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Cataloging Problems in Review

In furtherance of its policy as a journal of discussion, *College and Research Libraries* presents the following two summaries and analyses based on the cataloging problems presented in the March 1942 issue.

THE EDITORS

By HARRIET D. MACPHERSON

Report on the Cataloging Forum Presented by College and Research Libraries

Miss MacPherson is assistant professor, School of Library Service, Columbia University.

JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON once wrote some lines that seem applicable to the concern of librarians with the cataloging situation of today. He said: "It is so difficult a task to form any correct estimate of one's own surroundings, largely on account of our very familiarity with them, that historical students have generally evaded this responsibility. They have often declared that it was impossible to do so satisfactorily. And yet no one will ever know more than we do about what is going on now." Ten years ago, when plans were being laid to revise the *A.L.A. Catalog Rules*, catalogers evidently thought they knew what was going on in their branch of the profession and executives must have felt that they had no particular reason to worry over cataloging procedures. Now, coincident with the publishing of the new rules, executives and catalogers alike are taking stock of the present, as well as the past and future, of the cataloging situation. The March number of *College and Research Libraries* shows that librarians are not evading their responsibility in analyzing what is going on now in regard to cataloging.

It has become evident to many of us during the past year that the pioneer age of cataloging in America is over. The word pioneer is employed in place of golden, because it seems to the present writer that we have not yet arrived at the golden age of cataloging nor, indeed, of library service as a whole. There have been many outstanding names among catalogers during the past fifty or sixty years. To mention only a few of those who have made distinct contributions, the following might be cited: Cutter, Dewey, Hanson, Martel, Currier, Mann, and Hastings. They helped to outline standards by formulating rules and writing explanatory texts, by developing catalogs to provide access to huge collections, and by starting a system of cooperation among catalogers through the founding of the centralized card system at the Library of Congress.

---

They built almost from nothing. Frequently they had no precedent to guide them—only the sharp necessity of the moment. Much of their work still remains and is found practical; certain principles have already been scrapped; and, in the light of the probable future needs of libraries, many more of the results from the efforts of these pioneers may have to be abandoned.

Rugged Individuals

If we follow American history through the development of the West, it is evident that early settlers were rugged individuals who often succeeded in one undertaking and failed in another. They blazed trails but were not always able to keep their homes from being destroyed; they founded towns but often saw them evacuated in favor of other sites; nor did they always manage to save all the gold that they discovered. Nevertheless, the way was opened for future generations to profit from these early efforts. Perhaps we can find a specific parallel between the state of the nation in 1829, as described by Woodrow Wilson, and the state of cataloging today. In the first chapter of Division and Reunion, 1829-1909, Wilson remarks that he believes that the year 1829 was a turning point in the history of the United States. Of the intellectual conditions of that period he says: "Its [the nation's] strength was rough and ready. . . . It had been making history and constructing systems of politics. . . . The country was as yet, moreover, neither homogeneous nor united. Its elements were being stirred hotly together. A keen and perilous ferment was necessary ere the pure, fine wine of ultimate national principle should be produced."

So far as the library profession is concerned, we also are "neither homogeneous nor united." "The keen and perilous ferment" seems already upon us, however, and it is to be hoped that a "national principle" of library service, at least so far as cataloging is concerned, is about to be produced. If one may judge from the contributions of writers to the March number of College and Research Libraries, all this is so. For here we find an amassing of the ideas of brilliant, convincing, and practical thinkers. An attempt at a complete analysis and synthesis of the remarks of the ten people who survey the cataloging situation in the above-mentioned issue might result in a volume of greater bulk than the new edition of the catalog rules. The present writer will only try to evaluate the papers from the following angles: (1) The attention paid by the contributors to the representation in the revised code of the principles of traditional cataloging and of Library of Congress practice in the past; (2) The recognition of the distinct difference between Parts I and II of the revised rules; (3) The extent to which specific rules from the code have been criticized; (4) The degree to which writers have viewed the issues in terms of their own libraries; (5) The extent to which cataloging problems as a whole rather than the text of the code have been discussed. In conclusion, a brief elucidation, both of the trends shown in these papers and of the revised edition of the code, will be undertaken. These remarks will be limited to the usability of these printed materials for courses in library schools.


**Traditional Cataloging and L.C. Practice**

Nearly all the contributors make some mention of the fact that the new code represents traditional cataloging and, specifically, the procedures that have developed at the Library of Congress during the past forty years. Miss Smith goes so far as to say that she would like to “see the Library of Congress adopt the code, or at least keep on with the parts of it which it is now using. . . .”4 Among the writers who deplore the fact that the new code represents traditional cataloging, none is more decided in his remarks than Mr. Nyholm. The gist of his criticism may be sensed from one quotation: “The superiority of the new code may consist in many instances merely in its being a desirable clarification of an undesirable practice.”5 Miss Ludington believes that one of the chief values of the new edition is that it puts Library of Congress procedures into a form that anyone may consult. News about steps which may be taken by the Library of Congress that will make a break with tradition and thereby change some of the present L.C. card standards, is given by Miss Morsch and Mr. Mumford. Wisely, Miss Morsch reminds us that: “Simplifications must be based on the minimum essentials of the needs of the Library of Congress.”6 After all, outside institutions are a second consideration and will probably have to remain so, in spite of Mr. Ellsworth’s earnest plea that the “Library of Congress Card Division might well be replaced by a manual of Library of Congress practice. Part I, according to Miss Morsch, is not full enough, for she shows cases where types of entries have been omitted entirely. As for Part II, she thinks it should not be published at all, since attempts to standardize beyond the entry on a card do not seem worth while. “Instead the Library of Congress should publish a style manual describing its practice and be responsible for keeping it reasonably up to date.”9 Such a suggestion seems sensible. In addition, one may hope for separate, supplementary manuals devoted to rare-book and simplified cataloging and perhaps for a text that will provide explanations of reasons for rules set forth in Part I of the new code.

**Criticism of Specific Rules**

Several of the contributors made no attempt whatsoever to criticize specific rules.

---

Those who have done so are: Miss Morsch, Miss Ludington, Miss Smith, and Mr. Nyholm. Miss Morsch confines her remarks to the types of entries for which little or no information has yet been provided in the code. The different points discussed by Miss Smith are taken up under broad headings. Her point of view is, quite naturally, that of the reference librarian. Largely for this reason, her appreciation of some of the bibliographic features in Part II may be discounted. Many of her ideas are pertinent, however, because of the very fact that she is concerned mainly with the use of the catalog. Catalogers may well sit up and take notice when she says: "To me added entries are more important than the subject cards. A book is quoted by the name of its editor, joint author, illustrator, translator, by its title, the body sponsoring its publication—anything the reader or writer can remember offhand, and often the subject cannot be definitely determined from the fragmentary reference."10 Mr. Nyholm presents his specific criticism in the shape of suggestions for simplification. Among the existing rules that he discusses are those relating to periodicals, corporate entries, capitalization, and collation. Of these topics, his treatment of collation is perhaps the most successful; certainly his handling of corporate entries appears both incomplete and impractical. It is somewhat surprising to find that the most detailed attention to separate rules has been given by a library executive—Miss Ludington. She discusses and criticizes the sections of Part I dealing with corporate entries, government publications, series, analytics, added entries, and serials. In her handling of Part II she again cites individual rules, though this is done in a general way, so as to illustrate possibilities for simplification. With the exception of her criticism of entries for state documents, most of Miss Ludington's points seem clear and logical. She voices valuable, constructive opinion in suggesting that all material on serials be kept together. This same idea, by the way, was expressed by more than one speaker at the 1941 fall meeting of the New York Regional Catalog Group.11

Stress on Libraries with Which Individual Writers Are Connected

The extent to which contributors have viewed cataloging problems from the angle of their own particular libraries differs. Mr. Tauber, Mr. Nyholm, Mr. Clapp, and Miss Root make no reference at all to the institutions with which they are connected. Miss Morsch and Mr. Haykin present almost entirely the point of view of the Library of Congress, while Mr. Mumford mentions policies at the New York Public Library and the Library of Congress, the two institutions between which he was dividing his time. Since conditions at the Library of Congress may be said to affect the whole country, opinions expressed by members of that staff are not typical of reactions from most individual libraries. More heed, therefore, should be paid to Miss Ludington, Miss Smith, and Mr. Ellsworth, who make frequent reference to their present backgrounds in expressing their impressions of the new rules and of cataloging tendencies in general. While much may be gained by readers from the presentation of facts or beliefs in an impersonal manner, there is always a more sharp realization of values available from individual libraries.

10 Smith, loc. cit., p. 130.

11 This entire meeting was devoted to the handling of serials and government publications in the revised code.
when writers quote from their own experience. If every contributor to the cataloging forum had confined himself to the way in which the revised rules and present cataloging trends are likely to affect his own library, a different set of papers might have resulted. Something would have been lost because of the lack of stress on general application of principles but much might have been gained. What practical services may Miss Ludington, Miss Smith, and Mr. Ellsworth be said to have rendered other libraries because of their more or less personal viewpoints?

Discussion with Catalogers by Administrators

Quite evidently, Miss Ludington and the catalogers at Mount Holyoke are better informed about the role of cataloging in that library because of the discussions which preceded the writing of her paper. She acknowledges her debt to her catalogers, and it is certain that they must have gained in breadth of view through learning more about the executive side of the situation. It is to be hoped that many executives will follow Miss Ludington's example and take the time for mutual exchange of ideas with their catalogers. Also, the statement about statistics of Library of Congress cards used at Mount Holyoke may perhaps start a quest for information of the same sort in other libraries. Miss Smith brings up specific examples of how the catalog at the University of Michigan has failed or succeeded as to accuracy and fullness. Such facts should prove of help to staff members in other libraries. Her example of the problem of establishing the date of birth for Mrs. Nathaniel Hawthorne may bring forth criticism from librarians who do not think that the catalog should feature as a bibliographical tool but at least Miss Smith has raised an important issue in a practical fashion. Mr. Ellsworth more than once shows firsthand acquaintance with the reaction of his student body to the catalog. Also, he acknowledges that he has discussed problems with faculty members, both at the University of Colorado and elsewhere. Would that other library executives might follow in his footsteps!

Attention to Cataloging Problems as a Whole Rather than to the Text of the Code

Four of the contributors were, of course, asked definitely to prepare papers about the code. Miss Morsch, Miss Ludington, and Miss Smith may be said to have fulfilled that purpose. Mr. Ellsworth, however, devotes most of his time to making general remarks about the cataloging situation in his own and other libraries. The remaining six writers were not expected to concern themselves entirely with the new edition of the rules. Yet Miss Root mentions it frequently, Mr. Tauber includes it in his review article and Mr. Nyholm handles in admirable fashion the task of covering both the general cataloging situation and the trends shown in the code. Mr. Clapp, Mr. Haykin, Mr. Mumford, and Mr. Tauber all deal with the wider aspects of cataloging from the standpoint of librarianship as a whole. Such an apportionment of topics shows foresight on the part of the editors. The advent of the new rules is important but it should not overshadow everything else that is happening in cataloging circles. The forum is well balanced for the very reason that subject headings, classifications, and cooperative cataloging, not to speak of the general movement towards simplification, have not been overlooked.
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Conclusions

As a teacher of cataloging, I view the March issue of this journal as one of the most fruitful sources for required readings that I have ever come across. It is true that the first-year student in library school would be thrown literally into a maelstrom if he were confronted at the beginning of his course with the variety of opinions expressed in the ten papers relating to cataloging. After he has had some introductory instruction on the use of the catalog, the principles of its compilation, and the means of establishing different forms of entry, a beginning student should, however, be ready to grasp the fact that the library world is constantly changing and that catalogers must adapt themselves to new conditions. He should not be kept in the dark as to the lack of uniformity of opinion among executives and other members of the library profession as to how necessary changes are to be effected, and I know of no better way to introduce him to this situation than to put into his hands the papers presented in the March number. As for the advanced student of cataloging, he might well spend the entire term in analyzing and discussing points brought out by the ten different contributors. If each channel of thought were investigated thoroughly, the instructor would have little time to add anything else to the curriculum. For the student would be occupied in studying the new code for himself so that he might understand the papers; with investigating the differences between simplified, normal, and full cataloging; with reviewing his knowledge of standard subject heading lists and classification schemes and making critical inquiries as to the ways in which these tools have fitted in or have failed to fit in with the needs of different types of institutions; with determining the relationship of the catalog department to general library administration. He would, moreover, be reading the reflective ideas of experts in his profession, and it is to be hoped that he would find their varying opinions challenging.

Status in Library Schools

The status of the new catalog rules in the library school curriculum is not so clear. Many instructors have taken literally the notice accompanying copies of the preliminary American second edition of the code, which stated that this edition was not for use in library schools. Other teachers have felt that the beginning students should have some acquaintance with the new rules after a firm grasp of the principles of the 1908 code has been assured. In advanced courses there has been, of course, little danger in promoting discussion about features in the new rules at any time during the term. So much for this year but how about the immediate future? There is little profit in requiring students to assimilate the content of Part II if this whole section is to be deleted and other printed substitutes provided for the description of the book. Until the Library of Congress, the two A.L.A. committees devoted to the revision of the code, and librarians at large have come to definite decisions about changes and supplementary publications, the library school instructor will have to live from day to day—teaching the old rules, mentioning some features of Part I of the revised code that are likely to attain permanence, and pointing out constantly that an authorized delineation of cataloging procedures is still in the making. However difficult such a task may
prove, it has its bright side. Those students who are to be the catalogers of the future should, because of these uncertainties and disagreements, prove more adaptable in making changes and adjustments when they undertake the building of actual catalogs in libraries and the solution of future cataloging problems.

By FRANCIS G. WILSON

The Library Catalog and the Scholar

Mr. Wilson is professor of political science, University of Illinois.

