as soon as possible after the funds
requested can be obligated. Last year, the Legislative Appropriation Bill
was signed into law on October 2. Whenever the current bill becomes
law, you can be assured that we shall proceed promptly to effect the se-
lections of publications by the new depositories in order that we can
begin to mail publications to them. We hope that distribution of the
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publications produced by the G.P.O. can be begun to the 92 new de-
positories added since August 9, 1962, by January 1, 1964 at the latest, and
earlier, if circumstances permit. The current appropriation will also pro-
vide funds for the postage costs of distribution by our Office to all de-
positories, to be paid from Government funds instead of by the deposi-
tories, as heretofore required by law.

Unless something intervenes to change the result of the action by the
Appropriation Committees of the House of Representatives and the Sen-
ate, the portion of the additional funds that we have requested to enable
us to distribute publications not printed by the G.P.O., as these can be
identified and supplied to us, will not be provided in our 1964 appropria-
tion. We are directed, however, to continue the exploration of these publ-
cations with the agencies which produce or procure them, in the hope that
we shall be able to give a more definite estimate to the Committees of
the extent of the program and its related cost. We shall, of course, do
our best to comply with this direction.

From my talks with many of you at the Mid-Winter Conference and
the letters and telephone calls we have had, I know that you have a very
great and detailed interest in the Depository Program, as we at the G.P.O.
also have. I am grateful to your Chairman for his invitation to come here
and tell you in person what we have been doing since the new law was
enacted, where we now stand, and what we see ahead for the immediate
future.

DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION EDITORIAL POLICY
COMMITTEE MEETING

The Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee met at the Library of
Congress on October 1, 1962 to review various editorial matters in connection
with the preparation of the 17th edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification. It
advised the Decimal Classification Office especially on the revision of the form-
division table (to be called a table of “standard subdivisions”), on the degree of
allowable relocation of topics from one number to another, and on details of the
schedules for education and law.

Attending the meeting were Chairman Wyllis E. Wright of Williams College;
Secretary Deo B. Colburn of Forest Press, Inc.; members Edwin B. Colburn of the
of the Georgia State Department of Education, Carlyle J. Frarey of the Univer-
sity of North Carolina, Lucile M. Morsch of the Library of Congress, Esther J.
Pierce of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, Pauline A. Seely of the Denver Public
Library; Carmen Rovira, as alternate for Marietta Daniels of the Columbus
Memorial Library, Pan American Union.—Benjamin A. Custer, Editor, Dewey
Decimal Classification, The Library of Congress
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Library Resources & Technical Services
Depository Library - Privilege or Responsibility*

ROGER H. MC DONOUGH, Director
Division of State Libraries
Trenton, New Jersey

It is true, of course, that beginning with the Printing Act of 1895 substantial progress was made in expanding the system. In particular, the scope of government publications distributed to depository libraries was gradually enlarged from the Congressional Series to include committee prints, Executive publications, and other categories. The 1962 legislation, however, represents the first major advance since before the Second World War. Not only does it provide for the distribution of additional categories of materials; it also greatly enlarges the public to be served by the depository system.

The first and most immediately important gain under the new legislation is the doubling of the number of depositories authorized—from 720 to 1,321, a gain of 601 libraries. This is the first significant breakthrough in half a century. In view of the population increases that have taken place in that time and the number of new libraries that have been created, there is an obvious need for this particular provision.

As of April 1963, 68 new libraries had received depository status. The breakdown of these libraries is as follows: 52 college and university libraries, 12 public, 2 county law libraries, 1 museum and 1 state library. Libraries which had long needed to become depositories now have the necessary authorization. In California, for example, three college libraries, with a combined population of 25,000 to 30,000 students, are becoming depositories for the first time. I think that we may take satisfaction from the fact that so many of the newly designated depository libraries are in colleges and universities, in view of the anticipated tremendous growth in college population in the next few decades.
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A second provision of the new law opens the way to acquiring a large number of documents produced by government agencies in their own printing plants. This category of documents has grown in size and importance to a point where 60 research libraries in the country have cooperated since the close of World War II in the support of a documents expediter in Washington, whose job it is to locate these documents and make copies available to the cooperating libraries.

Our pleasure at this provision is tempered by the news that the budget request of the Government Printing Office for funds to hire the necessary staff was not granted by the Congress. We trust that the GPO will make every effort now to lay the groundwork for a successful effort next year. It is certain that ALA will continue to press vigorously for the implementation of this important provision.

The provision adding non-GPO material was much contested before it was enacted into law. There is no question that it places additional burdens upon the Superintendent of Documents' Office, and we can well understand the desire of the Government Printing Office to run its plant efficiently and, if possible, to show a profit. From the librarian's point of view, however, it is the service that is important. It costs great sums of money to prepare and print the thousands of documents that are produced in a steady stream in Washington, and the cost of making additional copies and distributing them to our libraries is minute indeed in terms of the cost of the whole program.

I am inclined to agree with the Subcommittee on the Library of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, which observed drily that "at least in some respects the attendant problems have been magnified out of proper proportion." As the Subcommittee stated, "... the issuing agencies may determine what materials printed in their departmental and field printing plants fall within the categories—(1) Required for official use only; (2) Strictly administrative or operational in nature; and (3) Classified for reasons of national security; and immediately exclude this material from the publications they would be required to make available to depository libraries."

Moreover, the Subcommittee found little distinction between the output of the departmental and field plants. This "indicates in a very practical way that depository libraries have a legitimate claim to certain classes of non-GPO-printed materials on the basis that they constitute informational matter which should be made available to the public through the depository library system."

The "Final Statement of the Subcommittee" concluded that "the expansion of depository coverage to include non-GPO-printed materials could be accomplished with no impairment or significant disruption of essential Government services."

A third major provision of the law is the creation of regional depositories (not to exceed 2) in each state. These may be designated by members of the Senate from among existing depository libraries. Any depository library which agrees to assume regional status must do the following:
(1) retain at least one copy of all government publications; (2) give inter-
library loan and reference service within its region; and (3) assist depository
libraries in disposing of unwanted government publications. This last
provision permits other depositories to discard government publications
after having retained them for at least five years. It appears to be a most
sensible provision; it permits the disposal of unneeded documents and, at
the same time, insures that at least one copy is kept within easy access.

A fourth benefit deriving from this legislation is the creation of an
advisory committee of librarians to work with the Superintendent of
Documents in developing policies and procedures for the continuing
improvement of the depository system. This is not part of the law itself
but came about as the result of suggestions made by the ALA repre-
sentatives who testified at the hearings. I am particularly pleased by this
provision because my experience in two hearings in Washington has con-
vinced me that better coordination is needed if the depository library pro-
gram is to be made to work properly.

There are other positive results of the new law; for example, the
shipping costs will now be borne by the Superintendent of Documents
rather than by the depository libraries.

On the minus side, we did not get any microfacsimile provision. The
main argument raised against including this feature was that the whole
field of microreproduction is still in a state of flux and that it would be
unwise to select any one system at this time. It seems to me that this is not
a good argument. I think it reasonable to assume that photocopying will
always be in a state of flux. The fact that certain firms are already_photo-
copying a great many government documents and selling them to libraries
indicates that they, at least, are not afraid of obsolescence. As for the
argument that the Government Printing Office should not compete with
private publishers, I find it difficult to take this seriously. If it were fol-
lowed to its logical conclusion, the Public Printer would not produce any
government publications because he would be competing with commercial
interests. I am unhappy that we were unable to include this microfacsimile
provision in the law; although I recognize that to have pressed for its in-
clusion might very well have endangered the bill.

In determining what the effects of the new law have been to date, I
wrote to a few of my fellow state librarians in various parts of the country
for their opinions. Several replied that the law had been too recently put
into effect to permit judgment; others noted evidence of progress.

From California, Mrs. Phyllis Dalton, the Assistant State Librarian,
vo\ite that the new law has enabled more libraries, mostly college and
university libraries, to be designated as depositories. She also reported:

Since the California State Library has been designated a regional depository,
other depositories in the state may dispose of publications no longer wanted. This
relieves the space squeeze which many libraries are experiencing and benefits
newer college and university libraries that are eager to receive publications no
longer needed in older depositories.
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Mrs. Dalton went on to make these suggestions:

(a) provide regional depositories with a microfacsimile copy in addition to printed copies; (b) compile and issue another 10-year (1951-60) cumulation of the Index to the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications; (c) permit libraries that discontinue receiving a title to dispose of the back file immediately, rather than be compelled to keep it for five years.

From Georgia, William Pullen, Librarian of the Georgia State College reported:

... The only benefit of the law so far in this area is that the Georgia Tech Library is being designated a depository. ... So far as I know we have not had a depository library in Georgia indicate that it is willing to become a regional library. I have always felt that this was one of the weaknesses under the law in that the responsibilities of becoming a regional library are so great that it will be difficult to get libraries in some states to agree to accept them. We have four depositories in Atlanta. ... I have recently suggested to the Library Advisory Committee of the University Center that these libraries at least get together and make sure that all depository items are selected somewhere in this area so that we non-depositories will know what to expect. ...

Some of the most interesting work at the state level has been in Wisconsin, which, in effect, anticipated by a decade the regional Library aspects of the depository legislation. In 1953 and 1954, it inaugurated an experimental plan under which the State Historical Society was given legislative authority to establish and operate a central state depository and loan collection of Federal documents.