The users of the college and research library hardly know that there is a "crisis" in the art and science of cataloging. In degree each professor and student is aware of the virtues and the vices of the catalog but few have any coherent opinions on what might be called policies of the cataloging department of a library. Yet any scholar should welcome the wide discussion among librarians of the question, for it is only the inert and static professional group which has no questions as to its own folkways. The users of libraries will see a hope for continued improvements in the management of the book resources of the nation in the re-examination of cataloging, even though they may not know just what the improvements are to be.

The nonprofessional approach to the catalog would, perhaps, distinguish first of all between the kinds of users of the library. Undergraduates have a certain type of demand, the graduate students another, and the faculty still others. But distinctions must be made between different kinds of faculty men, since some teachers seldom use the library while others regard it as their garden of research which must be carefully cultivated. If the least sympathy need be expended on the teacher who does no research, we must also recognize that the needs of the students generally follow the pattern of demand originating in the teaching process. The values of the teacher are reflected in the demands the students make upon the library. A library catalog is a single instrument which must serve the needs of the whole academic community.

Wider Meaning of Service

Professional librarians may become immersed in the details of policy and administration and they may therefore forget the wider meaning of the service they are rendering the university. The library is, for the liberal and humane aspect of education, the organic and functioning center of the campus. If the laboratory courses may neglect the treasures of the mind locked up in books, the humanities cannot. Our universities have grown up in measure around the permanence of the library. We assume that the library will continue always to be where it is and that it will be always available to the seeker for knowledge. Americans who have used libraries in Europe will in many cases have realized the achievements of the American librarian, and this realization comes from
knowing the relative inaccessibility of materials not governed by the modern catalog. Distinguished exceptions may be remembered in the libraries of the League of Nations and the International Labor Office in Geneva where the handiwork of American library science was visible in the arrangement and cataloging of the books. As with the liturgy of a universal church, the scholar is at home anywhere and any time with a good library catalog.

A catalog is the key to effective teaching and research. It is for people to use, always and openly. But "people" are not experts in cataloging, and here as elsewhere the latent conflict between the expert and the layman can be seen. While we may regard the undergraduate as a layman in the extreme meaning of the word, the practiced scholar is a little less of the layman, though not an expert in the librarian's sense of the word. In the field of government, the civil servant or bureaucrat often feels that his knowledge is unappreciated by the citizen-subjects of the modern state. There is continued conflict between the expert or administrator and the ordinary individual upon whom the impact of government falls. So with the library. The librarian must be conscious of rendering a real service to the public and that there is a debt of appreciation which should be shown in refraining at least from capricious criticism. Possessors of the administrative arcanum do not welcome the clumsy curiosity of the uninitiated. Whatever one may say of professional achievements, those in educational endeavor, including librarians, must stand a constant public inspection and a lay evaluation of their work. Law, medicine, and, once upon a time, theology, were accepted and respected by the ordinary mortal, but not education for which the whole society pays good tax dollars. The modern bureaucrat would like to hush his critics with a frown of disapproval but in a democracy let us hope that this will never be. Those who direct the cataloging of a modern library must remember that the bureaucratic virus will weaken their position; it is a disease resolutely to be resisted.

Institutions of Consultation

One basic solution, long suggested in the discussion of social policy, is to develop institutions of consultation with the recipients of public service. Good opinion, the best opinion indeed, should be consulted. For the cataloger the best opinion available is that of the active scholar. If there are policies to be determined in cataloging, such people should be regularly and formally consulted. It might be suggested that in each university library there should be a general committee of such people, appointed by the librarian, who will be consulted about the problems of cataloging. Scholars will not be unwilling to accept the wisdom of the professional librarian, but the professional librarian may find there is wisdom to be gathered from the scholar. It is not suggested here that the minute problems of what call number should be assigned to a book should be discussed by such a committee but that the larger issues facing the cataloger and administrator of the library should be discussed. The conventional library committee in a university hardly gets beyond the divisions of the budget, the purchase of particular academic rarities, and the discussion of certain equipment needs. If the contemporary librarian faces a crisis which will not be short, he should seek all of the advice on policy that it is possible for him to get.
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Value of the Scholar's Advice

Librarians are seldom if ever in ivory towers, though students and scholars may be at times. The specific needs of an individual are what the librarian faces, but those needs must be correlated with the general financial and administrative circumstances of a library. Such a correlation cannot be achieved by intra-professional discussion alone. The generalized interests of library users should be consciously studied by the ablest representatives of the consumer of the library service.

Let us assume that the library must accept its share of the critical time through which all public institutions, not military in character, must pass. The brilliant tradition of American library science is stalwart support for troubled days, and a capacity of libraries to hold their own might be about all that can be expected during the next few years. The possibility, even probability, that less money will find its way into library budgets is clear. Some savings must be made. The cataloger, like others, must reduce the cost of his services. To introduce technical imperfections in the process of cataloging may be necessary, provided other values in librarianship are maintained. In the conflict of library values, the consumer, the scholar, should be able to offer valuable advice.

In the abstract, it would seem that the scholar would prefer savings in every branch of library cost before the actual purchase of books and documents is curtailed. To what extent cutting the cost of cataloging will maintain the stream of new books coming into the library is a question for the library technician to answer. It is obvious that a book must be available else it might just as well not be purchased, but it is clear also that there are degrees of availability and an imperfect catalog might be the lesser evil. In the abstract, therefore, if a choice must be made the scholar would prefer simplification in cataloging if such simplification will enable the library to purchase a larger number of books. Yet any scholar knows that long-run issues are involved. It might be shortsighted to mutilate the symmetry of the catalog in order to acquire a limited number of new titles; there might be even added cost at some later date in order to restore coherence to the catalog. Nevertheless, almost any scholar and teacher will urge that one of the vices of the modern university is excessive administrative and maintenance cost, all the way from the library to the athletic program. What simplifications in cataloging should be accepted should, therefore, be a matter for sustained discussion between the professional librarian and the active scholar.

Scholarly Needs Vary

Scholarly needs vary greatly, yet it would seem there is in general a discrepancy between the perfection of the bibliographical data on the catalog card and the needs of the scholar. In effect the data used by scholars is in most instances governed by publishing practice, though notable and discouraging variations may be noted in the meticulousness of some doctoral dissertations. What a research man ordinarily takes from the catalog card is the data that will go into a published bibliography; if he needs more there are appropriate means of getting it. Or, indeed, his reference may be and usually is made directly from the volume in hand. It is not suggested that the author-title cards
in the catalogs should be correlated perfectly with the standards of research publication but a closer correlation is at least a possibility in the simplification of cataloging. The ordinary student or graduate student may take even less data from the catalog card.

Subject analysis, may be, perhaps, to the user, the most crucial of the issues in cataloging. Subject headings involve great expense but they are included in the catalog in order to make it more useful. Now many users of the library may urge that the subjects selected are or have become traditional; that they do not keep up with the emergence of new subjects of inquiry. On the other hand, a perfect catalog might require an enormous amount of reclassification rather than the more simple and less expensive process of cross reference to older and obsolete headings. It can readily be understood that a cataloger does not want to have incomplete or dormant headings but the user might urge that new literature on new subjects might begin where the older and traditional division, let us say of a social science, leaves off. Certainly, the consultation of the workers in a discipline, who may be invited from time to time to serve with a general committee, should be important in the constant evolution of subject headings. It might be urged, to be specific, that few scholars in the field of political science would use the subject heading of “Political Science” in the catalog. Clearly, no subject headings can be perfect, though new subjects might reflect the development of sustained research interests, either throughout the field of scholarship or in particular universities. A consultative committee of scholars might be able to indicate the emergent fields of research which should be recognized in the catalog, especially those which cut across the social sciences.

Subject Headings Should Vary

Subject headings should vary, it would seem, with the changing interests of particular fields and with the changing predominances of research in particular universities. Thus, a university whose faculty has pioneered and attained recognition in a particular field will have both undergraduates and graduates using the catalog for literature dealing with the subject. Why should not the cataloger follow this interest fully as much as the more or less traditional subjects worked out by the Library of Congress? For example, works on the totalitarian state have, we hope, a limited time interest but in future years even a dormant heading on this subject might be of great value in guiding the graduate student in the preliminary stages of his research.

Owing to the traditional procedures of American scholarship, it is doubtful whether the formal bibliography can be a substitute for the catalog in research. Almost any research project goes far afield; it crosses other disciplines and ignores the accepted classifications of subject matter. By definition, a real research project must do this. A research problem springs in part from the spirit, the intuition, and the reason of the investigator; the formality of a library catalog or a bibliography can never keep up with dynamic and determined scholarship. The bibliography can hardly fit a specific research need, though it may be of value to investigations on lower levels of originality. Bibliographies cannot become substitutes for the catalog with its dispassionate revelation of all the material that a library may have.

On the other hand, there are bodies of
particularly difficult material, such as government and institutional documents, where most scholars do not know the ramifications or the richness of what is available. Analytical bibliographies and subject analysis of government documents might be of great use to the scholar. In practice the researcher knows only a small segment of the publications of a government and when he moves beyond his hard-won documentary competence he is likely to feel lost. While no library should undertake to do all of the bibliographical labor a scholar needs, while a library can attempt to be too systematic in the organization of materials, it is nevertheless true that the librarian should concentrate on those phases of bibliography which prove in practice most difficult for the scholar. Even librarians must remember that some labor need not be saved and that some delays to the user of a library are administratively justified.

The Reference Librarian

Rather than subject headings and rather than bibliographies, the scholar must turn to the reference librarian to bridge the gaps that are financially or administratively necessary. It is unfortunate that so many research workers are unfamiliar with the assistance that can be got from the trained reference librarian. Any scholar should be in the habit of going to such a librarian with any or all of his bibliographical difficulties. Faculty members as well as students need constant instruction in the use of the library, especially as the field of interest shifts from familiar to unfamiliar bodies of material. As simplification in cataloging becomes more and more necessary, the reference librarian will become correspondingly more and more valuable to the scholar. For example, in certain unsystematized problems of cataloging, such as films, the reference librarian is invaluable to one engaged in research. This statement implies, however, no defense of such unsolved problems.

Whatever is done with the catalog in the future, certain things must be remembered by the administrator and the cataloger. The present and previous generations of American scholars have grown up and reached their maturity under existing cataloging practice. Long use has taught many researchers the difficulties of the present system and how to avoid them. The college library catalog is a fundamental part of the researcher's outlook on life. He knows the catalog is there and he knows some of the things that are in it; he knows that at any time it can direct him here and there through the riches of a research library, as an elaborate map can direct the traveler or the soldier toward his objective. Fundamental changes in the cataloging system would entail almost revolutionary changes in the habits of the research mind. Indeed, it might generate in some a sense of frustration which would be translated into aggressiveness against the very librarian who is trying to adjust the library to his needs in the light of changing circumstance.

Unity of the Single Catalog

All true students want the resources of a library expanded and preserved. They want books to be available and to be guarded for the use of the future, as for the present, generation of students and scholars. But the diversity of materials in a library is brought at least to a symbolic unity in the single catalog. Our tradition, our use and wont, expects unity in the catalog if in nothing else about the library.
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Yet all users of a library know that changes are necessary. If a scholar knows, through consultation, what the problems of the librarian are, he will accept those changes more willingly than if he is left in ignorance of the inner workings of the librarian's mind. The simplification arising in cataloging from cost, all will accept, and any other changes which the common interest of librarians and scholars may dictate.

Any person who knows a library from the standpoint of independent research will know how complex the management of great stores of printed material is and likewise he will appreciate the effectiveness of the staffs of university libraries. Whatever changes must be made, should be made in light of the observed needs of the users of libraries and in the light of the experience of the professional librarian. It must be, in the nature of the case, a slow process but one that is constant. The scholar and the librarian both have a profound common interest in the preservation and expansion of the American library. The elements of professional jealousy and scholarly arrogance must fade in the common consciousness of the larger issues before us in the maintenance of the library, scholarly or otherwise, as a functioning element in our democratic way of life.

In Anticipation of Reconstruction

American librarians in research institutions, harassed during the last several months with missing issues and volumes of foreign journals, can sympathize with their European and Asiatic colleagues. Those librarians have for the last few years had the multiple problem of delivery failures, extensive reductions in budgets, necessitating almost wholesale journal cancellations, and in many instances destruction of important sets already held by the institutions. The size of this complex problem is impossible to estimate at the present time but we have sufficient evidence already to know that it is of huge proportions. And with no immediately cheerful prospects of change in the international situation we can assume that the problems for both foreign and American institutions will continue to multiply.

Whether we in the United States receive aid in completing our sets of foreign journals or not there is considerable satisfaction to be derived from knowing that work has been accomplished in this country which will aid in the future rehabilitation of foreign institutions. The Rockefeller Foundation, with its constant interest in international scholarship, has given to the American Library Association grants totaling $110,000 to be used to purchase current issues of important American journals to be shipped to European and Asiatic research institutions at the end of hostilities. The Committee on Aid to Libraries in War Areas has been responsible for the administration of this program. A brief report on the acquisition of this supply appeared in the April 1942 issue of the A.L.A. Bulletin.

(Continued on page 268)
Revision of the Catalog Code

Mr. Osborn, chief, Catalog Department, Harvard College Library, read this paper before the Conference of Eastern College Librarians, November 29, 1941.

The thesis here maintained is a simple one. It is that action on the revised catalog code be deferred at least until the Library of Congress has had time to formulate its rules and practices anew.

Cataloging history is still at the stage where in American libraries the Library of Congress sets the fashion. As long as that stage continues the general cataloging code should follow closely, but not slavishly, Library of Congress usage.

The happy result would be that the Library of Congress might come to find a level of cataloging that large, medium, and small libraries all might follow with a minimum of variation. This is by no means an impossible goal. In fact the leadership now being shown at the Library of Congress points in this very direction.

The Library of Congress and the Anglo-American Code

In the preface to the preliminary American second edition of the A.L.A. Catalog Rules various reasons are given to show why the Anglo-American code should have been revised so extensively and so radically. In effect, these reasons boil down to one: such revision was deemed necessary to reconcile the 1908 code with Library of Congress practice.