The Society's Librarian, Mr. Benton H. Wilcox, commented on this experimental program and the new legislation:

The 'Regional Depository' plan has proved very effective in relieving depository libraries of their stock of 'old,' unwanted materials. In the years that we have had this plan in operation we have 'cleaned-out' the collections of the four public libraries in Wisconsin which had depository status (other than the Milwaukee Public Library). ... In this process we were able to shift nearly all the old collections to rising state college libraries, which had newly acquired depository status, and wished to build up their research collections.

Mr. Wilcox continued:

... In the movement for the new law we stressed the fact that the 'regional depository' would be instrumental in making service more effective throughout the state. This is more theory than fact. It could do that if the local public libraries had staff and reference tools so that they could guide patrons to these materials. In practice, during the years beginning in 1954, the calls on this 'regional depository' for service have numbered less than 50 per year, and the bulk of those came from one library. ...

As to the Federal law, Mr. Wilcox criticizes the absence of machinery for selecting the regional depositories and of control over their operations by the Superintendent of Documents. He proposes also that the law be strengthened by a provision for "true regional depositories" serving several
states in regions where such institutions would be impractical for individual states.

It is interesting to note that a similar suggestion was made in 1938 by another Wilcox, the late Jerome K. Wilcox, who proposed that designations be made “dependent entirely on three factors—heavy population concentrations, large library centers, and regional designation for the sparsely settled regions.”

These suggestions about the need for true regional depositories make a lot of sense. It is quite obvious that we do not need 100 such libraries, but, rather, a smaller number strategically placed. Such an arrangement could be similar to that which has been worked out by the National Science Foundation and the U. S. Department of Commerce which in 1962, jointly selected 12 university libraries to serve as regional technical report centers. These libraries agreed to maintain a cumulative library collection of all materials received and to furnish such services as personal reference, inter-library loans, photocopying, and assistance to users in obtaining retention copies. This seems to me to be a very practical arrangement and something we should definitely keep in mind for future amendments to the depository statute.

The comments from Georgia and the practice in Wisconsin point up the need of public financial support for those libraries which accept regional status. The support may have to be federal, state or cooperatively interstate should regional libraries be established which serve more than one state.

The title of this article is “Depository Library—Privilege or Responsibility.” We all know that too many small, weak libraries have sought and obtained depository status in the past. In too many instances, it would appear, libraries have thought more of the prestige value of a depository library designation than of their ability to use the depository materials effectively. Instances were cited in the Congressional hearings in which colleges with five or ten or even fifteen thousand students could not secure depository status because small public libraries in their districts had been given the honor many years before. They were clearly less able to use the documents than their college neighbors but until the new law was passed little could be done about it.

It seems to me that the state library agencies and the state library associations should join forces to insure that the depository libraries are selected on the basis of the overall needs of the states in terms of populations served, whether public or academic communities, and the geographical area in which they are located. Almost every state now has a library development committee, and the place of the depository libraries within each state should be considered in relation to the whole program of library development. The designations of new depositories should not be made as haphazardly as they have been in the past, for in our increasingly interdependent library world depository status is a responsibility first and a privilege second.

The passage of the new depository library legislation marked the
culmination of many years of work by many individuals in this Association. Under this legislation, more libraries will have depository status and all depositories will have additional categories of materials available to them. The new law is not a perfect instrument but it is the law of the land and all parties involved have a moral and civic responsibility to see to it that it works and that these tremendously valuable and significant materials reach the widest possible audience through our depository library system.

The American Library Association stands ready to cooperate in every possible way with the Superintendent of Documents, Mr. Carper Buckley, and his staff in insuring that the provisions of the law, as well as the intentions of the Senate and House Committees, are fully carried out.

The new Advisory Committee on the depository program would appear to be the key to this cooperative approach and we are grateful to Mr. Buckley for having brought the Committee into being. It is our hope that the Committee will be convened at an early date in order that it can begin to consider how the expanded program can best be carried out.
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   *I should like to acknowledge the fine support and friendly encouragement we received from Senator Everett Jordan of North Carolina and his associates at the 1962 Hearings and Representative Wayne Hayes of Ohio and his colleagues in the 1958 Hearings. The staffs of the Senate and House Committees did excellent work, and the 1962 report, embodying the results of their work, is a model of clarity and conciseness.*  

LUCILLE DUFFY

Friends of Lucille Duffy will be saddened to hear of her death September 30, releasing her from her tragic illness. She was Chief Catalog Director at the University of Washington when struck down by a brain tumor. And she was an active leader in catalog associations, including the DCC and the Catalog and Classification Section. We have lost a respected co-worker and a delightful companion.
Centralized Bibliographic Control

ROBERT W. WIENPAHL, Chief of Public Services
San Fernando Valley State College Library
Northridge, California

In April of 1962 San Fernando Valley State College Library entered upon an experimental program of centralized bibliographic control of the media used for book selection. Prior to this we had what might be described as a dispersed system, almost completely in the hands of the faculty. Faculty members submitted their order requests directly to the Acquisitions Department to be charged against their individual departmental allocations. The chief control exercised by the Library was to set up quarterly dates, by which periods sufficient order requests should be on hand to commit another quarter of each department's funds. In short, this was fundamentally a fiscal control, with the added feature of the spacing of work in the Acquisitions Department.

The extent of the involvement of the reference staff was to check items listed in the American Book Publishing Record and selected scholarly review journals, have them typed up on order-request cards, and submit these, along with selected Library Journal review cards, to the book coordinators of each of the academic departments for distribution to the faculty for their selection. This was a service voluntarily undertaken by the Library with no real proof as to how many of these cards were in turn selected by the faculty and sent on to Acquisitions for purchase. The faculty also set up its own checking and carding systems, usually on a less current and less systematic basis. Obviously, this resulted in a serious amount of duplicated effort; first at this level, and then again when the Acquisitions Department had to run all these cards through the card catalog and order file to check them against the Library's holdings and orders.

In addition, the involvement of the reference staff was minimal and not very rewarding, since the results of its efforts were difficult to ascertain. It should be added, of course, that the reference staff was still totally responsible for selecting reference materials and certain non-book materials.

In overhauling this system, we wanted to take advantage of as many of the printed card bibliographies as possible in order to avoid the costly typing of requests checked in the normal publishing and review media, to say nothing of eliminating as much of the duplication of requests as possible. In short, the results desired were broader coverage with less effort, more involvement of the librarians, and some additional fringe benefits, which will be noted below.
To accomplish this end, we subscribed to the Library of Congress proof sheets, cut and punched for ease of handling. In addition, of course, we were already receiving the Library Journal review cards. These two sources were to be our main selection media. They are received in the Acquisitions Department, multilithed on the verso with a blank bibliographical checking form which provides a standardized record of how the item will be searched, approved, ordered, etc. They are dated by this same process, divided into subject areas corresponding to the academic departments, and distributed to the reference staff. Each of these librarians, currently comprising ten, has charge of one or more subject areas, again corresponding to the academic departments. Each librarian is assigned to a subject or subjects primarily on the basis of subject competency, secondarily because of interest, and, lastly, by default, if there is no one else available; a small staff can muster only a limited number of persons with real subject competency.

The reference staff is, therefore, in charge of what we have called a centralized bibliographic control. To each of the subject specialists come the LC proof cards, the LJ review cards, and order request cards initiated by professors and librarians. Ideally, we hope to limit the last category primarily to older imprints, relying heavily upon the first two categories for all or most of our current buying.

We also have an additional experiment going on in current buying, whereby a separate sum of money is set aside for purchasing current titles for the general collection. These titles are limited to 1962 imprints for this past fiscal year. This sum was set up with the idea that it would be adequate for purchasing all new titles which would be considered of significance in meeting the acquisitions policies of the library, and in making them available on the shelves as expeditiously as possible. It was felt that by removing current buying from the limitations imposed by departmental accounts and faculty prerogatives in making its own selections, the library staff would gradually take over the major part of the selection of such current materials and do it much more rapidly and systematically than does the faculty. It was hoped that by the time most of the professors got around to making requests, the items would already be on the shelves. We did not expect faculty members to surrender their prerogative in this area all at once, nor have they; this really depends on the depth of each one’s interest and his confidence in the competency of the librarian who would be selecting in his subject area. Faculty cooperation in this venture was enhanced by the feeling that the current buying fund was a general fund open to all rather than depending on the departmental money and that the fund was adequate to cover all needs including borderline selections. Actually, a current buying fund is not a necessary concomitant to centralized bibliographic control, but it may help psychologically in achieving a greater participation in, and eventual control of, current buying by the reference staff.

The subject librarians realize the limitations and possible dangers in depending heavily upon LC proofs, since they are a by-product of acquir-
practice, this duty tends to be centered in one member of the department division who is elected book coordinator by his colleagues, either to do the selecting or to encourage the others to make selections. His own duty then becomes that of a true coordinator in obtaining the right people to do the job. Unfortunately, it is true that only a relatively small percentage of the faculty are bibliographically oriented.

Another reason for centralized control is to complete the involvement of the members of the reference staff in the selection of materials, thereby increasing their subject competency and awareness and ultimately enhancing their value to the faculty and students through their increased knowledge of library resources. Actually, justifying the involvement of the library staff in the full range of bibliographic activities appears tantamount to having to justify the involvement of a teacher with his students. But it is a fact that all too many librarians find their bibliographic role to be that of an accessory after the fact rather than a companion in the act.

And, finally, the centralized control transcends the vagaries of professors' and librarians' interests, vacations, sabbaticals, job severances, etc.; in short, it is an organized system which does not begin to limp every time such changes take place.

Each subject librarian receives the LC proof cards, LJ review cards, and college order request cards for his assigned areas and organizes them into an integrated file on the basis of the predetermined imprint date. That is, there are two basic files, one for the so-called current imprints, and the other for all earlier imprints. Regardless of whether the Library elects to set up a separate current buying fund, the usefulness of a separate current imprint file is obvious. It allows any interested professor or librarian to review, evaluate, and select the newest titles as a task separate from the great quantity of cards which accumulates in the development file. The development file includes, not only the non-current LC proof and
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This state college is only six years old, but it has experienced the fastest growth of any of the California state colleges. The collection, started from scratch, now exceeds 100,000 items. This represents a tremendous amount of bibliographical searching and typing of cards from all sources. Formerly, cards were scattered in faculty offices, in Acquisitions, in transit, etc. Now, they are largely available in one area and will be increasingly so as the system matures.

Each of the subject librarians establishes liaison with his faculty counterpart in order to establish a schedule for review and selection. In the case of current material, the librarian has the right to submit cards for areas where there is no strong faculty interest, as well as to make selections in collaboration with the faculty, and, in case the professor is unable to keep the schedule, to submit requests in that area as needed. In this way, an even flow of work for the Acquisitions Department is assured, and the current program is kept current; and in many areas the faculty is relinquishing the selection of current materials to the librarians.

The subject librarians, in consultation with the book coordinators, divide all of the material into categories of desirability. They weed it of items which do not come within the acquisitions policies of the Library. They arrange with the book coordinators for systematic evaluation of holdings by checking scholarly bibliographies and carding the wanted items to be added to the development file. They segregate LC proof cards which belong to other departmental subject areas but which happen to classify in their own. This is especially true of an area like geography where the holdings are often scattered. Such cards are sent to the subject librarians for that area. Of course, professors are at liberty to, and do, peruse the cards in other subject areas. And this is easily done with centralized control. The subject tracings on the LC proofs and the annotations on the LJ review cards are of great help in evaluating the contents of a book.

Another area of control is that dealing with out-of-print materials. Order requests for items which are cancelled by the jobber or dealer because they are out of print, or items in used-book dealers’ catalogs lost by prior sale, are returned by the Acquisitions Department to the subject librarians who hold them for evaluation by the proper professors. Items worth searching are returned to the Acquisitions Department for want listing. When this fails, such cards are returned to the subject librarians.
who maintain desiderata files to be checked periodically against dealers’ catalogs.

Subject librarians and professors are also called upon by the Acquisitions Department to evaluate proffered gifts, both prior to acceptance and after, to eliminate non-useful titles or to determine the need for retaining duplicates. The same procedure is also used in dealing with collections for sale, both prior to and after purchase.

As to the fringe benefits mentioned at the beginning of the article, two are of particular importance.

One is the fact that the LC proof slips have complete bibliographic information and require no further verification prior to ordering—except to establish the price, a fiscal requirement. LJ review cards also have all necessary information, including the price. This information, together with the correct entries, greatly eases the burdens of the Acquisitions Department by shortening the bibliographic checking routine. One difficulty has arisen due to the fact that the Library of Congress catalogs many items from American publishers prior to their release date and, therefore, seeking prices for these books is subject to some delay until they are listed in the normal book-trade channels. This is one reason for dating LC proof upon arrival and delaying the search for the price. Only experience with this system of selection can set the pattern of handling these cards. At any rate, any delay in ordering is one which would be encountered by the non-availability of the item under any circumstances.

It may be of interest to know that we dealt with an estimated 75,000 cards during the year, the very large majority (over 70,000) being LC proofs. Of current 1962 imprints, we selected approximately 10,500 items which would have cost approximately $67,000. We say “would have” since our purchases were curtailed because of lack of funds to be devoted to this one purpose. Of the number selected, approximately 14% were from publishers abroad. This is less than might be expected. However, it should be noted that, while ours is a relatively new college attempting to build an adequate collection as quickly as possible, we are not a university with all that this implies in catholic tastes. These figures represent the selections of a faculty of less than 400, for a student body of approximately 8800, and with fourteen fields of concentration for the master’s degree. It will be noted that all of the above figures are approximate. Since every institution of higher education is completely individual, it is patently impossible even to suggest that our experience would form a parallel for any other institution. In addition, one year’s experience can scarcely be considered as a criterion for valid judgments. But it is hoped that these approximations may prove useful to other institutions as a point of reference.

The other important fringe benefit arose from the fact that the Library was already operating a Xerox 914 copier for the campus at large. So, with the addition of a Multilith machine and the use of LC proof cards as a selection tool, we were quite ready and able to produce our own catalog cards. Instructions are given to limit all bibliographic checking
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and approval signatures to the verso of the card leaving the face to be photographed. Upon arrival of the book, the LC proof card is pulled from the order file and placed in the book. With the addition of the classification number by the Catalog Department, a unit card is ready for Xerography. Four cards are selected on a basis of similar numbers of cards required for a set. They are placed vertically one above the other in a strip and Xerographed onto a Multilith master. These masters are then Multilithed on four-up, punched card stock. They are later cut into sets. A Xerox No. 1 camera or Ektalith would provide a greater measure of control, but that will have to wait until the volume of work justifies the investment. We are also planning to order one LC card for those older items for which we have no LC proof. This will be used as a unit card for reproduction.

This, then, is what one library calls centralized bibliographic control. After almost one year's operation, both the Library committee and the reference staff have expressed approval of its potential benefits. Not all phases of it have worked fully, nor equally well in all areas. But it is a functioning system and has already achieved sufficient benefits to merit its continuation. In short, it is not only practical in theory, but practicable in fact.

**SURVEY OF INFORMATION STORAGE SYSTEMS**

A DIVISION PRESIDENT'S duty, it would appear to this President from this vantage point, is mainly to get other people started on various activities and to keep in touch with their progress in carrying out the tasks assigned. This report is not a report of what your President has done, but of the many very active committees working in fields of interest to the Division. It will be supplemented by reports of the four Sections where projects in the special fields of acquisitions, cataloging and classification, serials, and copying methods are being carried out.

Our newest and perhaps most active committee of a general nature is our Planning Committee. Recommended at a meeting of past presidents of the Division last year and strongly sponsored by Helen Welch, last year's President, this Committee was appointed on an ad hoc basis to test its usefulness. This status was agreed upon because of doubts expressed by some members of the Board of Directors on two fronts: Would such a committee be assuming functions properly belonging to the Board of Directors? Would it find enough problems sufficiently broad in scope to justify its existence without infringing on the activities of the section policy and research committees? To answer the first objection, the Committee's statement of function has been made very restrictive: "To consider problems of technical services as a whole, including long-range divisional objectives and areas of new divisional interest, and to suggest action to the Board of Directors." Liaison with the section committees is being maintained by reporting sessions of the chairmen of all these committees at Midwinter and by the exchange of written minutes and reports. I believe there have been one or two instances of referral of projects from the Planning Committee to a section policy and research committee. On the other hand, there have been cases where a project being considered by a section committee proved to be part of a problem that might well be considered as an over-all technical services project. The Planning Committee prepared a careful proposal for three projects which were recommended to the Board of Directors at its Midwinter meeting. All were accepted for action or further study and are now in the hands of special committees. They are: (1) A committee to develop standards for size of technical services staffs. Since Miss Welch is bowing out as Chairman of the Planning Committee, we have asked her to serve as Chairman of this Special Committee. (2) A committee to bring up to date a survey published in 1955 on coordinating routines of acquisitions and catalog departments. The Chairman of this Committee is Kathryn Renfro of the Univer-
sity of Nebraska. (3) Of a somewhat different nature is a committee, with Andrew Osborn of the University of Pittsburgh Library School as Chairman, to investigate the "feasibility and present appropriateness of a project to write a history of technical services librarianship." The Planning Committee will have a new Chairman next year, John Fall of the New York Public Library, another Past President of this Division. If this Committee continues to function as actively as it has during the past year, it is my hope that the Board and the Division will shortly decide to make this a standing committee.

The Bookbinding Committee arranged for the publication this summer of papers presented at the workshop it sponsored immediately preceding the Miami Beach Conference. It has recommended to the ALA Publishing Department that revision of the Library Binding Manual be deferred until completion of the three-year testing program concerned with performance standards of library bindings which began in February, 1962. In the meantime, it is hoped that the present edition of the Manual can be kept in print. At its 1963 Midwinter meeting, the Committee considered an appeal for advice on binding problems from a Nigerian college library and prepared a list of practical suggestions for libraries in underdeveloped areas for the use of the ALA International Relations Office.

Another new committee this year is our Committee on Documentation. Because this is an area of overlapping interests, ALA has also appointed a committee to explore the various angles of ALA's interest. I quote from the RTSD Committee's report:

The program of documentation, as viewed by librarians who have been in the business of serving users on all levels of need for many years, has been directed primarily at the inadequacies of traditional library techniques to provide the depth analysis of the subject content of literature for the needs of users. The application of automation and mechanization to library procedures has been implicit, and the various conferences that have been held in the country during the year have emphasized this aspect.