Cataloging history reveals a long story of interplay between the two systems. In 1901 the instructions to the Catalog Rules Revision Committee called for a code of rules in agreement with those in force at the Library of Congress. Nevertheless, the published code of 1908 differed from Library of Congress practice in a number of more or less important details. Between 1908 and 1933 the Library of Congress added to its body of rules, with the result that discrepancies multiplied.

Since many libraries were attempting to follow Library of Congress practice, the consequence was that the 1908 code was criticized increasingly often as the gap widened. With such libraries and with library schools that taught the use of L.C. cards, the code could not fail to lose caste and it did this in spite of the fact that it is essentially a very good piece of work.

All through the twentieth century the general tendency has been for libraries to make concessions to Library of Congress cataloging, with a great librarian like Cutter pointing the way. The preliminary American second edition of the catalog code can be regarded as a major concession to the Library of Congress, a statement which should be made with the clear understanding that it has been the desire for the past forty years to have a catalog code that does agree with the Library of Congress.

In these circumstances, it is germane to ask whether the proposed new code has been successful in realizing this old objective. In the first place, some Library of
Congress practice is footnoted just as it was in the 1908 code. In general, this is a wise procedure. In the second place, Library of Congress cataloging of the middle thirties was itself divided on many points, a fact well known to libraries which are doing cooperative cataloging and which are familiar with the phrase, the “preferred Library of Congress practice.” For the success of the proposed code, the Library of Congress of 1941 or 1942 would have to adopt these interpretations of its practice, which up to 1940 it was willing to do. In the third place, the code disagrees with or modifies Library of Congress practice of the middle thirties in a number of cases, the more significant of which are anonymous classics, religious headings, and the form of the publisher’s name. In a few instances the code states that the Library of Congress of the middle thirties will not change.

In general the new code has been rather successful in setting out Library of Congress practice; but, and this must be emphasized, it records Library of Congress practice as it was prior to 1940, not as it may be in the immediate future. From the point of view of the editorial committee for the new code, its misfortune was that it had no occasion to suspect that the cataloging situation at the Library of Congress might undergo such a remarkable change as it has since 1940.

Cataloging in College and University Libraries

Library of Congress cataloging affects college and university libraries intimately, since they are the largest users of its printed cards. In 1938-39, out of a total of $297,000 received by the Card Division at the Library of Congress, no less than $162,000 came from college and university libraries (whereas public libraries, by contrast, spent only $80,000). Nine hundred and twenty-five college and university libraries used the card service. Of these, however, 718 (those with a student body of less than one thousand) spent an average of about $75 a year on Library of Congress cards. The remaining 207 (all with a student body of more than one thousand) are the libraries most extensively concerned with the proposed code and its problems.

In spite of the great and increasing use of Library of Congress cards by college and university libraries, the present cataloging needs of these libraries differ very greatly from those of the Library of Congress, which was not the case in 1901. Open access now makes a very great difference to the cataloging program. At least the faculty and graduate students have open access in college and university libraries, while undergraduates have complete access in some cases and limited access in others. With open access, many readers use the catalog only after they have been to the shelves. As a result, fewer subject cards, fewer added entries, and fewer references are needed, while the classification scheme can be regarded as performing many of the functions the card catalog would otherwise be called on to perform. In addition, a great part of the use of a college or university library is through reserve reading rooms, the work of which does not call for reference to the card catalog to more than a slight extent. Further, departmental and similar libraries on a campus are capable of functioning with the methods of the relatively small or special library. This is particularly true when the departmental libraries order and catalog their own books. In fact, some of the best departmental libraries in the
country have been built up satisfactorily because attention has been concentrated on the acquisition of materials and a minimum of work has been done on cataloging. This was the situation, for example, in the greatest law library in the country which happens to be a departmental library. Again, college and university libraries have made considerable use of self-cataloging methods, particularly for government documents. The cataloging of serials has often been simplified greatly through reliance on serial checklists of one kind or another. In this connection, it might be pointed out that the Library of Congress itself is now in a position to modify and simplify its cataloging of serials in a similar manner, since it is now installing a visible index for its numerous serials.

College and University Libraries and the Code

Apart from the question as to what extent the Library of Congress and the few similar reference libraries with closed stacks (such as the New York Public Library) need very detailed cataloging, it is clear that college and university libraries do not require detailed cataloging for a large part of their specially organized work. Hence they have less need for as detailed a code as the one that has been prepared. This applies to both parts of the code, although it applies much more to the second part than to the first. Cooperative cataloging does not change the picture. Of the 41 libraries doing cooperative cataloging, 35 are college and university libraries. For this work, the cataloger requires a knowledge of the rules and practices followed by the Library of Congress. But these do not need to be applied any more than is necessary for cataloging that is done purely for local use. College and university libraries would be the losers in the long run if they adopted a detailed code for the sake of cooperative cataloging.

General Comments

One important change in the cataloging code is in the concept of the author heading itself. The old code attempted to look on the author heading from the point of view of entry words. The proposed new code tends to get away from this idea in a number of respects and to give the author heading a status and importance of its own. It does this by adding new elements to the author heading, whether these are needed or not. This tendency can be observed particularly in the headings for documents and anonymous classics.

The sequence of rules in the old code needed some adjustment, but in general it was effective, particularly for teaching purposes. The arrangement in the new code is very different and may appear to some librarians to be less effective than the old code in several important directions. In this connection, it will be interesting to learn the opinion of library school instructors.

The wording of the code has likewise undergone much change in the process of revision. Again, some librarians may feel that the simpler wording of the 1908 code is often preferable.

The proposed rules allow some variations in practice. They could with advantage be more permissive, especially in such matters as the use of authority cards and the number of added entries and references called for.

Libraries can spend a great deal of time and money, not always to the best advantage, on rules for religious and corporate entries and for serials. This suggests
that the rules for these items might bear very careful scrutiny to make sure that every detail is really justified.

The second part of the code is likely to come in for more criticism than the first, especially in little matters such as adding the Fascist to the Christian year in the imprint. As far as the detail of the second part is concerned, the Library of Congress may need to determine many details for the printing of its cards when homemade type-written or multigraphed cards can be made with relatively slight attention to such refinement.

The preliminary American second edition cannot be called the Anglo-American code. This seems to be a loss in something more than just international cooperation. A certain check and balance for the code may have been lost as well.

The proposed code contains no reproductions of sample cards, although the number of examples included in the text is very great. The sample cards in the 1908 code were assembled rather hastily and unsystematically so that they were never very effective. Perhaps sample cards can be issued in a separate publication. They have considerable value both for teaching and for everyday library purposes.

Library administrators are apt to comment most frequently on the fact that the proposed code does not seem to have made any contribution or concession to simplified cataloging, apart from the simplified rules for cataloging incunabula. The big need of the day is for simplification of cataloging details, together with simplified rules for less valuable books and pamphlets.

Recommendations

The Library of Congress has spent a year reorganizing its processing divisions. It is only now in a position to begin considering the technical rules of cataloging. Accordingly, it is of first importance to recommend that all action on the code except discussion should be suspended for a year or more until the Library of Congress has had time to review its rules. In this way only can the instructions of 1901 be fulfilled. This interim would give the Library of Congress time to show the leadership in cataloging matters that is now needed of it.

The next recommendation is that the 1908 code should be re-examined carefully. This is not advocated from a conservative or obstructionist point of view. Rather it is to emphasize that there is much that is genuinely good and basically sound in that code. Perhaps the Library of Congress could do worse than follow the old code more than it has done in recent years.

The third recommendation is that all necessary time be allowed to elapse so that the British can cooperate fully in the new code. There is everything to be gained by retaining an Anglo-American code. If such delay means waiting several years, the time can be used to advantage in studying the cataloging needs of various types of libraries and in cooperating in every way possible with the Library of Congress in the formulation of new rules. The preliminary American second edition has changed and expanded the rules so much that a great deal of time is necessary for careful consideration of them. It is not easy to see a way out of the difficulties in which cataloging now finds itself, nor at this stage is it easy to recommend what should be done with the proposed new code.

The special recommendation for college
and university libraries is that they should re-examine their cataloging program to see whether their present needs coincide with the 1901 instructions.

Finally, libraries of various types can see whether their cataloging objectives for the future may not even now be indicating the shape of things to come. For example, the book stock and the card catalog have both grown and have both been given hard treatment for a generation. In the light of these facts, should current cataloging be got in hand so that catalogers could be set free to revise and improve the card catalog? Are libraries relying on card catalogs too much in the care and building up of the book stock? The card catalog is apt to describe a book as it was when it was received in the library. Will the future make increasing demands for a more realistic catalog, for one that is more in keeping with the book collection as it is now rather than as it was at the time of cataloging? Questions of this kind are likely to come up as the book stock shows additional signs of wear. A new code might crystallize cataloging practice for a long time to come, and that possibility suggests the desirability at this stage of an examination of both present and possible future objectives for the card catalog.

Present Developments and the Revision

It is extremely unfortunate that present developments could not have come before revision of the cataloging code was undertaken. The need for economy has become so urgent that even the fundamental principles on which the American dictionary catalog has been built up are now for the first time being questioned. The revision committee did not do a perfect job but from the technical point of view it produced a first-rate piece of work for which all credit is due. A totally different problem now exists from the one the committee was appointed to meet. The need now is to re-examine all cataloging practice to see what is essential and what nonessential. It really is a case of starting again from scratch. The work that has been done on the code is not lost. It will be turned to with satisfaction when the new objectives are defined.

Real gain is already apparent from the intensified interest that head librarians are taking in their catalog departments. It is a matter of satisfaction to find more than a few administrators inquiring carefully into the revised code and into the cataloging situation in their libraries in consultation with their catalogers. Lasting benefits are sure to come from such developments.
The Cataloging Process in the University Library: A Proposal for Reorganization

Mr. Lund is librarian, Duke University Library.

Among the recent developments in the catalog and the cataloging process, there are two that will undoubtedly be of the greatest significance to those concerned with the organization and administration of university libraries. The one is the division of the dictionary catalog into an author-title catalog and a subject catalog; the other, the division of the cataloging department into a descriptive cataloging section and a subject cataloging section.

Neither of these, however, is properly a division, but they represent, rather, the resolution of the catalog and the cataloging process into their original component parts. Furthermore, although the two developments have so far apparently been independent of each other, there is a very close correspondence, on the one hand, between the author-title catalog and the descriptive cataloging section, and on the other hand, between the subject catalog and the subject cataloging section.

As to the division of the dictionary catalog, we might very well ask why it did not begin earlier. For we have certainly been aware that author-title and subject entries were intended to serve entirely different purposes—the former to locate books already identified by author or title and the latter to identify books on particular subjects—and since it is just as useful to keep unlike things apart as it is to keep like things together, a priori logic would certainly favor the separation and place the burden of proof on those who proposed combining the two. And even as a mere practical device for reminding us of the distinct function of the two types of entry and aiding us in adapting each to its own

1 The university library is here considered in its function as a scholarly reference and research library. This function comprises service to faculty members, research workers, graduate students, and to undergraduates in their advanced work in their "major" held during the junior and senior years. The other function of a university library, that of providing library service for the general education program of undergraduates during the freshman and sophomore years and part of the junior and senior years, though certainly no less important, is entirely distinct from the former function and properly requires separate organization and administration.

2 This division has recently been made at the University of California (1938), Duke University (1940), the University of Pennsylvania (1941), and elsewhere.

3 This division has been made, among other places, at the New York Public Library and the Library of Congress.

4 There seems to be no example as yet of the two occurring in any one library.


6 It is not easy to determine from the available literature exactly when and why the dictionary form was adopted. One explanation is that the dictionary catalog did not evolve from the combination of separate author-title and alphabetical subject catalogs, but rather that it developed from the author-title catalog alone by the gradual increase in title, inverted title, catchword, and other added entries—the accompanying subject catalog in classified form then disappearing as it was superseded by the subject entries in the author-title catalog. Cf. Cutter, Charles A. "Library Catalogs." Public Libraries in the United States of America, . . . Special report, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, pt. 1, Washington, 1876, p. 526-622; also Heiss, Ruth M. The Card Catalog in Libraries in the U.S. before 1876. (M.S. in L.S. thesis, U. of Illinois, 1938), p. 31-34.
particular purpose, the division would likewise seem justified. Furthermore, we have seen that much of the talk about simplifying and reducing the cost and complexity of the dictionary catalog, without changing its basic form, has been of little avail.

Similarly, we might ask why our recognition of the two distinctly different types of work that make up the cataloging process have not brought about their separation before now. On the one hand, there is the bibliographical description of the book, with the making of the usual author, title, and other added entry cards, and on the other, the entirely different process of examining the subject matter of the book and determining the subject headings and the classification number under which it belongs. It is not that we have been unwilling to create additional departments or sections—in fact, it would seem that nothing short of an active desire for a new department could explain the setting up, as is sometimes done, of a separate department for classification, apart from the regular catalog department where the subject headings are assigned. At any rate, with the division into descriptive cataloging and subject cataloging we have unquestionably made the first step in the rationalization of the whole cataloging process and are already further along than all our general talk about reducing the cost and complexity of cataloging could ever bring us.

The next important development in the organization of the cataloging process will come when the interdependence of the two distinctions here mentioned is fully recognized. The two divisions will then be made in the same library and coordinated so that the descriptive cataloging section assumes the responsibility for the author-title catalog and the subject cataloging section for the subject catalog. But even with this rationalization of the cataloging process itself, we shall merely have laid the foundation for the integration of this process with the other library functions—acquisition and service. For the descriptive cataloging done by the cataloging department cannot—in the interests of good management—be separated from the bibliographical work that must be done in the course of ordering and accessioning books, any more than—in the interests of good service—the subject cataloging done by the cataloging department can be separated from the subject work done by the reference staff, whether by means of the catalog, bibliographies, or their own knowledge.