In general, it appears that the particular service that the Committee might provide the Division is to continue to keep attuned to developments which have application to the various segments. . . . In the sense that all members of the current Committee are involved in interlocking movements or agencies, this is probably being done in a way that may not always be possible. Moreover, there are so many directions that need to be observed, and so many meetings and conferences that involve the concern of RTSD, it is likely that no Committee can keep up to date with all events. During the year there have been conferences at UCLA, Minnesota, and the Library of Congress. During the year the first textbook, Textbook on Mechanized Information Retrieval, by Allen Kent, was published. It is more than likely that other textbooks in the field will reveal the essence of documentation in a different way. . . . A textbook by Joseph Becker and Robert Hayes has been promised in the near future. Others are being developed.

In addition to the publication of synthesized information in textbook form, the Committee calls attention also to the current literature in American Documentation, Journal of Documentation, and the new Information Storage and Retrieval. . . . Note should be made also of Number 11 in the series of reviews of
Current Research and Development in Scientific Documentation, issued by the National Science Foundation in November, 1962. In general, these reviews have been concerned with studies in the following areas: information needs and uses, information storage and retrieval, mechanical translation, equipment, and potentially related research.

The Chairman of this Committee (Maurice Tauber) is also Chairman of the ALA Interdivisional Committee on Documentation, and with this Committee has indicated support of a Pre-Conference meeting in St. Louis, in 1964, on the general topic of automation and application to libraries. The relationship of automation to approaches to information is a pivotal one, and the emphasis on equipment, as reflected in many of the current projects supported by the government, foundations, and educational institutions, is designed to develop easier methods for the processing of information, as well as devices for reading, storing, searching, transmitting, and translating.

The Organization Committee has had a busy year considering the setup and functions of several new committees. In addition to those mentioned above, it has prepared statements on an RTSD Intersectional Committee on U. S. Congresses and Conference without Fixed Headquarters, and a proposed standing committee on Book Catalogs to take the place of a special joint committee on Book Catalogs of the Catalog and Classification Section and the Reference Services Division which completed its work last year.

The Committee on Resources of American Libraries has worked primarily through its two subcommittees. The Subcommittee for the National Union Catalog, has held two meetings concerned with the cooperative cataloging of materials distributed under Public Law 480. With respect to the NUC itself, the Subcommittee is beginning to search for means to publish all of the as yet unpublished portion (from the beginning through 1952) and is optimistic these will be found. They are also concerned with the problem of getting better reporting of library holdings for the NUC. The Subcommittee on Micropublishing Projects has had reviews prepared and published of several recent publications in microform. The primary purpose is to help the prospective purchaser appraise the worth of the publication before buying it. Many micropublishing projects pose an unusual problem, however, in that they are not published until enough buyers have placed orders to assure a profitable undertaking. A review of projected and announced publications is what is really required, but many publishers are unwilling to submit their projects for such pre-review for a variety of reasons. In the absence of such pre-review, duplicate projects are wastefully undertaken, and badly conceived and executed projects are bought to be regretted later. On the assumption that librarians want objective reviews of such projects by competent scholars, the Subcommittee will continue to search for a solution to this dilemma, but however sound the solution, its value will depend upon the use made of it by librarians.

The Regional Processing Committee is in the final stages of revising a manual on regional processing centers. The School Libraries Technical
Services Committee has compiled a bibliography of references felt to be helpful to librarians working in the area of centralized processing.

I am sorry that space does not permit a detailed account of the work of the Interdivisional Committee on Public Documents. At Miami Beach, this Committee was able to report success in efforts supported by many groups and individuals to have Congress pass a bill revising the laws relating to depository libraries. The opportunities and problems developing from the passage of this bill are the basis for the program at the Chicago Conference, sponsored jointly by the Reference Services Division and RTSD. Following a report that the United Nations Documents Index would cease to list the publications of the UN specialized agencies, the Committee prepared and submitted to the Boards of RSD and RTSD a resolution expressing interest in having this indexing continued. The Boards did approve the resolution, on behalf of the ALA, and it was forwarded to the persons concerned through ALA channels. Two subcommittees of this Committee are its Subcommittee on the Federal Depository Library Act and Subcommittee on Census Publications.

The Resources and Technical Services Division appoints several of ALA's representatives to outside organizations. Richard Angell, who represented us at the meetings of the American Documentation Institute, is also a Councilor-at-large of that group, and has done a fine job of reporting to them our activities in this field, and of urging them to consider closer affiliation with ALA. The responsibility of appointing this representative has this year been transferred from our Division to the Interdivisional Committee on Documentation.

Laura Cummings has attended two meetings of the Sectional Committee Z39 of the American Standards Association as our representative, and has turned over to the RTSD Board of Directors a "Proposed American Standard for Periodical Title Abbreviations" for consideration at this meeting. Our representative on the ALA Membership Committee, Joseph Treyz, reports a very active year participating in the general activities of that Committee, and also in contacting state and provincial membership committees about ways of increasing the participation of technical services librarians through their organizations.

John Dawson reports that the Public Law 480 program is proceeding smoothly and successfully as concerns India and the United Arab Republics. More than one million pieces have already been acquired and shipped, and indications are that the annual rate of acquisitions will run from one to one and a half million pieces. Printed catalog cards for this material are being issued. Present plans are to open pilot programs in Burma, Indonesia, and Israel next year. The Library of Congress, which is responsible for implementing this program, is to be commended for pursuing it with energy and vigor. Our representative to the U. S. Book Exchange is Benjamin A. Custer, who reports that the Exchange continues to flourish and grow in its sixteenth year of operation.

You may be interested in knowing that, since approval at last summer's business meeting, of a Bylaw permitting the affiliation of discussion
groups with the Division, two groups have requested affiliation. These are the already organized Technical Service Directors of Large Research Libraries and the Technical Services Administrators of Medium-Sized Research Libraries. In addition, George Hartje has arranged a meeting at this Conference to consider the organization of a similar group of Technical Services Administrators of Large Public Libraries.

In closing, I should like to emphasize that your officers and Board of Directors are glad to have your questions and your suggestions. I am sure this applies to the incoming officers also. I have been impressed with the willing, and often eager, response to invitations to serve the Division on committees and in other capacities, and I take this opportunity to thank all of you who have contributed to the Division's program during the past year and will continue to do so in the future, I am sure.

RTSD Acquisitions Section Annual Report, 1962 /63

FREDERICK L. ARNOLD, Chairman

Acquisition Policy and Research Committee.

The Committee began the year as almost a new committee. It had no projects carried forward from the previous year, and all members were appointed for terms which were to effect as rapidly as possible the newer five-year periods of service. The Subcommittee of the Acquisitions Policy and Research Committee on Bibliographical Holdings of European Antiquarian Societies submitted its report this year and was dismissed. The Committee voted to refer the report to the Division's Committee on Resources for action. The Committee met once at Mid-winter and carried on business by correspondence and advised the Division's Committee on Bookdealer-Library Relations. At year's end, it had several items on its agenda for study, including the pricing policies of some materials suppliers, and the appropriate amount of university contract overhead to go into the library book funds.

List of Dealers in Underdeveloped Countries.

The list prepared by Philip McNiff is now published and is being sold through the RTSD Office at ALA Headquarters.
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Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee.

The compilation of Standards for Library Book Jobbers and Whole- salers was discussed at Midwinter meeting, and negotiations were begun with the Library Technology Project for funds. These funds were refused by the Council on Library Resources. Since the funds for this study were not approved, this seems to point up the need for a preconference to precede the St. Louis Conference, bringing together bookdealers, publishers, and librarians to discuss this topic. Plans are being made to hold this workshop.

Cost of Library Materials Index Committee.

The Committee placed Marietta Chicorel's paper on Price Trends in West Germany in LRTS, Winter, 1963. The following investigations are under way: Cost index for Swiss books, cost index for Canadian publications, an up-dating of the Index for the Mexican book index, and an Index for Microfilms; a Cost index for rare books, and a Cost index for paperbacks is under further study.

Committee to Compile a List of International Subscription Agents.

The Committee reports slow but steady progress, and information of all agents is being circulated to committee members and is then sent to the ALA Publications Department.

RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section Annual Report, 1962 /63

SUSAN M. HASKINS, Chairman

THE WHOLE IS EQUAL to the sum of all its parts. This is as true of CCS as in mathematics. Therefore this report is a summary of the activities during the year of the various committees that are the backbone of the Section.

As Paul Dunkin said in his summary of the Year's Work in Review for 1962, "Well, at least, we have begun to move." After a year of frustrat-
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ing delay, work on revision of the cataloging rules was resumed in September, 1962, with a grant from the Council on Library Resources and under the newly-appointed editor, C. Sumner Spalding, released by the Library of Congress from his position as Chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division. Most of the year's work has been concentrated on the rules for corporate bodies, which involve a compromise rule for institutions for consideration by the Library of Congress. The expectation is that the work will be completed for final consideration by the Code Revision Committee at the 1964 annual conference. International cooperation with the British has been stepped up and will be maintained throughout this final period of code revision. Noel Sharp, Chairman of the British Sub-committee on Cataloguing Rules, met with our Committee for the two-day meeting at Midwinter. He was accompanied by Philip Escreet, an assistant to the British committee. These two representatives from the British committee were also present at the meeting of the Code Revision Committee preceding the July Conference. Laura Colvin, a member of our Steering Committee, is meeting with the English committees during her stay in England this summer.