**Proposal for Reorganization of Functions**

We come thus to a concrete proposal for the reorganization of those library functions included under the terms “technical processes” and “reference service.” The proposal is simply that the ordering, accessioning, and descriptive cataloging processes be organized as a unified division and that subject cataloging and reference service be likewise organized as a unified division. Instead of creating an additional department by the separation of descriptive from subject cataloging, we shall thus have greatly reduced the number of administra-

---

1 The terms “descriptive cataloging” and “subject cataloging” are used to designate these two functions, as is done at the Library of Congress. European librarians have always kept the two separate, though they usually also separate the classification of the books on the shelves, since with them the latter is often not a matter of subject classification at all.

2 The failure to separate the two types of work has made it impossible to determine the professional level of cataloging work and has likewise made it difficult to state the essential qualifications and the proper training for a cataloger. For descriptive cataloging and subject cataloging each require their own answers to these questions.

---
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tive units and considerably simplified the organization of the library. This simplification, however, would be only one result of the proposed reorganization—the real justification rests on other considerations.

**Bibliographical Work and Descriptive Cataloging**

The close connection between the bibliographical work done in the process of ordering and the work that falls under the head of descriptive cataloging is readily apparent. Both involve the establishing of the entry and the identification and enumeration of the bibliographical and physical characteristics of the book. Most libraries have recognized this to the extent that they have attempted to prevent duplication of this work by the order and the cataloging departments. These attempts, however, have not proved particularly successful, and we still find the catalogers verifying the information secured by the order department if it is passed on to them or securing it anew if it is not passed on. Obviously there would be nothing to be lost and much to be gained by letting the same group prepare the catalog cards for a book for which they had already secured the information needed to check and order it. The simplification of records that would result would not be the least of the benefits of combining the two. Such a unified bibliographical department would have a subdivision for the clerical work of writing orders, checking bills, accessioning, etc., and perhaps also a subdivision for serial publications, without affecting its essential unity.

On the other hand, the combination of subject cataloging and reference work may require some explanation. Once we recognize two factors, however, the desirability of combining the two is obvious. In the first place, satisfactory subject cataloging and subject classification in a university library can only be done by persons with advanced academic training in the subjects they deal with; likewise, satisfactory reference service in a university library can only be done by persons who have academic training equal to those whom they serve. And since no one person can be competent in all or even very many fields, we have tried and are still trying to build up a staff of subject specialists in both the cataloging and the reference departments. The cost of this duplication of what must necessarily be high-salaried persons is unjustifiable under normal conditions and will become prohibitive in the period we are now entering. Furthermore, within the limits of the staff of each department, it is often impossible to secure coverage of the entire range of subject fields. But by combining the two we shall have eliminated this duplication and shall have available twice the number of people to cover the subject fields. In the second place, with the continual change in our subject divisions and approaches, the subject catalog of any particular collection can no longer be regarded as the final and complete guide to the subject matter of the collection—and certainly not to the subject material in other collections, which the scholar cannot ignore. The personal knowledge and service of the reference librarians and both general and special bibliographies are taking places of at least equal importance with the subject catalog. And proper coordination of the three can certainly best be secured by combining them in one administrative unit. In fact,
the need for closer cooperation between
the reference and cataloging departments
has been felt for some time and efforts
made to obtain it. Full combination of
the two, however, has only become pos-
sible with the separation of subject from
descriptive cataloging.

Two Divisions

In place of the usual order, cataloging,
and reference departments, we then have
two divisions—one of professional library
work in a technical sense, covering biblio-
graphical checking and descriptive catalog-
ing, and the other of professional library
work in an academic sense, covering subject
cataloging and reference service. Under
this organization the “processing” of a new
book would be carried out somewhat as
follows. Preparatory to placing the order,
the bibliographers—as we shall call the
assistants in the first division—will, as
usual, check the entry, title, and imprint
in order to identify the book and prevent
duplication, and will make a preliminary
card. When the book is received, this card
will be revised as necessary to conform with
the book, collation added, and the title,
editor, and other added entries determined.
The distribution of books among the sev-
eral bibliographers may well be made by
language, or by form, rather than by sub-
ject.

The book is then taken over by the
reference librarian (or subject cataloger)
in whose particular subject field it falls.
The book is classified, subject headings
are assigned—subject to some centralized
revision—and the title entered in special
lists or checked in printed bibliographies
as the reference librarian sees fit. In the
course of the subject cataloging procedure
the reference librarians actually handle
and have an opportunity to familiarize
themselves with the books being added to
the library in their respective fields. This
is undoubtedly one of the greatest values
of the arrangement.

The book then goes to the stacks, the
cards are typed, traced, and filed—in the
author-title catalog under the supervision
of the bibliographers and in the subject
catalog under the supervision of the refer-
ence librarians.11

Use of L.C. Cards

In this basic outline of the “processing”
of books there are several points that may
need amplification. There are also certain
possible variations and innovations that
merit consideration.12 Take first, for ex-
ample, the question of using L.C. cards in
a university library. There is no doubt
that the information contained on L.C.
cards is very helpful in the descriptive
cataloging process and can save a good
deal of time. But it is certainly reasonable
to suppose that if university libraries had
been making these cards instead of the Li-
brary of Congress, they would have ar-
ived at a different form. And since
university libraries cannot get L.C. cards
for all their books, they are forced to
choose between using L.C. form for the
cards they make themselves and having
two different types of cards in their cata-
logs.13 But perhaps we are worrying too
much about the form of descriptive catalog-
ning and perhaps consistency is the most

11 It may, of course, prove advisable, as is often
done now, to file a temporary card in the author-title
catalog as soon as the book is received and the entry
established.
12 Some of these would be applicable to other forms
of organization than the one here proposed.
13 There is, of course, also the delay and expense
of ordering L.C. cards to be taken into account. We
might have the benefit of the information on the
card without necessarily adopting the card itself by
simply using the depository catalog (as Harvard
does) or if a depository catalog is not available, order-
ing one L.C. card for each book at the time the book
itself is ordered. Another possibility would be for
publishers to supply information for cataloging along
with each book.
important consideration. For descriptive cataloging is, after all, only one step in the cataloging process, even though the primary step.\footnote{We must guard against assuming that by solving the problem of a descriptive cataloging code or of centralized descriptive cataloging we have thereby solved the cataloging problem. This is particularly pertinent now that we are considering the new A.L.A. code and proposals by the L.C. Experimental Division of Library Cooperation for a centralized card-making bureau.}

It is when we come to subject cataloging that we meet the real difficulty. Here the value of the subject headings and classification numbers on L.C. cards is very doubtful. For while it is possible to make universal descriptive cataloging rules, it is not possible to do the same satisfactorily for subject cataloging. Subject cataloging, including classification, cannot be done once and for all like descriptive cataloging but must be constantly changed and revised to meet changing approaches and conceptions. Each library must face and solve this problem in terms of its own peculiar conditions and purposes and the needs of its users—and also must be prepared to revise and change the solution continually.\footnote{No one will deny that our lists of subject headings and our classification schemes are in need of revision, if not complete reworking.}

Perhaps centralized subject cataloging cannot even be satisfactory within a library that has departmental libraries and it should be left to each separate unit. One reason, undoubtedly, why libraries have used the subject headings on L.C. cards is that they have not had subject catalogers competent to work out their own system of subject headings. The combination of subject cataloging and reference work in one department should, however, make this possible.

**Classification**

The second point that needs special consideration is classification and its place in the processing of a book. If the book could be classified by the descriptive catalogers—instead of the subject catalogers, as we have proposed—we could make a further improvement in the routine, for the descriptive catalogers could then file their cards in the author-title catalog as soon as the call number was added, before turning the book over to the subject catalogers—thus eliminating perhaps the need for a temporary card.\footnote{Tracings for added entries in the author-title catalog could be put on the shelflist card by the descriptive catalogers and then sent on to the subject catalogers who would trace their subject entries on it before it was filed in the shelflist.} At the same time they could make, say, three or four extra cards to be sent along with the book, to which the subject catalogers could add subject headings before filing them in the subject catalog. But to have classification done by the descriptive catalogers would violate the basic principle by which we are proposing to reorganize the processing operations, because separating from the subject cataloging classifications would require descriptive catalogers with the same subject knowledge as the subject catalogers.

There is, however, one way in which classification could be done by descriptive catalogers with no special subject knowledge but it would mean either adopting a scheme of subject classification so broad that no particular academic knowledge would be required to classify a book by it,\footnote{This could very easily be worked out for the departmental libraries of a university library. The descriptive cataloging could be centralized in the main library, just as the ordering is—the cards in the union author-title catalog simply stamped "departmental library" and filed, and then a certain number of subject cards (also some for the departmental library author-title file) going with the book to the departmental librarian (who functions as the reference librarian and subject cataloger in that field), and she would then do her subject cataloging and shelf arranging as she saw best, independent of the main library or other departmental libraries. (Such an arrangement would parallel a national situation in which descriptive cataloging is done by a central agency, but subject cataloging left to each individual library.)} or else giving up subject classification on the shelves altogether and choosing...
some factor other than subject as a basis for arranging the books in the stacks—such as order of accession, date of publication, country of origin, size, alphabetical sequence of authors’ names, or a combination of any of these. There is more than a remote probability that we shall eventually come to the latter, and in any event, with detailed subject classification proving to be less and less useful and less and less permanent, some other system based on some more permanent characteristic should at least be considered.

Another important point that can be discussed further is the manner of making subject entries. One of the chief obstacles to continual and regular revision of the subject catalog is undoubtedly the physical problem of changing the subject headings typed on the cards. But if subject headings were not actually typed or written on the cards and instead guide cards were used, the various titles could be filed from time to time and new headings added and old ones removed with little difficulty. Of course, this would mean that we would have to give up tracing and run the risk of having subject cards in the catalog for books that had been reclassified or withdrawn. Here we would have to weigh advantages and disadvantages against one another.

Pamphlets and Similar Materials

The treatment and servicing of pamphlet and other research material that does not warrant regular cataloging has always been a problem. However, under the proposed reorganization with the reference librarians responsible for the subject cataloging and the subject approach to the material in their respective fields, whether listed in the subject card catalog or not, this material can simply be arranged in groups corresponding to the various subject fields and each reference librarian made responsible for his part of the collection. Since this type of material will not be listed in the author-title catalog, it can go directly to the reference librarians who can supervise its shelving in a special room or section of the stacks and make whatever special lists or indexes may be necessary. In time these collections will develop into what may be called research collections and will include a great deal of material that belongs much more properly in such a collection than in the general stacks.

For this type of material, then, the reference librarian, with the help of his shelf arrangement, actually takes the place of the subject catalog. And it is quite probable that he will be of more help.

The decision as to what sort of material does belong in such a research collection presents some difficulty. It is possible, however, in a university library to draw a distinction between “reference” material and “research” material. The former is material that is not referred to by specific references and is still important for the original purpose for which it was written. The second is material that is referred to by specific reference and which has lost its originally intended significance and is important for some other reason—as a 19th century textbook on chemistry, important now only in the study of the history of education. The former material should be fully cataloged and shelved in the general stack, the latter need not be cataloged by individual pieces and may well be housed together in a room apart from the stacks where it is available to research workers only. The recognition of this distinction and the possibility of treating “research” material without regular cataloging will enable the library to be more liberal in its collecting policy and thereby solve another of its vexing problems. Cf. Taube, Mortimer. “The Theory of Book Selection, pt. I.” College and Research Libraries 2:223-25, June, 1941; also. “The Realities of Library Cooperation.” Library Quarterly 12:246-56, Apr. 1942.
to research workers than any subject catalog could ever be.

There is a further responsibility that the reference librarians will be in an excellent position to assume—that of suggesting new titles for purchase in their fields. It is conceivable that each reference librarian might, in fact, act as the library representative for an academic department or two or more related departments and review their recommendations for new acquisitions before they are passed on for ordering.  

In general, each reference librarian could function as a liaison agent between the faculty and graduate students of his department or departments.

Conclusion

It may seem, then, from one point of view that we have proposed to solve the cataloging problem by eliminating the catalog department. From another point of view, however, we have greatly extended the cataloging function so that it takes in the bibliographical checking process preparatory to ordering on the one hand and extends over into the work of the reference department on the other. At any rate, whatever the new arrangement does to the traditional cataloging department, it assigns a new importance to cataloging itself and makes it a more integral part of the library's work.

The foregoing presentation of the proposed reorganization must, of course, be considered as an outline that includes only the basic steps of the processes involved. Many details remain to be worked out before it can be put into practice and once the reorganization has been made, further adjustments will be necessary.

It is true that the proposed reorganization will help reduce library administrative costs and that this will be an even more important factor in the immediate future than it is now. Economy, however, has not been the primary reason for proposing the reorganization. The ultimate purpose of the reorganization is the improvement of university library service to the faculty and advanced students, by making the contents of the library accessible from the point of view of the scholar. The aim is to provide, not a librarian's library that the scholar may learn to use, but a scholar's library administered by the librarian.
The Divided Catalog: Duke University Library Catalog Faces the Future

Miss Burch, senior cataloger, Duke University Library, read this paper at the meeting of the Duke University Library Staff Association, November 28, 1941.