The Descriptive Cataloging Committee is hard at work, in cooperation with the Library of Congress, on a partial revision of the LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging, which, it is expected, will be issued as a part of the Catalog Code. An exchange of information with the corresponding British committee is also being maintained in this area. A basic recommendation being considered in this revision is that the present LC rules for limited cataloging, with modifications, be extended to all cataloging with the exception of rare books. The Committee has also continued the study of the LC rules for Persian transliteration, and it is hoped that a revised system will soon be approved. Transliteration systems for the languages covered by the PL-480 Program for India and Pakistan have been developed by the Library of Congress and have been approved. Cards in these languages are now being printed. Among other questions, the Far Eastern Materials Committee has also been considering possible revisions in the LC Descriptive Cataloging Rules, particularly those relating to the imprint.

A Subcommittee of the ALA Editorial Committee to revise the ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards has been working throughout the year under the chairmanship of Pauline Seely. Close cooperation is being maintained with the Code Revision Committee in order that the revised filing rules will reflect changes in the cataloging rules.

The Cataloging Policy and Research Committee has met twice during the year in addition to its regular meetings during the Midwinter and Annual Conferences. The Committee has considered many and varied topics, such as:

1. The desirability of reviews of book catalogs
2. The question of book numbers. As a result of the Committee's discussion of this topic, a statement of LC practice is being pub-
lished in LC's *Cataloging Service Bulletin*, and a recommendation has been sent to the ALA Publishing Department that Barden's *Book Numbers* be revised.

3. The possibility of a cooperative cataloging project for the analysis of scholarly monographic series.

Other suggestions have been discussed by the Committee and submitted to the Executive Committee for consideration.

In addition to its routine services, the Classification Committee has been considering this year the formulation of basic guiding principles that can be offered to new academic libraries in their selection of a classification scheme.

The Subject Headings Committee has been concerned chiefly with two matters: (1) the review of the Sidney Jackson proposal to study the relationship between the LC and the Sears subject headings; and (2) the need for and feasibility of issuing new LC subject headings on cards.

A special one-man committee was appointed to compile a directory of commercial cataloging services. Barbara Westby accepted the responsibility for this project and has been soliciting information regarding the various services. The complete directory will be published during the coming year in the *Library Journal*. Annual publication is being considered in order to include new services that may be established.

The special interdivisional Book Catalogs Committee, having fulfilled the purpose for which it was created three years ago, was discharged by the executive boards of the Reference Services Division and the Cataloging and Classification Section. As a by-product of its assignment the Committee prepared and published a statement of "Preferred Practices in the Publication of Book Catalogs." Several papers were also prepared by members of the Committee, some of which have already been published. It is expected that all of them will be included in a collection of essays that is being prepared on the subject. The CCS Executive Committee recommended to the RTSD Board of Directors that a standing committee on book catalogs for consideration of continuing problems be established with appropriate Sectional representation. The matter was referred to the Committee on Administration. Such a Committee has now been established.

The Margaret Mann Citation was awarded this year to Arthur Hugh Chaplin, Keeper in the Department of Printed Books, British Museum, London. This is the first time that the citation was awarded to a person outside this country.

The Committee for the Margaret Mann Award and the Nominating Committee performed their duties with distinction. The Bylaws Committee has been inactive this year.

In behalf of the Executive Committee members, I extend our appreciation to these committees whose work constitutes the accomplishments of the Section.
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the Section held two meetings during the year, one at Miami during the Annual Conference in June, 1962, and one at the Midwinter meeting in Chicago, January, 1963.

At the Miami meeting it was announced that Giles W. Shepherd had been elected Vice-Chairman, Chairman-Elect, and William S. Budington had been elected Executive Committee Member-at-Large. Subsequently, Mr. Shepherd was forced to resign because he will be out of the country during 1963/64; Robert K. Johnson was elected to replace him.

Also at this meeting, it was announced that the standardized photographic order form, developed by a committee of this Section, was now in production and available from several library supply firms, and the new Directory of Library Photoduplication Services had just been published. The Policy and Research Committee recommended the appointment of a committee to (1) develop a code of ethics, in addition to copyright regulations, for photo copying, and (2) work out a simplified payment procedure for photoduplication orders. This recommendation was approved by the Executive Committee, and the following ad hoc committee appointed: Charles LaHood, Ralph Carruthers, and Hubbard Ballou, Chairman.

At the Midwinter meeting, the Committee on Library Standards for Microfilm announced that delays had been encountered in completing its work and that the grant from the Council on Library Resources, which was financing the Committee's work, should be extended. Permission for such extension has been requested from CLS, and granted.

The Policy and Research Committee reported that Allen Veaner had suggested the preparation of a Manual for Institutional Photocopying Procedures, and this Committee recommended its accomplishment. The Executive Committee approved the idea in principle and asked that a specific outline of the manual and a budget for its preparation be prepared for consideration at its next meeting.

It was also suggested that a meeting of persons with major concern with library photocopying be held at a well-equipped photo laboratory for discussion of common problems and new techniques. Attendance would be limited and by invitation only. The Executive Committee requested that Peter Scott proceed to develop plans for such a meeting by consulting with others qualified, and report to the Executive Committee for further action at its next meeting.
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Serials Policy and Research Committee

The Serials Use Study which was presented to the ALA Executive Board meeting in Miami Beach for approval was rejected as "not sufficiently worked out nor adequately justified." The matter has been shelved.

Two other proposals, a study of the unit output of serials checkers and a historical study of serials work, are in abeyance since they likely will be covered by two related studies which are under consideration by the Division. William Huff, the Committee Chairman, will keep in touch with the two ad hoc divisional committees being appointed.

Under discussion has been the feasibility of establishing a clearing house for information regarding the use of data processing machines in serials work. So far it has been suggested that information retrieval be excluded from this and that the committee be cognizant of the actions being taken by the Documentation Committee in this area. It will be pursued by the Policy and Research Committee.

The Committee is also considering the interest in a historical directory of corporate bodies and a bibliography of serial bibliographies.

Joint Committee (Serials and Acquisition Sections) to Compile a List of International Subscription Agents.

The Committee Chairman, Elizabeth F. Norton, reports that the manuscript copy for the list of International Subscription Agents is in the hands of the ALA Publishing Department. The Publishing Department has scheduled it for publication this year.

The Committee asked for a decision on the possibility of its continuing on after the publication of the list to maintain a continuing information service on subscription agents and their performance, with a view toward issuing future revisions. This proposal was approved by the Executive Committee, and such a committee will be appointed.

Duplicates Exchange Union

The Chairman, James Jones, formally presented a proposal, which was passed at Midwinter, that the clerical mailing routines of the Committee be taken over by the office of the Executive Secretary. The Committee is continuing to handle requests and other correspondence. The Committee
is working on the problems of better publicity for the Union and the fact that there is nobody concerned with the problems of exchanges with foreign institutions.

Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials

Bernice Field, ALA representative to the Joint Committee, reported that progress is continuing on the editing of the third edition of the Union List of Serials and that publication is expected in late 1964 or early 1965. A study is to be made this year of the future of the Joint Committee after the publication of the third edition. The Library of Congress wishes an advisory committee on New Serial Titles, which could be a function of such a committee.

Intersectional Committee on U. S. Congresses and Conferences Without Fixed Headquarters

This new committee, joint with the Acquisitions Section, has just been established with Mary Kahler as the Chairman. Its function is to investigate improved means of acquisition of the publications of U. S. congresses and conferences without fixed headquarters and to recommend appropriate action to the executive committees of the Acquisitions and Serials Sections.

Nominating Committee

The Nominating Committee, Harry Richardson, Chairman, presented a full slate of nominees for the elective offices. The Vice-Chairman, Rolland Stevens, developed a roster of committee members under the general approval of the Executive Committee.

By-Laws Committee

Upon a motion passed at Miami Beach, Lorena Clarke, Chairman of the By-Laws Committee, submitted to the Executive Committee at Midwinter the proposed wording for a change in the by-laws to reduce the number of members at large on the Executive Committee from three to two. The wording was approved, and the proposed change was voted upon by the membership at the Chicago conference.
The word "secretary" carries the root meaning of learner of secrets; I assume that the term "executive secretary" means one who ferrets out secrets and acts on them. The device of the "carbon chain" by which copies of letters are sent to all officers concerned and to the Secretary makes the first half of the job easy.

Your ALA Headquarters Office (which I hope many of you were able to visit during the Conference) functions as a clearing house for the business of our three hundred officers and committee members in their interrelationships with one another, with groups within or outside of ALA, and, with the individual librarian. By correspondence with committees and individual members who write or call with problems; by informal conferences; by collecting and distributing reports, minutes, proceedings, highlights of meetings; and by participating in meetings such as those held by our regional groups, your Executive Secretary carries on the task of transmitting information about activities in the technical services areas.

If—as it seems—the good committee man must be both genius and drudge, our work is to lighten his drudgery. By maintaining files, issuing lists, handling supplies, paying bills, setting up election machinery, helping prepare the budget, handling project grants, arranging meetings, helping plan pre-conference institutes and conference programs, by duplicating and distributing materials, we help our officers and committees in any way they, or we, can think of. We handle circulation for Library Resources and Technical Services, and fill back orders. For the American Standards Association's Subcommittee PH5 on Photographic Reproduction, we mail out calls to meetings, minutes, and submit standards. This year we will take over the clerical work of the Duplicates Exchange Union. When necessary, we go into the publication business; this spring we published the List of Book Dealers in Underdeveloped Countries.

I am glad to report that our request for additional clerical help has, apparently, been granted. This means that Erlyenne Meuer, the Secretary's Secretary (like "poet's poet," this means the quintessence of the art) will be able to function more as an administrative assistant than has been possible formerly.

I mentioned our relations with other groups inside ALA. As this is one part of our work with which few of our members are familiar, I might cite some examples. This year we have had frequent, though informal
contacts, with the Library Technology Project, which issued a summary of findings on methods of card reproduction and the papers of our Miami Binding Workshop; with the Small Library Development Project, among whose series of pamphlets for the small library were several in our field; with the ALA Publication Department, which recently published a revision of Swain’s *Notes to Be Used on Catalog Cards*, and which is working on a new textbook in cataloging, a revision of the ALA filing rules, and other aids in our field such as the *List of International Subscription Agents*.

Obviously, our work overlaps that of the type-of-library divisions such as the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Public Library Association, and the American Association of School Libraries. With the last our School Library Technical Services Committee has strong common concern in the field of centralized processing, for example. Many types of libraries are acutely interested in the work of our Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee. With the Reference Services Division we share responsibility in the field of public documents, book catalogs, the use of the card catalog, interlibrary loans, and documentation. With the Library Administration Division this past year we have worked on matters as diverse as placement and library statistics. We are in close contact with the Membership Office, and the International Relations Office has arranged interviews with us for foreign visitors interested in technical processes.

The Executive Secretary has many rewards. There is the stimulation of association with distinguished leaders of our profession who are willing to spend laborious years working on committees. There is the satisfaction of being part of the expert, hard-working, warmly-human Headquarters Staff. But nothing is more interesting than our work with the Regional Groups. This year, Barbara Westby, Chairman of the Council of Regional Groups, has provided them with encouragement, help, and leadership. We are confident that Doris Ransom will continue to seek ways in which we may be of greater assistance to them, and help them take a more active part in recommending persons for committee assignments, suggesting new projects, and helping with projects under way as they have helped this year with the revision of the descriptive cataloging and the filing rules.

When invited to do so, the Executive Secretary takes part in regional group and other meetings on matters in our field. My travel diary for the past year shows that in August I attended the University of Chicago Institute on the Medium-Sized Library; in September, I represented the ALA at the Institute on Information Retrieval at the University of Minnesota; in October, I spoke to the Southeastern Regional Group of Resources and Technical Services Librarians in Memphis. November brought the Allerton Park Institute on Selection and Acquisition Procedures in Medium-Sized and Large Libraries, and a course in Information Retrieval given by IBM in Chicago. The spring circuit began in early April with the Midwest Academic Librarians’ Conference in St. Louis. In late April came an invitation to talk to the Ohio Valley Group of Technical Services Librarians in Dayton; then I attended the Clinic on Library Applications of
Processing at the University of Illinois. May brought a meeting of the Philadelphia Area Technical Services Librarians, followed by a talk to the Catalogers’ Section of the New Jersey Library Association in Atlantic City.

President Comins has given you a report on the year’s work in RTSD. From my seat beside the driver, it seems that one of our most significant advances may prove to be our new attack on the problem of the cost of technical services. Because of our desperate need for comparable statistics, wave after wave of expert attackers have tried, only to retire when their labors seemed in vain. Worse, the misuse of existing cost figures has been a positive evil. But the canny chairman of our Planning Committee, struck by the usefulness of cost index figures for acquisitions, has conceived a new approach—and a committee is now attempting to establish standards for the size of technical services staffs, based on current work production in libraries of various types and sizes. At the same time, we were able to secure the appointment of an Advisory Committee on Statistics for Technical Processes, which will work with the new National Library Statistics Coordinating Project in a concerted attack on the problem.

Another interesting development mentioned by President Comins is in the area of history which, though it can discourage while it inspires, is commonly thought to add a useful dimension to science, one which has been lacking for technical services. As is our custom, when faced with a problem, we appoint a committee. On the operational level, Miss Comins has herself recently demonstrated the usefulness of history by studying the minutes of past meetings, a study in which your Executive Secretary hopes to engage in the coming year.

A matter of especial pride to me this summer was the way in which many RTSD members, concerned though we are with the vexing problems of our specialized labors, dropped for two days our special concerns, and took part as librarians in the Conference Within a Conference. Somehow we managed, by squeezing our committee meetings into breakfast, lunch, dinner, or midnight hours, to get our business done as usual. We have shown a willingness to widen our horizon in another way. This was the year in which a number of us advanced timidly into the field of documentation. Now that we are learning the natives’ strange tongue, we are looking boldly at some of their contraptions.

Catalogers have a tradition of international relations—the Dewey Decimal System covers the globe—but the strengthening of the bridge built by the Anglo-American Code goes on with renewed vigor. Noel Sharp and Philip Escreet of the British Library Association are becoming friendly figures at our code revision meetings, and the Margaret Mann Citation for 1963 was awarded to Arthur Hugh Chaplin of the British Museum.

After two years, I am still amazed at the achievement of Esther Piercy, our Editor, and Ray Hummel, our Managing Editor, in making Library Resources and Technical Services so excellent a journal, working on it as
an avocation. I realize also how much our Division owes to Dorothy Comins for her devoted labor as President. We are fortunate to have her as chairman of our Organization Committee in the coming year, where she will continue her efforts to get our machine into good running order. Finally, I should like to remind our members that she, like Helen Welch before her, has had the added chore of educating a new Executive Secretary, a job they have undertaken with cheerful, inexhaustible patience.

MEMBERSHIP BARGAIN

The American Library Association Membership Committee reminds prospective new members that a New Members Bonus exists as of September 1. Any new member enrolling in any membership category after September 1, 1963, receives ALA membership for the remaining months of 1963 and all of 1964.

ALA membership entitles members to selection of two division memberships, the ALA Bulletin, the publications of the selected division, conference proceedings, members' rates at national conferences, participation in a group insurance or major medical plan.

ALA membership dues are $6.00 for lay members and trustees, and range from $10.00 to $50.00, according to annual salary, for those in library work.

MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS


Copies of these publications are available from the National Microfilm Association, P.O. Box 386, Annapolis, Md. The price of Supplement A is $4.00 per copy ($2.50 to NMA members), of the DoD Specifications, $3.00 ($2.00 to members). For orders not accompanied by remittances, an additional charge of 50 cents per item will be made.
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Regional Groups

Barbara Westby, Chairman
Council on Regional Groups

The Council of Regional Groups, which is composed of the chairmen of all of the regional groups, held two meetings at the ALA Conference in Chicago. The first, at which ten groups were represented, was an early morning discussion meeting on program planning, membership, and other matters of particular interest to the groups. At the annual luncheon held at the Pick-Congress Hotel, the representatives of the Regional Groups were joined by officers of the Resources and Technical Services Division and its sections. There I had the pleasure of introducing my successor, Doris Ransom, University of Cincinnati, who will be reporting in these pages in the future.

This is my final report as Chairman of the Council of Regional Groups. The past two years have been interesting and rewarding, and I wish to express my thanks to the membership for the privilege of serving in this position. The officers of the groups have been most cooperative, and their friendship and warm regards have been a source of encouragement and pleasure.

The twenty-nine regional groups served as sources of information for two ALA projects this year. Pauline Seely, Chairman of the Subcommittee on revising the ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards offered literature and speakers, and a few groups have had this topic on their programs.

At their spring meetings the groups were asked by Bernice Field, Chairman of the CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee to consider the limited cataloging rules. Response was very good, with eight groups and twenty-five individual members corresponding with Miss Field, and one group appointing a committee to consider the matter. There is still time for other groups to express their opinions.

The Michigan Regional Group of Technical Services Librarians discussed the Library of Congress services in connection with the limited cataloging rules. Since money and man-power are two factors in this service, the Michigan group sent a resolution to its delegation in Congress urging its support of the Library of Congress appropriations. More regional groups and other librarians may wish to follow this example. This is one instance where a Congressman or Senator can be shown that money he appropriates will benefit the libraries and the voters in his own district.

The regional groups have had interesting and varied programs this year with few duplications of subjects. Following is a report of the Spring meetings of fourteen groups:
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The Wisconsin Library Association Technical Services Section joined with the Reference and the College and University Sections for a Spring Conference. Hubbard Ballou, Columbia University Libraries, in his talk, "Introduction to Microfilm Reading Facilities," traced the development of photographic processes and stressed their importance to libraries. Half-hour demonstrations of their equipment were conducted by representatives of Filmac Readers Printers, Microcard, Recordak, and Xerox corporations.