The increasing number of discussions concerning the library catalog, its form, rapid growth, and difficulties of use, only tend to make it evident that library catalogs are reaching a crisis. The dictionary catalog, "this strange creature of modern library economy," has become firmly established and is the predominant form used throughout the United States. The divided catalog is used pre-eminently in the larger European libraries. Two main catalogs are found in all large research libraries in Germany: 1. An alphabetically arranged catalog by authors and anonymous titles ("Alphabetischer Katalog" or "Nominal-Katalog"); 2. A subject catalog ("Sachkatalog"). A single dictionary catalog ("Kreuzkatalog") appears in only two large German libraries.1

As early as 1886, there have been criticisms of the dictionary catalog in the United States. At this time Mr. Schwartz,2 librarian of the New York Apprentices' Library, said that the dictionary catalog, "instead of being (as is supposed) the best and most convenient, is in fact the worst and least convenient of the three forms of catalogue: 1. Dictionary catalogue; 2. The systematic; 3. The alphabetico-classed." In 1905, "the future of the catalog" was discussed by William I. Fletcher,3 librarian of Amherst College, who says that the size and complexities of the dictionary catalogs are the chief sources of complaints by their users. Amherst College library has had its catalog divided for years into an author section and a subject-title section. This form of division is not common. The extensive Harvard University Library is one of the early users of the divided form of catalog. William Warner Bishop writes that "if it appears desirable to keep an author record separate from the subject record, it may be done without any departure from the basic principle of the dictionary catalog."4

With the recent advance of higher education, university libraries have grown so rapidly that the only obvious step toward simplification is division. Rolf K. Hagedorn, cataloger at the University of Texas says5 that the catalog should be divided into its three component parts, subject, author, and title files. This division would result in the elimination of the other two offenders in each alphabetical

---

1 Runge, S. "Some Recent Developments in Subject Cataloguing in Germany." Library Quarterly 11:46-68, Jan. 1941.
file. The “vertical” division, which has been followed by the Baker Library of the Harvard Business School, is a breaking up of the catalog into two separate units, as author-title catalog and subject catalog. A “horizontal” division of the catalog has been explained by Wyllis E. Wright of the New York Public Library, as making a “division into several catalogs each of which, within the field it covers, is a complete dictionary catalog.”

Other Divided Catalogs

In 1938 when the University of California divided its catalog into an author-title and a subject section, the library staff felt that the complexities of the large dictionary catalog had reached the point where the undergraduate had great difficulty in using it. The principal arguments in favor of its division were: first, the filing—and, therefore, finding—would be simplified drastically; second, the catalog would be more convenient for use, the author-title trays would be available for quick and frequent use while the subject trays were being studied.

The only instance found in which the divided catalog has not proved more satisfactory than the dictionary form is at the University of Chicago Library where, “after struggling for years to explain the system and to train users in the finding of entries under three separate alphabets,” the cards were filed all together in one alphabet, absolutely word for word.

A catalog for the Duke University Library, employing standard size cards, was begun in 1903 with a divided form, an author section and a subject-title division, on the Amherst College plan. This divided catalog was used until 1914 when, with interest mounting for dictionary catalogs, it was decided to file the cards together into one alphabet. The Duke University Library catalog has grown very rapidly, especially during the last ten years since the library has been housed in its present building. The dictionary form of catalog has been used continuously from 1914 until 1940 when it was decided to divide it into two sections, an author-title catalog and an alphabetical subject catalog. The division was made to eliminate many filing problems and complexities which have heretofore only caused bewilderment to the student users, and to divert the clumsily increasing bulk of a single unit into smaller sections for easier handling. The trays had become so full that shifting of the cards was imperative; so the time was ripe for the division. The exact period chosen for the work was selected because fewer students were on the campus at that time and the physical shifting of the trays came between the last summer school and the opening of the fall session when no classes were in progress. The author-title section is used for ready reference to find a special book, leaving the subject section free for the study of graduate students and those working on papers who are searching for material from the subject angle. This relieves congestion in the public catalog room.

Simplification of Catalog

Simplification of the catalog by the formation of a separate serials catalog and a periodical catalog had already been made.
before the dictionary catalog was divided. Cross references from the main entries are in the author-title catalog to these two catalogs. The public seemed to appreciate finding the complete holdings of the library's serials in a small catalog of only fifty trays. The periodical catalog is located in the periodical room, where the complete service of periodicals, including circulation, is made. By discontinuing the complete cataloging of most pamphlets, the number of cards going into the catalog has decreased. The pamphlets are taken care of in a special pamphlet collection where the material is shelved by subject and serviced by the reference department. The library's holdings for material in manuscripts, pamphlets, and public documents are brought out by the use of blue cards in the catalog. In the author-title section a blue card is filed under each state which reads:

The Library maintains a collection of the PUBLIC DOCUMENTS of this State. For information consult the Librarians in the Documents Room.

A blue card is filed in the subject section under each state and certain individual subjects and in the author-title section under some author entries, which reads:

The Library has additional material under this heading in its collection of:

✓ Manuscripts
✓ Pamphlets
✓ Public Documents

Consult the Librarian at the desk in the Public Catalog Room or in the Reference Room for further information.

Actual Dividing Begun

On August 1, 1940, the actual work of dividing the dictionary catalog into an author-title catalog and a subject catalog was begun. The work was completed on September 12. When the division was begun, six catalogers working in groups of two, began to turn through the catalog card by card, making three simultaneous divisions, A—F, G—O, P—Z. The cards taken out were the subjects and cross references.

The author and title cards were pushed to the front of each tray and the subject cards were put in the back of the tray, separated by a guide marked “Subjects.” This division did not necessitate the changing of the labels on the front of each tray.

As the division of each tray was completed, the author-title cards and the subject cards were measured and the inches tabulated on sheets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>author-title cards</th>
<th>6,964 in.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject cards</td>
<td>4,701 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total catalog</td>
<td>11,665 in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the entire catalog was divided, the number of inches was computed for the amount of cards to be used in the trays for each section after the separation was completed. Ten inches were allowed to the tray for author-title cards and eight inches to the tray for the subject cards, varying of course upon the possibility of division at the end of the tray. Eight hundred and twenty-three trays were used for author-title cards and 588 trays for subject cards, making a total of 1,411 trays used. Before the catalog was divided 1,272 trays were being used. The trays needed to be shifted, since this had been postponed for some time in view of the approaching division.
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Cabinets Rearranged

After the separation of cards within the trays was completed, it was decided best to rearrange the cabinets holding the catalog in the public catalog room. Heretofore the cabinets had been in rows. Now it seemed that it would prove less confusing if the cabinets were placed end to end down the center of the room making one long row, except for two small breaks to allow passage from one side to the other.

Signs were placed at the top of the cabinets showing which side contained the separate catalogs.

In order to move the cabinets the trays had to be removed. They were placed in order along the reference room tables. The cabinets were moved during the night so that no time was lost by the library staff. The next morning the trays were brought in truck loads by an assistant, and four catalogers working in pairs began separating the author-title cards and the subject cards which were still in the same tray. The subject group removed their part of the cards from the trays and sent the remainder to the author-title group. The cards were measured and placed in the trays, goals being set on the author-title side so that this division would be complete on one side of the cabinets. Proper labels were made for the front of each tray; those for the subject side were typed in red and the author-title labels were typed in blue. When this was finished, guide cards typed in red were made for the subject side of the catalog. The guide cards already in were left, for the most part, on the author-title side. These were not reworked until they were picked up by the filers. The trays on each side were numbered beginning with one—an “S” being added to the numbers of the subject trays.

The cross references taken out were checked and when the entry also appeared in the subject catalog, the typists made subject cross reference cards (typed in red). The author-title cross references were refilled immediately. An authority file for cross references for each division of the catalog is kept now in the cataloging department. Since the division of the catalog, duplicate cards have not been made except for the necessary cross references and an extra card for autobiographies.

Simplification of Filing

Further simplification of the filing has been worked on since the catalog division. One filer has been giving her full time to turning through the catalog card by card and adding the publication date to the upper right corner of the catalog card for the books having several editions in the library and arranging them chronologically beginning with the earliest edition. Different editions of the same book having editors and translators, had the surname of the editor or translator added to the upper right corner of the card and the cards filed alphabetically by these names.
A single prolific author has guide cards added for works, selections, and the titles of his chief works. The cards back of these guides are then arranged chronologically by dates in the upper right corner or alphabetically by editors. Chaucer affords a good example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Chaucer, Geoffrey</td>
<td>The Canterbury tales of Chaucer ... 1798.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847-51</td>
<td>Chaucer, Geoffrey</td>
<td>The Canterbury tales of Geoffrey Chaucer ... 1847-51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Chaucer, Geoffrey</td>
<td>The Canterbury tales of Chaucer ... 1860.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Chaucer, Geoffrey</td>
<td>Chaucer's Canterbury tales, edited ... by Alfred W. Pollard ... 1894.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Chaucer, Geoffrey</td>
<td>Chaucer's Canterbury tales, annotated ... by John Saunders ... 1894.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Chaucer, Geoffrey</td>
<td>Geoffrey Chaucer's Canterbury tales, nach dem Ellesmere manuscript ... 1915.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chaucer, Geoffrey
Geoffrey Chaucer's Canterbury erzählungen ... 1925.

Chaucer, Geoffrey
Canterbury tales ...[c1928]

Chaucer, Geoffrey
Canterbury tales ....[1934]

Chaucer, Geoffrey
Canterbury tales ......1935.

Professors and students alike seem to enjoy using the author-title section without having the bother of the subject cards. This section brings together the scattered titles for the same work of an author. Some few have to be educated as to what the exact meaning of the subject catalog is. They think of the title as the subject of the book and expect to find this title in the subject division. One professor would like to have still more of the subject matter of the library brought out in the subject catalog, rather than just the chief subjects of the books.

Although the divided catalog is still new and time has not tested its merits, we have realized that something had to be done to keep the catalog under control and make it more usable for the public. We are now looking forward to see what new innovations will be made in the catalog of the future.
Microfilm in the Small College Library

Mr. Paine, librarian, Beloit College Library, presented this paper at a meeting of the College Libraries Section of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, December 29, 1941.

Despite recent marked advances in microphotography and microprint techniques, the time when a student or faculty member will come to the loan desk of the college library to borrow Berlin Diary for home reading and go out with a three-inch reel of sixteen or thirty-five millimeter film or a three by five card size microprint edition, is far distant. There is nothing yet to replace a real paper book for reading one's self to sleep, despite the promises of at least one company to bring out a special projector to hang over the bed.

A review of the literature which has appeared in the field of photographic reproduction and projection as it concerns the librarian through the period of 1936-41 reveals some 450 articles, with no more than three or four purporting to consider microfilm from the standpoint of the small college library. Nor, for that matter, are there more than a very few having to do with administrative problems in any library. Most of the literature thus far has been in the field of technical developments. This is a natural trend in a technical field in which developments, if not origins, are so recent. Those who are most active in the field are either photographic technicians or librarians who have become interested in the technical developments to the exclusion, for the time being at least, of the administrative aspects.

What Herman Fussier wrote in 1938 is apparently still true:

Much time on the part of librarians has been spent during the past few years in dealing with purely technical matters. If microphotography as low-priced reproduction is really to fulfill its apparent potentialities, there must be some bed-rock planning and consideration first, and the librarians must assume the obligation, for investigators are too much concerned with their own individual subject fields to consider scholarly documentation as a whole. The technicians, likewise, have neither the knowledge nor the inclination to direct the path of the new technique...1

If we may judge from the literature on the subject which followed, college librarians did not take up this challenge. It was our belief that only research institutions could afford this luxury. Nor was this concept of microphotography as a luxury entirely without grounds, for turning again to Mr. Fussier, we find "If $50 is invested, the results may be worth that amount, but... they will, of course, nor be what a laboratory costing $5000 or

more can produce. As if this mention of some figure lying vaguely between $50 and $5000 were not sufficient to frighten any budget-conscious college librarian, Mr. Fussler goes on to list cameras with supplementary lens, home-rigged copying stand, developing tank, hand viewer or semi-home-rigged projector, and a few accessories such as bottles, safe light, balance, a graduate, fifty-foot capacity reels, three mixing tanks, Stineman reels, printers, enlargers, splicers, rewinders, etc. This was the technician, trying valiantly to interest the college librarian in embarking upon a microfilm program in his library. No one has contributed more to technical knowledge of microphotography for libraries than Mr. Fussler, but apparently the information which he has given us has fallen upon deaf ears.

Recognition for the College Library

Of the few authorities on college library administration who have produced books on that subject during this five-year period, Miss McCrum, in 1937, is the only one who, to my knowledge, has granted microphotography any recognition as a legitimate part of the college library. Even of the former it has been said, “Reproduction of such material on request is, of course, self-supporting and therefore not a liability to the library but a definite asset to prestige.” That it would be the latter I do not doubt, but considering the small volume of such reproduction which would be called for from the average college library and that the original cost of the reproduction equipment and laboratory must be amortized, the field of microphotography is not one in which any of us can afford to indulge—to charge off an expenditure of several thousand dollars, or even several hundred, to the prestige account is apt to bring the auditors on the run.

Separation of Microphotography and Microfilm

Even Miss McCrum failed to recognize that microphotography and the use of microfilm can be separated insofar as library administration is concerned. In the “checklist of building requirements” which she appended to her book, there is no entry under microfilm, but under microphotography we find “... Space and equipment for making and using film and photostats. Plumbing for developing room. Provide for growth in this department.”

More fanciful authors have gone so far as to suggest to the college librarian the filming of the card catalog as economy of space and insurance against loss by fire or flood. Even at a minimum cost of one half cent per card, this would seem to be rather expensive insurance when we figure the chances of destruction of the card catalog, by these or other means, especially when the film copy would be out-dated before it was ever completed. Moreover, recent experiments and developments in a microphotographic charging system,
though undoubtedly practical in some situations, are not steps which the average college library can justify.

Such schemes, along with the failure of most authorities to distinguish between microphotography, with its expensive equipment and laboratories, and the use of microfilm, have undoubtedly been major factors in the college librarians' apparent failure to recognize the potential place of film as a solution to at least some of their administrative problems.

In this paper I do not propose to assume any psychic powers in order to tell you what your problem is and how microfilm can solve it. No one but you can pretend to understand your immediate problems or propose their solution. Neither can I tell you all about microfilm and its reading equipment; and, if I could, it would be useless duplication of literature already in existence, from the hands of more competent authorities. My purpose shall be only to state one problem of library administration and, by presenting alternative solutions, to demonstrate that under certain conditions microfilm has a place in the college library.