At the biennial meeting of the Technical Services Section of the Mountain Plains Library Association, Pauline Seely, Denver Public Library, spoke on adapting the 16th edition of Dewey at her library and reviewed the work of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee. Forrest Carhart, ALA Library Technology Project, described studies on card-holding devices, book labeling machines, and card reproduction systems undertaken by the Council on Library Resources.

The annual meeting of the Division of Technical Services of the Oklahoma Library Association was a business meeting, and so there is no program to report.

The Michigan Library Association Technical Services Section met together with the College, Junior College, and Reference Sections for a Spring meeting at Central Michigan University. At the general session, Helen H. Lyman, Public Library Consultant, Wisconsin Free Library Commission, spoke on Regional Reference Centers, discussing the statewide library system in Wisconsin. At its separate meeting the Technical Services Section discussed the limited cataloging rules.

"Information Retrieval in the Research Library" was the subject of the talk by Henry J. Dubester, Library of Congress, at the meeting of the Resources and Technical Services Section of the Kansas Library Association.

The Texas Regional Group of Catalogers and Classifiers heard Sarah Vann, Library School, University of Texas, speak on the topic, "Toward Dewey 17." She summarized the results of a survey of catalog departments in Texas as to uses and preferences of the 14th, 15th, and 16th editions of Dewey. Ruth Wassenich, Texas Christian University, reviewed developments in cataloging and classification in the past year. The meeting concluded with a discussion of limited cataloging rules.

Orcena Mahoney Peterson, a member of the Subcommittee to revise ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards, spoke to the Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians, discussing the background on the formation of the Subcommittee, problems involved in establishing rules, and the work of the Subcommittee to date.

The Southern California Technical Processes Group heard a discussion on "Book Catalogs and Centralized Cataloging." Catherine MacQuarrie, Los Angeles County Public Library, presented the background of her library's change to the book catalog and IBM procedures. This catalog was entirely in capital letters and hard to read. The sequential card devised by the Econolyst Division of MVT Industries allowed for a
Robert Sage, of that Company, narrated a film showing the use of sequential cards; and Frank Pastrinostro, also of the Econolist Division, discussed costs.

There are two meetings of Philadelphia Area Technical Services Librarians on which to report. At its March meeting, Samuel Acker, Xerox Corporation, demonstrated the Xerox Copier 914 with the aid of slides. In May, the Group heard Elizabeth Rodell, RTSD Executive Secretary, describe briefly the varied activities of RTSD. Richard Davis, Drexel Institute Graduate School of Library Science, discussed the “New Curriculum in Information Science” initiated by Drexel and the only degree course on this subject in the country. The meeting concluded with a lively discussion of the limited cataloging policy at the Library of Congress.

Mrs. Rodell was also the speaker at the Spring meeting of the Catalogers Section of the New Jersey Library Association. Her topic was “How LRTS Alerts the Cataloger.” She discussed the role of RTSD and LRTS in keeping catalogers informed of new developments and ideas. The Library Technology Project and the Small Library Project also serve this purpose.

The Ohio Valley Group of Technical Service Librarians held its annual meeting at the Dayton-Montgomery County Public Library. Arthur Hamlin, Librarian, University of Cincinnati Library, spoke on “Italian University Libraries and their Catalogs.” In other aspects than cataloging and reference work the libraries are excellent. He found only one modern catalog department. Before 1910 the catalogs were hand written folio volumes; from 1910-1958 catalogs were bound volumes. Card catalogs began in 1958. Jesse Shera, Western Reserve University, addressed the group on “The Book, the Cataloger and the Machine.” Just as the cataloger has established standard terminology for subject headings, so the people working with computers are building codes and standard vocabularies. He described various techniques and processes of language analysis and the creation of computer language.

Binding was the subject of the Spring meeting of the Chicago Regional Group of Librarians. William Burgmeier, Burgmeier Book Bindery, presented a film, “The Art that Binds,” which showed the process of binding a book in library binding and standard binding. Frazer Poole described the Library Technology Project, of which he is Director, and the development of binding specifications. He discussed the specifications for lesser used materials (lum specs). He also showed a film “Tests for Binding.”


The New York Technical Services Librarians on their Spring trip visited the Technical Services Unit of the Westchester Library System.
WITH THE PUBLICATION this year of Ralph R. Shaw and Richard H. Shoemaker's *American Bibliography, a Preliminary Checklist for 1801-1819*, the gap in our national bibliography between the end of Evans and the beginning of Roorbach has, in some measure, been filled. This is, because of its method of compilation, only a partial list. Almost none of the items have been examined. All references to a given title in all sources have been compared, and the “best” entry has then been determined. In order to compile a nearly-complete list of surviving titles, an extensive search at great cost in a large number of libraries would have had to be made. It is doubtful if such an effort could be justified economically today. Though we are receiving corrections and additions to the *American Bibliography*, we also are finding that it is being used with fair satisfaction, in spite of its omissions and errors. It is so much better than the almost complete lack of listings that existed before, that it will probably serve well until such time as someone is willing to spend a large amount of money to produce a nearly-complete and accurate bibliography.

With these thoughts in mind, the junior compiler of the above-mentioned title looked at the years following 1819.

For over one hundred years we have used Roorbach's *Bibliotheca Americana* as the national bibliography for the period 1820-1861. It is recognized that it is very incomplete, has many inaccuracies, gives too few dates of publication, and no locations for the titles listed. The sources exist for a much better list and the author is attempting to compile it.

Most important of these sources is the American Imprints Inventory, now at the Library of Congress, made by WPA workers in the late 1930s and early 1940s. Many people have used it as a source for theses and other publications for regional imprint lists, and all such lists that are known to the author are being used in this compilation. The American Antiquarian Society Library probably has the richest holdings in 19th Century American imprints. It is cooperating to the full in allowing the author access to its shelf list, collections, and Charles Evans' preliminary cards for 1820, the last year he meant to cover. He had 525 items beginning with the letters A and B. These have been checked against the *Checklist*, and
it appears that about 50 of these have not yet been entered in it. But the Checklist has 490 entries for these two letters, though about 25% of its sources still remain to be checked. The imprints catalog in the rare book room of the New York Public Library is the next most important source. Finally, many libraries have sent copies of dated shelf lists to be checked and included. A full list of these will appear in the bibliography of sources for the compilation.

Since almost all of the entries are taken from secondary sources, their errors will be perpetuated and some further errors will undoubtedly be originated by the compiler. The intention is to give what information is available in the sources, as it is found, with correction of only the most obvious errors.

Almost all readily-known locations for each title will be given. The Checklist will therefore serve as a sort of union catalog of the period.

The perfectionist cataloger and bibliographer will not like the entry rules, for they are not very complicated. Entry will be by name as found in the source, without further search. In other words, "no conflict" entry. Title will be transcribed as given, but may perhaps be shortened if it is very long and redundant. Imprint will be transcribed as given, except that the order will generally be place, publisher and/or printer, and date. Pagination will not include preliminary pages unless they form a majority of the work. Illustrations will not ordinarily be noted unless they are the most important part of the title. All of these rules may be abrogated if necessary to distinguish different issues or editions. The reason for the choice of these simplified rules is to avoid examination of the items described, but to identify and distinguish one item from another.

Under corporate authors, such as United States, no subdivisions are used. All items are entered directly by title under the corporate author heading, since the changing and merging and splitting of subdivisions leaves the searcher generally at a loss.

No doubt, this kind of description will cause certain separate editions, states, or issues to be confused into single entries, and will also produce apparently different entries for the same entity. But if this list is to be compiled at all, it must be done largely on the basis of secondary sources, for by this decade in the 19th Century, the survival rate of titles printed is growing. If all the survivors have to be examined, there will be no list. It is also questionable whether such examination would add a great deal from the point of view of the majority of its users.

A major difference in scope between the 1801-1819 list and this one is that the 1820-1825 list will not include periodicals or newspapers. The author thinks that the forthcoming Union List of Serials will take care of periodicals and that Clarence S. Brigham’s History and Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820, and American Newspapers, 1821-1930 are sufficient for that form.

This project is supported in part by a grant from the Rutgers Research Council and by the Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers-The State University.
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Happiness Is a Long Footnote

Paul S. Dunkin, Professor
School of Library Service
Rutgers—The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

If you do not believe it, just look in the latest issue of almost any library periodical—nay, look even in this one—and find yourself a footnote. Then ask yourself: "How much of this stuff do I really need?"

Of course, you will find the same sort of business in almost any "scholarly" (whatever that word means) journal. We simply took it over from our brethren. Some of us think it makes us somehow more "professional" to copy long-winded footnotes. In the average "scholarly" or "professional" journal such footnotes may be excused because of ignorance; but among librarians, who so often and so vigorously clean their cataloging house, detailed footnotes, are, to say the least, an ironic anachronism.

What do we ask of a footnote? Only that it guides us to the basis of a statement we question or want to examine more closely. This means two things:

1. That a list of footnotes need be a finding list only.
2. That we distinguish between the list of footnotes and the bibliography. We shall examine each of these principles in some detail:

1. List of footnotes

The finding list idea means that only those details useful for finding the references be included. We can omit a number of things:

The full name of a periodical is not necessary. Generally only its initials will be enough and in some cases—e.g., LJ or LRTS—these initials have long been in use as an accepted abbreviation. If necessary, a periodical could carry in each issue a standard list of title abbreviations it uses in footnotes.