Newspapers

Briefly stated, the problem is newspapers. Our files comprise the local papers, including the college paper, from 1847 to date, and the New York Times from 1913 to date. At least half are pulp paper. As in all such collections, the problem is inherently twofold; namely, the prevention of deterioration of the paper stock itself and the provision of adequate and accessible storage and reading room space.

The traditional solution of the first phase of the problem would be the preservation of the originals by some process, varying from the covering with Japanese tissue at a cost of seven or eight cents per sheet, to lamination with cellulose acetate at a cost of about fifteen to twenty cents per sheet. With an estimated minimum of 175,000 pages, or 87,500 sheets, in the files of the local newspapers alone, the immediate cost to be anticipated would range from $6125 to $17,400. These figures do not take into consideration the rebinding costs and the added storage space necessitated by the increased bulk resulting from any known preservative process. Nor are we, for the moment, even considering the overwhelming task of taking any steps toward processing the New York Times, 1913 to date.

In the second phase of our problem, we are confronted with an estimated total of 6250 cubic feet tied up in newspaper files, traffic, and reading room space, with all available shelf and building space already occupied.

Space Requirements

The New York Times and our local newspapers in bound form require thirty-five cubic feet of shelf space annually. To provide adequate shelving and traffic space at this rate of expansion for a period of twenty-five years would require the immediate addition to our building of a room fifteen by twenty feet at an estimated cost of $3000, or $1 per cubic foot—and this without any regard to architectural continuity. Shelving would cost from $1000 to $2000, depending upon whether ordinary steel storage or roller type were purchased.

Summarizing briefly, if the foregoing solution were adopted, including processing of the local papers and the provision of building space and shelving for the next twenty-five years, an immediate expendi-
ture of $10,125 to $22,400 would have to be made.

Microfilm presents the only alternative solution. It is with the adequacy and economy of this alternative that the remainder of this paper is concerned.

The first question with which we are confronted is that of the durability of microfilm. We know that the new safety microfilm is less subject to destruction by fire than is paper, in that the former will burn only so long as it is in contact with flame from another source. It is obvious that it is easier to provide fireproof storage for film than for the originals, which might require as much as 98 per cent more space. We are reasonably sure, according to the U.S. Bureau of Standards, that, stored under proper conditions of humidity, cellulose acetate ("safety") microfilm can be expected to last as long as the best rag paper.

Legality of Film Copies

Another question pertaining to film copies to which we must give some thought is that of the legality of such copies; in other words, are materials on microfilm preserved or merely reproduced? In the filming of certain types of material, especially those which might conceivably be referred to for legal purposes such as business records, vital statistics, or other archival and primary source materials, the admissibility of such copies as evidence, in the absence of the original document, has been considered. In an opinion handed down by the United States Court of Appeals in the case of the United States of America, Plaintiff, vs Martin T. Manton and George M. Spector, Defendants, it was held that such photographic records (in this case, of cancelled checks) constitute not secondary but primary evidence as proof of payment. This does not mean that there remains no further question of the legality of film copies, but as far as newspapers and perhaps other materials in the library are concerned, there would seem to be no reason for hesitation in discarding the originals for film copies in the interests of more efficient storage and preservation.

Having concluded that microfilm offered the legitimate medium for the preservation of newspaper files, our next problem was one of sources and costs of photography. Several alternatives were immediately apparent. First, the library might purchase outright or rent the necessary equipment from the Recordak Corporation and employ an operator. Second, a contract could be entered into with the Eastman subsidiary, under which the library would ship the materials to be photographed to the company's plant, where all of the work would be done. Third, we might find a professional operator properly equipped for microphotography and near enough to make it possible to set up a

camera in our building, or to whom we could get the materials to be filmed without elaborate packing and high transportation costs. Obviously, the criteria for choosing from the above methods must be the quality of work obtainable and costs.

**First Method Discarded**

The first of these methods was discarded because to amortize equipment costs would have raised the price of filming to a figure in excess of that received on bids from the commercial sources. In addition, if a library undertakes to do its own filming, it must assume the responsibility for good copies. And the statement of the Recordak Corporation that it takes little or no experience to take microfilm pictures because the experience has been built into the equipment itself is only applicable in filming uniform materials in which there is no variation in the size or type of paper and the intensity of the impression from one sheet to the next. One authority has said “the reproduction or the control of tone values is as important in copying as it is in pictorial photography.”

You will never realize this so well as when you have obtained a poor film copy of some long-sought bit of source material.

As for the costs and quality of work to be expected from either of the commercial sources, we discovered that there was no appreciable difference between the two, and the deciding factor was purely that of convenience. Costs will be found to vary with the volume of work to be done and type of material to be photographed. For the filming of our local newspaper files a figure of two and one half cents per page, or a maximum of $4.375 was estimated. This represents a saving of not less than 30 per cent over the cheapest possible preservation by any other means, and instead of an increase in bulk, would permit a 98 per cent reduction over the storage space now required. So far as the current and future files of the *New York Times* and the local paper are concerned, if obtained on film, the immediate need for an addition to our building would be obviated.

**Requisite Reading and Storage Equipment**

But microfilm of any material in the library makes requisite certain reading and storage equipment. Investigations in this direction led us to the conclusion that there was only one satisfactory all-purpose reading machine with the necessary simplicity of operation for library usage. I refer to the Recordak Library Film Reader, Model C, at a price of $380, equipped with writing table. The superiority of this machine, except for reading short strips of film not on reels, is so obvious that we will not discuss it further here, except to warn that, if you plan to embark upon any extensive use of microfilm in your library, you must have a machine so easily operated as not to discourage patrons in their use of it.

To assure the greatest degree of permanency of microfilm, it must be stored under conditions of a constant humidity from 50 to 52 per cent. For this purpose there are two competitive steel filing cabinets on the market today; one, at a cost of $125, the other, at a cost of $167.50. The first of these depends for its humidity control upon an asbestos block to which water is added when the humidity gauge on the outside drops below 50 per cent. The more expensive of the cabinets, manufactured by Remington Rand, appears to be
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more adequately insulated and depends for its humidity control upon certain chemical crystals which maintain a constant humidity within the cabinet by giving off moisture when the humidity drops below 50 per cent and absorbing moisture when it rises above 52 per cent. For year-round usage in very dry climates, in any climate during that part of the year in which the building is heated, or in airconditioned buildings, the cheaper of these cabinets would seem to be adequate. However, in regions where during the spring, summer, and fall the prevailing humidity is in excess of 50 per cent, I do not see how any reduction can be effected within the water-controlled type of cabinet. The film capacity of both cabinets is the same, sufficient for sixteen years of the film edition of the New York Times. In other words, two of these cabinets, costing $335, will house more of the Times on film than could be housed in original form in a $4000 addition to our building.

Microfilm for Newspaper Files

By making use of microfilm the solution to the problem of our newspaper files requires a maximum expenditure of $5050, as against some amount ranging from $10,125 to $22,400 by any other effective means of preservation and storage. Such figures present a picture that every college business officer and trustee will understand, and yet even for a problem as pressing as this $5000 cannot often be readily conjured up from the income of the average small college. Our own experience, however, has demonstrated that the reading and storage equipment necessary for film, and probably the filming itself, holds more gift-appeal to alumni and other interested groups than long ranges of steel shelving.

Having acquired, by gift, a Recordak Model C reader, a Students Microfilm Reader, and one controlled humidity cabinet, our first step was to convert our subscription from the bound edition of the New York Times to the film edition, thereby immediately eliminating any need for the construction of a newspaper storage room. By these same acquisitions, the way is opened to a project for filming early files of the Beloit papers which we expect to get under way this year, with the financial aid of interested local persons and organizations. When that job is completed, we will have not only assured the continued existence of valuable source materials but will also have released one much-needed room, now used for storage, for other purposes, and last but not least, we will have made available hundreds of pounds of paper for national offense.

Moreover, with even this minimum of film reading and storage equipment, the library has opened the way for an investigation by the college of the possible efficiency and economy of preserving on film its archives from the business, registrar's, and dean's offices.

Research in Colleges

Still more important, the library has opened the door to this mysterious thing called research—which, for lack of library resources in the college, is supposed to be one of the distinguishing features between the college and university faculty. Even honors work may take on new significance. For now, armed with the Special Libraries Association's Directory of Microfilm Sources, the catalogs of Southwestern Microfilm, Incorporated, and other guides, many out-of-print and manuscript materials may be entitled to consideration for purchase.
Consultant Service and the College Library

Mr. Jameson, Administrator of Consultant Service, Library of Congress, presented this paper at a meeting of the College Libraries Section of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, December 29, 1941.

The Consultant Service of the Library of Congress looks toward the solution of two of the major problems and a very large number of minor but important problems confronting the research libraries of this era. The first of the general problems might be referred to as the bibliophobia of scholars. The second, the wild book, has been discussed by Ortega y Gasset in his significant article, "Man Must Tame the Book."

The bibliophobia of scholars is a problem well recognized by all of us who have to do with research libraries. It may be the fault of the older school of librarians who liked to keep their books on the shelves, but I think the cause lies deeper. It seems to be a law of nature, like one of the laws of thermodynamics, that there is a repulsion between librarians who keep books and research men who use books; it seems to be a war which is without truce and without prospect of peace. We all know that librarians want to know where their books are in order to keep the record, and that the record (in theory at least, though now and again librarians sin) is not kept for the sake of the record but kept simply to make more books available to more people more frequently. There are few scholars who will not concur with this reasonable view when it is explained to them. There are many, however, who, having concurred, continue placidly to take the books off the shelves and into their offices without making a record. There is goodwill on both sides but unfortunately a difficulty in implementing the goodwill. Consultant Service, which brings research men into the library for a year or longer as members of the staff, gives them an opportunity to survey their field in its entirety, and an opportunity to talk to librarians as colleagues rather than as enemies, may, in the course of time, bring to research workers an understanding of what our problems are and why they are problems.

The wildness of books is the second large problem this generation is facing. It is not necessary for me to remind you of the enormous speed with which printed matter is being produced or of the difficulties experienced in deciding with budgets always too small which of the materials are likely to be of the greatest use. Ortega y Gasset has warned us that if we do not tame the book our culture will revolt against it. The books will overwhelm us. There is, in fact, evidence that the present generation of undergraduates is already...
turning against books, that the present generation is becoming increasingly illiterate; that even where the college libraries are good libraries, with collections thoughtfully selected and attractively displayed, undergraduates, and in some colleges even faculties, continue to avoid the library. To put research people in libraries as part of the library staff (providing always they are men or women with scholarly vision), to request them to guide the undergraduates in their reading is one way of taming the books.

Librarians of Congress and other librarians long before the Library of Congress was established, have dreamed of associating with themselves subject specialists who will assist them in their many tasks. In 1806 Senator Mitchill, in a report from the Senate Library Committee, said the aim of purchasing books was

to furnish the library with such materials as will enable statesmen to be correct in their investigations, and by a becoming display of erudition and research, give a higher dignity and a brighter luster to truth.

In 1897 Melvil Dewey, in hearings before the Joint Committee on the Library, observed that

... specialists would be simply invaluable. You could begin with a few who would divide the field among them; one in history, another in science, another in art, another in social science, in law, in literature, in philosophy; but I predict that the public usefulness of such officers will be so great that within a few years their number will be largely increased and that the National Library will become in fact a bibliographic university.

Realization of Ideal

Progress in the realization of this ideal has been slow. According to law, until 1925 any money received by the Library of Congress was paid into the Treasury of the United States and had to be reappropriated by Congress for any special undertaking. Consequently, the librarian was unable to engage in experiments which, though they had every promise of being successful, could not be demonstrated to fulfill a need of the library. Moreover, private individuals and foundations were loath to deposit funds in the Treasury of the United States inasmuch as the librarian could, on his own word, give no formal assurance that the funds would be used for the purpose desired. In March of 1925 a joint resolution was passed establishing a trust fund. The officers of the fund are ex officio, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Librarian of Congress, the Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, and two citizens. The trust fund is a quasi-corporation. Its funds are deposited in the Treasury of the United States and the Treasurer of the United States has undertaken to pay on them 4 per cent interest in perpetuity.

Although from time to time Librarians of Congress have succeeded in associating with themselves research men of great brilliance, the Consultant Service as such was not formally constituted until about a decade ago. At that time Dr. Putnam was enabled to invite to become consultants of the library a number of subject specialists, most of them professors emeritus, who would spend half their time in the library at a nominal honorarium and advise the librarian on his collections. These scholars worked faithfully within the terms of this agreement. Shortly after Mr. Mac-Leish assumed office, however, it became clear to him that more was needed. He needed not only consultants to give him occasional advice, he needed fellows of the Library of Congress who could give their
full time and full energy to the enormous
tasks facing them. Consequently in the
summer of 1940 five scholars were ap-
pointed as Resident Fellows of the Library
of Congress.

Make-Up of Consultant Service

The Consultant Service of the Library
of Congress as now constituted consists
of five Resident Fellows of the Library of
Congress, five Fellows of the Library of
Congress (not in residence), four Con-
sultants, a number of Honorary Consult-
ants (for the most part not in residence),
eleven Associate Fellows, a clerical staff,
and the Administrator. The Resident
Fellows of the Library of Congress are
scholars in midflight on leave of absence
from their universities. The fields rep-
resented for this year are: technology and
library science, chemistry, folklore and
Americana, naval history and contempo-
rary Europe, and French literature. The
stipends of the Resident Fellows of the
Library of Congress equal the stipends
they receive in their universities and their
full time is devoted to the study of the
Library of Congress problems as seen by
research men.

The Consultants are, with one excep-
tion, displaced European scholars who
have been stationed in the library through
the kindness and generosity of foundations.

The eleven Associate Fellows are mem-
bers of the Library of Congress staff who,
because of their advanced study, are ap-
pointed to assist the Resident Fellows of
the Library of Congress. The Associate
Fellows are granted one day a week from
their regular duties to survey the collec-
tions.

The Fellows of the Library of Congress
were last year’s Resident Fellows of the
Library. Their appointment is honorary
and the Librarian hopes that in the course
of years a corps of Fellows of the Library
of Congress will be built up throughout
the country who will continue to give him
advice on their special subjects.

Functions of the Fellows

As experience has accumulated with the
Consultant Service it has become increas-
ingly clear what functions these men can
perform. In his letter of appointment in
the summer of 1941 Mr. MacLeish de-
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number of textbooks of interest perhaps to the future student of inter-cultural relations but of little interest to the research specialist. The discovery that in a number of cases we have duplicate sets for exchange, unique in the country, is gratifying. Less gratifying is the discovery that though we may have the latest critical edition of an author's work we do not have supplementary volumes which appeared a few years after the critical edition was published.

Checklists

In order to make these discoveries, to decide what is needed, the Resident Fellows of the Library of Congress prepare annotated, evaluative checklists of the one or two thousand books which would constitute a definitive basic collection for a research library. Indications are given for each item as to whether it would be needed in a library which would use it for oblique reference or in a college library where the subject is taught but where no advanced research is contemplated or in a large reference library. The lists are then searched to discover whether the items are in the Library of Congress and references are made to other places where they may be located. The items not in the Library of Congress constitute a desiderata list. The lists are made accessible to the general public and it is hoped that the special knowledge of the Resident Fellows of the Library of Congress may be used by libraries for purposes of checking and evaluating their collections. The judgment displayed in these lists is not the judgment of an isolated individual scholar; the lists are built up through consultation with the forty or fifty most distinguished members of the field in universities and elsewhere.

A second type of list now being prepared is the encyclopedic reference list, for example, the hundred to hundred and fifty books in English which will cover authoritatively all aspects of the U.S.S.R., contemporary politics, etc. These are being annotated by men who know their subject thoroughly and will serve, we hope, as a useful reference guide.

Recommend Books for Purchase

The second duty of the members of the Consultant Service is to recommend books for purchase. The national bibliographies in their subject fields as well as their technical journals are made available to them as soon as they arrive in the library. By means of reviews and their knowledge of the personalities in their field they are thus able to recommend for purchase non-copyright books. In addition to these sources of information there are of course the usual sources, dealers' catalogs and so on. This duty is being performed conscientiously both by the Fellows of the Library of Congress in Residence and those not in residence.

The duty of improving the accessibility of the books resolves itself into conferring with members of the divisions of the Process Department, suggesting changes in the schedules or in added entries. When, for example, the Fellow of the Library of Congress in Population, whose specialty is differential fertility, found himself referred from “fertility” to “fecundity” in the catalog, he indignantly reported that he would use that term in any population convention he would be hooted off the platform. Conferences on these problems usually begin after the Fellows of the Library of Congress have been in residence for six or seven months and have familiarized themselves with problems of the Library.
In addition to these duties the Consultant Service takes care of a very large amount of reference work, an amount which is increasing rapidly as the emergency increases.

To what extent this sort of service might be useful in a college library college librarians know better than I. They know, too, that libraries not attached to universities are apt to cherish an amiable illusion in that they imagine that college and university faculties are constantly at the librarians to improve and balance the collections. This is, unfortunately, not true in very many cases. Where there are library committees, presidents are apt to appoint good and able scholars but not to appoint men of the very first brilliance.

Other library committees resent meeting with the librarians unless there is money to be spent and still others just don't function. Experience in the Library of Congress has shown that the training received by the Resident Fellows of the Library of Congress is of enormous value to them and the question arises as to whether it would not be wise to station members of the several departments in the college in the library for a year, reduce their teaching loads to the point which would enable them to confer actively both with librarian and student. This is the more needed, it seems to me, because of the need to tame the books. Although advanced research men fondly hope that before they die they will have read everything that has been written on their subject, none has realized that hope. How much more desirable, then, in an undergraduate college where students do not even have the wish to read everything that has been written on their subject, would it be to have available for several hours a day a man who has gone farther in his reading than the undergraduate and can assist the undergraduate in the wise selection of his books.

Benefits from This System

At least three benefits might be found to result from this system:

1. To the library. The librarian would have a specialist available at some regular time during the day who could advise him on purchase policy, cataloging problems in his field, arrangement and accessibility of his part of the collection, and other problems of importance.

2. To the faculty member. By becoming acquainted with the problems characteristic of a research library as a member of the staff he will be able to make better use of the collections than he has made. In addition, he will be given a certain amount of leisure which, it will be understood, he is to devote to the reading of his technical literature. Finally, by dealing with all of the students in his department he will get a better understanding of their needs and difficulties than is possible when he is principally in the classroom or in conference.

3. To the student. He will have the advantage of specialized advice from a faculty member who knows not only the special field of study on which the student is engaged but also the collections of the library and the problems faced by librarianship.
The Latin American Bibliographical
Activities of the Library of Congress,
with Hints for Future Developments
in This Field

Mr. Hanke, chief, Hispanic Foundation,
Library of Congress, read this paper at a
meeting of the Reference Librarians Sec-
tion of the Association of College and Ref-
erence Libraries, December 30, 1941.

The Library at this mo-
ment bears a marked resemblance, in-
ofar as its Latin American bibliographical
activities are concerned, to a boa con-
strictor who has swallowed a sheep and is
thoroughly engaged in labor. For during
the last two years the Library has started
work on several major activities in this
field which are now absorbing much of
our time and attention but which will not
yield published results until some time
hence. Most of the projects are being
supported by grants made, on a temporary
basis, by Congress through the Inter-De-
partmental Committee on Cooperation
with the Other American Republics, by
the Rockefeller Foundation, or by the
Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.
Many of them could not be profitably
carried on now, however, were it not for
the fact that the Library has been con-
cerned with Latin America for many years
and has made regular attempts to build
up its collections.

Music

Almost everything in the field of music
is still to be done. No great collections
exist, few bibliographies have been pre-
pared, and the number of trained special-
ists is small. The appointment last year
of Gilbert Chase as the Latin American
assistant in the Music Division was a real
step forward and has already resulted in
the compilation of a mimeographed "Bibli-
ography of Latin American Folk Music,"
comprising more than a thousand anno-
tated items. In order to aid educators
and students who do not read Spanish or
Portuguese, Mr. Chase is now compiling
a "List of References in English on Latin
American Music" and already some three
hundred have been collected. Mr. Chase
also compiled a "Partial List of Latin
American Music Available in the United
States, with a Supplementary List of
Books and a Selective List of Phonograph
Records," which was published in mimeo-
graph form by the Music Division of the
Pan American Union last March.

The most important bibliographical tool
under way, however, is the "Guide to
Latin American Music" which Mr. Chase
is now preparing and hopes to have ready
within two years. It is expected that this "Guide" will be a basic reference tool in this relatively neglected field by providing information on the music, the literature about the music, and on musicians and musical organizations.

**Documents Division**

Probably more books, periodicals, and pamphlets are published by the various Latin American governments than by all their private publishers put together. These publications are rarely brought under bibliographical control by the governments themselves and the great mass of the publications which pour forth become known to few people and few libraries have reasonably complete files. The importance, therefore, of the "Guide to the Official Publications of Latin American Governments" now being compiled by James B. Childs with various assistants can readily be appreciated. It is planned to include the following information: First, the correct name of the bureau or department as determined by both statute and usage. Second, reference to the legal antecedents, such as the law or decree of its creation, the law or decree regulating its functions and organization, and other legal measures vitally affecting it. This legal data would facilitate further investigation as to more detailed information regarding its functions and organization. Third, a description of the publications issued and explanation of their contents if not already clarified by the title. Mr. Childs' publications in this field are already well known and in as much as the Library is an official depository of the publications of foreign governments, our collections are reasonably complete. One of the valuable by-products of the "Guide" will be to locate our weaknesses.

This work is necessarily slow but a draft of the Paraguayan section has been completed and will soon be sent to the government of Paraguay for suggestions and criticisms, a procedure to be followed with all sections of the "Guide." Work is already in progress on the publications of Bolivia, Chile, and Colombia.

**Law Library**

A large part of the intellectual resources of Latin America has been devoted to law and many of her most eminent figures today have had legal training. It is not surprising, therefore, that the legal literature of Latin America is both voluminous and important. A quarter of a century ago the Library published a *Guide to the Law of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile* by Edwin M. Borchard which is still one of the few standard reference works in the field. John T. Vance, present law librarian, has continued this interest in Latin American law and now has Crawford Bishop at work on a "Guide to the Law and Legal Literature of Nine American Republics." Introductory chapters on each of the nine countries have been written, outlining their legal and constitutional history from their independence until today, and particular attention is being given to the study of legal periodicals. When completed, this "Guide" will provide the basic bibliographical information on the law of these countries.

**Hispanic Foundation**

The following projects are under way in the Hispanic Foundation, the division of the Library specifically devoted to Hispanic culture, which was opened in 1939.

1. "Guide to Latin American Periodicals Currently Received in the Library of Congress." Periodicals in Latin Amer-
merica are difficult to follow because they are established, stopped, suspended, or just disappear with astonishing rapidity. Even periodicals published about Latin America in this country have these characteristics—witness the recent death of the Inter-American Quarterly which for the last three years has been a great boon to librarians who had to recommend a review in English on Latin America. To provide a standard guide in this difficult field the Hispanic Foundation has prepared a tentative list of about nine hundred items. This preliminary edition, which is not for distribution, contains the following information on each item: title of the periodical, initial date of publication, number of issues per year, method of enumeration, name of the director or editor, place of publication, name of the publisher, the Library of Congress classification number and card number, any information which has been found concerning the history of the publication, its changes in title, and periods of suspension. The final edition of the "Guide" will appear later in printed form, after the necessary revisions and changes have been made, and will include all the information given in the preliminary version, together with a brief paragraph describing and evaluating each periodical and bibliography listed. Those items which are considered important according to the judgment of the various editors of the Handbook of Latin American Studies, who are specialists in the various fields, will be indicated by a star. The mortality rate of the editors of this "Guide" has been high. The first and second incumbents, Murray Wise and Alexander Marchant, joined the State Department staff in quick succession, and Charmion Shelby, the third editor, will be responsible for the final edition.

Materials in Fine Arts

2. The "Guide to Materials in the Fine Arts in Brazil and Spanish America" is now well under way, directed by Robert C. Smith, with the assistance of Elizabeth Wilder. It has now been about half completed and will consist of the following items: (1) A selected bibliography of published books and articles pertaining to the fine arts in Brazil and Spanish America from the beginning of the colonial period to the present, with informative and evaluative notes on each item; (2) A selected list of periodicals devoted to the fine arts in Brazil and Spanish America; (3) A list of the public museums and private collections of art, history, and archeology in Brazil and Spanish America with a description of their buildings, collections, publications, and personnel; (4) A list of the government agencies, professional societies, and principal dealers and photographers; (5) A list of the art historians interested in the field, with information on the age, position, field of research, and principal publications, and a discussion of the teaching of the subject in the universities and schools of the American republics.

In order to secure fresh and detailed information for the "Guide" Mr. Smith has visited Mexico and Central America and Miss Wilder has made an extensive trip in South America. Another related activity in this field is the "Archive of Hispanic Culture" now being built up by Mr. Smith. The field of Spanish American and Brazilian art is one of the most neglected in the general history of the fine arts. We know relatively little about the artistic styles, the monuments, and the artists of each Latin American country from the beginning of the colonial period.
to the present day. It is true that in the case of Mexico a few general books illustrating the principal monuments of architecture and painting have been published but sculpture has been neglected. And in the case of the art of the other nations there is neither a general history, special monograph, nor guidebook which adequately illustrates even a small portion of the existing monuments. Nor do separate photographs exist in this country. In the great photographic archives already established at Harvard and New York universities and at the Frick Art Reference Library, there is almost no material on Brazil or Spanish America.

This archive will include photographs and relevant biographical information, will serve as a primary reference collection for scholars engaged in research in this field and for others who will visit it for purposes of comparison, for the historian wishing to illustrate his publication with the best reproductions available, and in the field of the minor arts for the collector.

Social Science and Humanistic Studies

3. A third publication now in preparation is the “Record of Investigations in Progress” is designed to provide the following basic information on investigators in this country at work on some phase of the Latin American social science or humanistic studies: (1) Name, age, and permanent mailing address of the investigator. (2) Principal field of research and a list of principal publications in their field. (3) Title of investigation now in progress and number of years it has been under way.

It is pleasant to turn away from all these projected publications which are now merely in preparation, to mention bibliographies which are now ready for distribution or which will shortly be ready:

1. The long-awaited C. K. Jones “Bibliography of Latin American Bibliographies” is now in galley proof. This bibliography is a compilation of some 2500 titles of books and articles, in which are included collective biographies, histories of literature, anthologies and bio-bibliographical notes, and some general and miscellaneous works of frequent use for reference purposes, encyclopedias, anuarios, almanacs, and others of like character. Descriptive and evaluative notes are provided for many of the items and it is expected that this work will become the basic reference volume for all students engaged in Latin American studies and for all librarians and catalogers throughout the Americas.

Handbook of Studies

2. Handbook of Latin American Studies. The sixth annual number of this bibliography of the important publications of the previous year on anthropology, archives, art, economics, education, folklore, geography, government, history, international relations, law, language and litera-
ture, libraries, music, and philosophy is now in page proof and will soon appear in book form. The Handbook is published under the auspices of the Committee on Latin American Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies and edited by Miron Burgin of the Hispanic Foundation staff with the assistance of thirty-eight section editors.

3. Another publication of this same committee, edited by Madaline Nichols of the Hispanic Foundation staff, is the Bibliographical Guide to Materials on American Spanish. This Guide lists the outstanding studies on the Spanish language in the several Spanish American countries. It includes a brief historical account of the growth of an American Spanish; a special section on the work of the American language academies and philological institutes; and approximately twelve hundred annotated entries, covering general studies of the language of each country, dictionaries and vocabularies of local terms, words borrowed from other languages, geographical nomenclature, and flora and fauna.