The month (or other designation) of a specific issue of a periodical being cited is excess baggage. After the first year or so, most library copies of a periodical will be bound anyway.

The subdivision of a corporate entry, long a nuisance in cataloging, is certainly not needed here. "American Library Association"—if not, indeed, "ALA"—should be enough by itself in a list no longer than the usual batch of footnotes.
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If the author is a person, the name should be briefly cited. There is a difference between the personal name in a footnote and in a bibliography; see below.

The title need be only long enough to identify the book, article, or periodical to which it refers. Words in a title may even be abbreviated if the full form is obvious—e.g., “bibl.” Phrases such as “second edition enlarged” should become “2d ed. enl.” Alternative titles, of course, are not needed. Name of a series (or other sequence of events or materials) to which a book or periodical belongs is seldom necessary.

Place and publisher may vanish. Neither is given for a periodical even in the most elaborate footnote. A finding list is not a buying list. Of course, the book may not be in the library, and the reader will then turn his citation over to the order librarian. But if the book is of any age at all, the order librarian will probably not go to the publisher for it; or, if he does want the publisher he can easily locate it.

Pagination needs of the footnote are different from those of the bibliography; see below.

Standard rules for punctuation or capitalization are not necessary. As long as the author follows some established practice and is consistent within the list, he will do enough.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, a footnote is no place for a long discourse. If the discourse belongs in the paper, then it should appear in the body of the paper where it will be read. If a tedious discourse pops up in a footnote, it betrays either that the author was too lazy to organize his paper in such a way as to bring it in where it belongs, or that it is so divorced from the subject of the paper that it does not belong there at all. (I have written such footnotes and I know.)

2. List of Footnotes and a Bibliography

A list of footnotes and a bibliography are different things because they serve different purposes.

A bibliography may attend (as a sort of “reading list”) but does not necessarily document or explain an article or a book. Or a bibliography can stand alone and, indeed, may be intended to do so. At the other extreme, an article or a book may be attended by both a list of footnotes and a bibliography.

A list of footnotes must attend and document a particular article or book. It cannot stand alone, and it is not expected to do so. Indeed, it can be eliminated if each footnote, properly abbreviated of course, is enclosed within parentheses immediately following the statement in the text which it supports.

Because a list of footnotes and a bibliography serve different purposes, the form of entry in each is different, and the arrangement is different.

Thus, in the entry in a bibliography it is necessary to supply the name of the author, title of book or article, and (if an article is involved) inclusive pagination—e.g.
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Because one of these entries is a book, it is necessary to give at least the first given name of the author; without it our poor reader would have to thumb through all the cards for Joneses with first names beginning with J. And, once this is done, we cannot enter the second item under “Jones, J.” because this might separate that entry from the other works of Joseph. The volume number of LRTS is given as well as the date because it furnishes the reader a double check—and there is no telling how the library binder may have labelled the volume. The fact that “20-46” refers to pages is obvious; therefore, we need not say so.

In an entry in a list of footnotes it is necessary to give brief name of the author (if not given in text), title of book or periodical (abbreviated if possible) and specific page cited—e.g., the statement “Joseph Jones says catalogers are wacky” would be adequately documented thus:

*Black and Blue Catalogers (1935) 20.*

or


The title of the book by Joseph is given because the reader will need it to find the reference; the title of the article in LRTS is not given because the reader will not need it to find the reference. Never, I beg you, write “op. cit. 25”; the op. cit. may be twenty references back in a sequence which is not ever alphabetical. Arrangement is in sequence of citations. Often there is no need for a separate list of references; they can simply be given in the text as the need arises—e.g., “Joseph Jones says catalogers are wacky (LRTS 35 (1999) 25).” This last practice I heartily endorse.

We said above that a list of footnotes and a bibliography could appear in connection with the same book or article. In this case the bibliography would appear as a bibliography at the end of the paper and independent of the paper, with entries arranged alphabetically. References could be made to specific pages of items in the bibliography simply by including them in the text of the book or article, thus: “Joseph Jones says catalogers are wacky (‘Nuts’ 25)” with no indication as to where the Jones entry would be in the bibliography because the ABC’s would find it. If the author wished, he could, of course, include in his Bibliography many articles which he did not find it necessary to cite specifically.

So endeth the voice of one crying in the wilderness of footnotes. Happiness is a long footnote. Happiness for whom?

For him who writes it?

(Editor’s note: This Author and this Editor have had a running argument on this subject lasting over a period of several years. By publishing the above perhaps we can pull others into the discussion.)
Catalog Use

The ALA Reference Services Division is making plans to have a study made of the reference use of the Card Catalog. This, it would seem from this corner, is long overdue. A great deal is, and has been, said about what reference librarians need or want (not always the same thing), and "our" reference librarians are summoned in spirit by catalogers, usually to back each person's stand on a debatable point. And there is the old saw dropped glibly in all related (or not so related) discussions: "It is better to have the cataloger do it once ('it' referring to garnering almost any piece of information) than for reference librarians having to look it up over and over." Do they look "it" up over and over—or maybe once in five years, or maybe not at all?

Reference librarians, I was once told by one of them, ideally would like to find, fully indexed in the catalog, every part of every book, every article from every magazine, every pamphlet, and every document. She herself recognized the impractability of this. It's impractical on several counts—prohibitive costs, crippling delays, and a catalog too large to be housed and too complicated to be used.

At the other extreme are the economy-minded who can't see why anything is needed beyond the single entry (in title-page form) for each bound book of importance—these cards to be left unchanged forever. This, of course, is only a skimpy and not-too-accurate finding list and of little reference use.

Somewhere between these two poles there should be a compromise point which is appropriate for the specific situation, balancing the demand for information, costs, timing, usability, etc. But no one has ever undertaken to find, systematically, a measuring stick. So we all continue to decide, on subjective opinion, what to do. And no two people seem to have the same opinion. When a practice is dropped to save cataloging costs, does it pass the burden (multiplied) on to the Reference staff? Or are practices continued just "in case" they will be needed? Is the catalog expected to provide answers which are more appropriately found elsewhere? Who knows?

A careful study of reference use of the catalog—not opinion, but positive evidence—should be of great service. We can all pray that such will come to pass.

—E.J.P.
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today scientists can possess the most powerful tool for information searching ever developed

we call it
SCIENCE CITATION INDEX

write us for complete information

Please send details on Science Citation Index

Name _______________________________ Title _______________________________
Organization __________________________________________________________
Address _______________________________________________________________
VERSATILE — The new Micro III will read Microcards and other opaques up to 5” x 8”, and with its film illuminator attachment*, will read microfiche and jacketed microfilm as well.

PORTABLE — This compact little reader folds into its own self-enclosing case, weighs just 6½ lbs., yet offers large (8” x 9½”) screen reading and precision components.

ECONOMICAL — Priced for purchase by individuals as well as institutions and industry, the Micro III is only $129.95. For a free brochure write to Dept. L, Microcard Corporation, West Salem, Wisconsin. (*Optional at extra cost.)

Free Planning Guide — If you are considering microforms for industrial or institutional use, this planning guide will help you. It describes microform systems in terms of costs, applications, and flexibilities. Write to Dept. L for your free copy.
Expert Service on
MAGAZINE SUBSCRIPTIONS
for
ALL LIBRARIES
Faxon's Librarians Guide
free on request
For the very best subscription service at competitive prices—ask about our Till Forbidden plan.
F. W. FAXON CO., INC.
83-91 Francis Street Boston 15, Mass.
Continuous Library Service Since 1886

TO HELP YOU
RECOGNIZE — AND GET —
CERTIFIED LIBRARY BINDING
There is only ONE LIBRARY BINDING whether you obtain it for rebound books, periodicals, or prebound new books.
LIBRARY BINDING — the very term — means a process exclusive for library use which Certified Library Binders warrant, and which provides maximum circulation and service from every volume bound to the rigid Library Binding Institute Standard.
Our Treasure House consists of new material for your guidance.
1. HANDBOOK OF LIBRARY BINDING (1963)
2. STANDARD FOR LIBRARY BINDING (Revised 1963)
3. COMPLETE MEMBERSHIP ROSTER (1963)
4. CURRENT POSTERS FOR LIBRARY PROMOTION
5. SET OF COLORED SLIDES "THE ART THAT BINDS"
6. 16mm SOUND, COLOR FILM "THE ART THAT BINDS"
All available without charge from
LIBRARY BINDING INSTITUTE
160 State St., Boston, Mass.
The DUOPAGE process is unique in that a Xerox image is produced on both sides of the same sheet. This single sheet method of reproducing books, magazines, or manuscripts has found great acceptance in the library field.

DUOPAGE reproduces a book in the accepted format and not with folded sheets printed only on one side of very thin paper. Reproductions are furnished on normal-weight paper and the resulting copy is paged like the original.

Micro Photo will assist you in locating rare or out-of-print books and manuscripts. Let us know of your interests and we will be happy to work with you.
For Libraries That Want Quality Bookbinding

GLICK BOOKBINDING CORP.

Specialists in the Binding and Rebinding of Books and Periodicals

Serving Institutional, Public And Research Libraries Since 1905

We Have Moved—Our New Address Is
32-15 37th Avenue
Long Island City 1, New York
Stillwell 4-5300

In Nassau and Suffolk
IVanhoe 3-9534

In New Jersey
Mitchell 2-5374