This then is the story of Latin American bibliographical activity now in progress at the Library of Congress. Before passing into the dangerous realm of conjecture and prophecy—where certain suggestions will be made as to bibliographies that need to be prepared and certain guesses will be hazarded as to future development—I should like to cite one other activity of the Hispanic Foundation which may be of interest to those of you who have a special concern with the technical processes of a library. Being a new development and having many intimate connections with other divisions of the Library we decided to have technical studies made of various problems which had presented themselves to us. We were fortunate enough to secure the services of Anita M. Ker (now Mrs. Duncan Johnson) formerly of the Catalog Division of the Library, and during the course of about a year she made investigations and reports on the following topics:

1. A study of the practicability of the establishment of a union catalog of the Hispanic material contained in all District of Columbia libraries.
2. The compilation of a guide to Hispanic material in the libraries of the District of Columbia.
3. A report on the feasibility of having all the Hispanic material in the Library of Congress represented in a general Hispanic catalog.
4. A study of the possibility of engaging in extensive analysis of Hispanic periodicals.
5. A selection and listing of some 160 titles of Hispanic periodicals suggested for analyzation. This selection was made with the aid of various specialists and leaders in divers fields of Hispanic culture and thought.
6. A report setting forth in detail the major difficulties which exist in the present method of control over Hispanic periodicals received and housed by the Library of Congress. Remedial measures are suggested in this report.

These reports are all fairly detailed and technical but information on any of them may be obtained by writing to the Hispanic Foundation.

Other Activities and Bibliographies

There are many other activities and bibliographies that need to be considered and which doubtless will be carried out in the fullness of time. Some of the more important ones already discussed in the Library—and which have already been turned down by those persons holding the moneybags—are:

1. "Guide to the Manuscripts Bearing on Latin America in the Library of Con-
gress." The Manuscripts Division has thousands of pages of manuscripts and transcripts on Latin America but no suitable guide exists.

2. "Guide to Current Statistical Sources on Latin America." Statistical information on education, trade, politics, etc., of Latin America comes out in many different kinds of publications in many countries, but no guide to them has been prepared to make it easy for the student who would use these widely scattered sources.

3. "Guide to Government Departments of Latin America." As our relations with Latin America are solidified, and when the Childs' "Guide to the Official Publications of Latin America" is completed, the need for this "Guide" will be felt and money will be secured to prepare it. The importance of government agencies in all cultural undertakings in Latin America is such that libraries perforce must have some sort of assistance to enable them to deal effectively with the many agencies.

4. Project to microfilm manuscripts in Latin American libraries. The Library of Congress project by which hundreds of thousands of pages of manuscript material on United States history in European archives is too well known to require detailed description. This project was made possible, of course, by the previous preparation of excellent guides to the pertinent material in these archives by the Carnegie Institution of Washington. No similar guides exist to the archives of Latin America, but even so, much valuable material could be brought to this country if funds were available to embark on this project.

Future Developments

In conclusion, if one may enter the dangerous field of conjecture and prophecy—attention should be directed in the future toward the following three general developments in this field which are important—so important that, somehow or other, the obstacles must be removed or surmounted:

I. The building up of adequate collections of Latin American books in our college and public libraries. Many courses are being offered on Latin America and much general interest has been aroused on inter-American relations but more can and should be done to improve the existing book collections in Portuguese and Spanish. Book publishing in Buenos Aires, Santiago, Mexico City, and Havana has greatly developed during the past five years and a great variety of inexpensive books is now available for purchase. The section on "Latin American Book Catalogs" of the Handbook of Latin American Studies provides an annual statement on available material.

II. The preparation of guides to Latin American material in our libraries and archives. This country has great resources of printed and manuscript material on Latin America but much remains to be done before it is adequately known or cataloged. Important guides to some of the collections now exist but the field is large and will require years of cultivation by librarians and archivists.

III. The working out of a national system for the use of research materials in this country bearing on Latin America.
Why Special Collections in College Libraries?

Mr. Hirsch is librarian of Bard College. This paper was presented at the Conference of Eastern College Librarians, November 29, 1941.

When the new library building of Albion College in Michigan was dedicated in June 1938 Randolph G. Adams of the Clements Library in Ann Arbor gave a remarkable address, in which he stressed the need for special collections in college libraries.1 “It seems to me,” he said, “that one of the neglected functions of the college library is to collect, to preserve, and to make available for properly qualified readers those unusual books which belong uniquely and appropriately to the community in which the college is located.” And later, he stated in even more general terms that he thought it a particularly important function of a college library to be a local center of collecting and preserving unusual books. To live up to his own theories, he concluded his address by making the announcement that he had solicited from some leading antiquarian booksellers the gift of seventeen rarities bearing on the history of Albion College and the state of Michigan and on the development of printing since the days of the incunabula. The fact that the statement was not just made by an ambitious college librarian but by the head of an outstanding research library, adds greatly to its weight. It may be taken as an invitation to consider here, in some detail, the problem of special collections in college libraries, particularly since this topic has not yet found in the professional literature the careful attention which it deserves.2

When speaking here of the college library, I have not so much the big and well-endowed institution in mind. After all, the special collections of Williams and Dartmouth rank with those of the universities. I think chiefly of the small or medium sized college libraries, like Albion or Bard, with a small professional staff, with collections of fifty or sixty thousand volumes and with a book and periodical budget in the neighborhood of $4000. The question is, how far do these smaller libraries need special collections in order to fulfill their educational function and how far can they afford administering them. Before arriving at any general conclusions, it seems desirable to examine the

1 Published in Albion College Bulletin 34: Aug. 1938.

various types of special collections as they are found in college libraries. There are three major types of special collections, not all alike in relevance for a college library. The first type would be the special collection that is related to the history of the institution and the founder's family, the religious and educational background of the college, and the geographical area in which it is located. The second type refers to the function of the library to promote the appreciation of books; these collections deal with the history and aesthetics of printing and binding. The third type is coordinated with the educational work of the college; these subject collections grow out of benefactions of friends of the college or out of the teaching and research of faculty members.

**Historical Collections**

There are quite a few collections of the historical type that combine local interest with high general significance. The large and rich collection that the library of Mount Holyoke has assembled on Mary Lyon, the founder of the college, has a meaning far beyond the campus of South Hadley. It bears on the whole early history of women's education in this country and offers sidelights also on social life in New England; some appreciation of its wealth may be gained from a study of A. C. Cole's colorful centennial history of the college. The same recognition is due to the Quaker Collection at Haverford, which has no rival in this country. Here many rare volumes from the earlier days of Quakerism, as well as the best of the later literature and also manuscript writings of individual Friends, have been gathered together. They are consulted not only by Haverfordians but also by outside students of Quakerism. In the opinion of the curator of the collection, Professor Thomas E. Drake, "Haverford profits from the fact that it is a recognized depository of the records of Quaker thought and a center for the study and exposition of the Quaker way of life."

Generous gifts have enabled Bard College Library in recent years also to develop a historical collection that may add to the usefulness of the library. This so-called Bardiana Collection deals chiefly with the history of the founder's family and with the early years of the college. The Bards were French Huguenots who came to this country early in the eighteenth century and rose rapidly to wealth and scholarly fame. The most renowned member of the family, Dr. Samuel Bard was one of the great figures in the early history of Columbia College and also a president of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. The Bards owned a large estate in the Hudson River Valley which was called Hyde Park; from that place the now so well-known town of Hyde Park derives its name. This collection of documents, letters, pictures, and books has, therefore, a meaning for the history of Columbia University as well as that of Dutchess County, in which the college is located, and has been used by scholars interested in either aspect. The varying displays of items from the collection have appealed to prominent outside visitors just as much as to neighbors in the county and to faithful alumni. Last but not least, they have made some of the students aware of the

---

3 This rapid survey is based on experiences and observations made at Bard College Library and on information kindly furnished by the following librarians and curators: Fanny Borden, Vassar College; Thomas E. Drake, Haverford College; Flora B. Ludington, Mount Holyoke College; Th. E. Norton, Lafayette College; Edith Rowley, Allegheny College; N. Orwin Rush, Colby College.

4 This collection is described in the present writer's article on the Bard family in *Columbia University Quarterly* 33:222-41, October 1941.
tradition to which the college is linked. Recently a special room was designed to house this collection adequately and there we are also placing the more valuable part of the personal library of the founder's family. From the educational aspect it has never seemed satisfactory to stress only the history of the Bard family. We have been trying to bring together also other materials that might be useful for students seriously interested in the Hudson River Valley and its problems. A faculty committee has just been appointed, of which a history professor experienced in regional studies is chairman and of which the librarian is also a member, in order to develop a suitable program of such studies. There are already a few senior projects along these lines and the committee hopes to stimulate more of them. As time goes on—and all these collections need very much time and loving attention—we will thus add to the original Bardiana Collection a working collection for educational purposes.

Needs of Undergraduate Students

This is a very important point, for in a college library one cannot only think in terms of advanced scholarship. We have to keep the needs of undergraduate students in mind and have to make the historical collection meaningful to them—that is, with the support of the experts on the faculty. Otherwise, we would fulfill the function of a museum instead of that of a college library. The reservation that students do not fully grasp the value of such collections has sometimes been made by librarians. Lucius W. Elder of Knox College states frankly: "Students go into the room of a special collection to study in quiet and leave the books therein to rot at their leisure." Professor Drake knows of undergraduates who remember the Quaker Alcove at Haverford "chiefly as a retreat from the scrutiny of the watchdogs of the library, where tired feet may be elevated above one's book as an aid to study or a preliminary to sleep." And the situation at Lafayette College leaves also something to be desired. In the course of a decade, a rich collection of books, pamphlets, manuscripts, etc., dealing with Lafayette's career and with the French participation in the American Revolution, has been built up there and made readily available to the public. However, the librarian, Mr. Norton, declares: "I am not satisfied with the use the books get. There is not likely to be any improvement or increase in the usefulness of the collection until we have on the college teaching staff in either French or history men who have a special interest in this subject."

Educational Value of Rare Books

The second type of special collections, as defined at the outset, is represented at Bard by a large group of books that was once exhibited under the title, "From Gutenberg to Goudy." It includes a leaf of the forty-two line Gutenberg Bible, some incunabula, a number of works printed by Aldus and Estienne, as well as famous works of later centuries, including some designed by masters of our own day, like Updike and Goudy. The majority of these items were given to the library long ago and were kept there under lock and key. Only a few years ago did we start to display them freely and to use them for the purpose of strengthening an understanding of the graphic arts among the students. That is an important function in a college in which the Fine Arts are a major field of study. This appreciation of fine printing has been deepened by lectures.
given in the library by men like F. W. Goudy and Helmut Lehmann-Haupt. From my own observations, I would like to agree with Blanche P. McCrum, librarian of Wellesley College, who, in her annual report for 1939-40, protested against the "unqualified assertion sometimes made that rare books are a drug on the college library market. So they are if treated as museum pieces; but when instructors and curators join hands in making them part of the bone and sinew of teaching and when they provide material for theses and for original study by students in advanced classes, they begin to make the rich contribution to the educational resources of the college planned" by the benefactors.

**Librarian and Collector**

Out of the efforts to evaluate and display the treasures of our two collections, the nucleus of a third collection was born. A neighbor of the college, himself a book collector of great distinction, gained confidence in the work of the Bard Library when he saw how the staff handled the other collections. He decided to present it with some samples of masterpieces of English literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in order to give new inspiration to the study of English at Bard. The volumes and manuscripts he has donated from time to time are not many in number but they are among the choicest possessions we have. This friend of Bard Library started out with letting us have some precious Hardy items. Now he has presented us with Dickens' own autographed copy of the first edition of Nicholas Nickleby and with a set of original letters by Sir Walter Scott, in which the author gives advice to a young poet—indeed a topic of interest to students. Other gifts along similar lines may follow. Even though this collection is small and does not aim by any means at completeness, it has its great value to the college community; for it does make a difference, at least to sensitive persons, whether they see a famous Hardy poem in a cheap edition or in the manuscript. The fact that this collection is being developed not by the initiative of some professor or librarian, but by a collector, should not be a reason for complaint. On the contrary, Randolph G. Adams, in his earlier mentioned address, blames librarians for having so little conception of the function of the collector. It seems to me that indeed we should try to gain their friendship and thoughtful advice without ever hunting for their possessions. We are librarians, not beggars!

**Relations with Collector**

This attitude is also the only fair one in dealing with the book collector who happens to be a member of the faculty. At Bard we have such a case. The professor of French, Artine Artinian, has brought together in many years of research what is probably the largest collection of Maupassant items in existence. We have been permitted to display the collection for a number of months and its existence on campus has created a sustained interest in Maupassant and all he stands for in French literature. Collections of similar quality may be found on quite a few campuses; they are always worthy of the librarian's appreciation and, if needed, his cooperation. In some instances, a professor who is advanced in years might even present his collection to the library of his college. Haverford College Library, to name just one, has the good fortune of falling heir to Rufus M. Jones' Collection on European mysticism.
Another variety of a gift collection is happily represented at the library of Allegheny College in Pennsylvania. Three years ago, Ida M. Tarbell turned over her working collection on Abraham Lincoln to the library; this collection consists of all the materials that she used when writing her Lincoln book. Edith Rowley, the librarian, states that from the point of view of educational usefulness the collection is a decided addition to the resources of the library. The year Miss Tarbell presented the material she gave a month of lectures on biographic methods, using the Lincoln collection for illustrative purposes, and later the head of the history department gave a seminar course in the room now housing the collection. Three seniors used phases of Lincoln's life as the subject for their so-called comprehensive papers.

Teaching and Collecting

One group of what we called the subject collection is not yet found at Bard, due chiefly to the fact that the college in its present form is still very young. We do not possess any collection that has grown out of the actual teaching over a long period of years. Such collections will help the college library greatly in fulfilling its task. Here I think, for instance, of the Hardy Collection at Colby College, which is the work of Professor Carl J. Weber, who in fifteen years of passionate effort brought together a collection of unusual wealth and comprehensiveness. This collection has added greatly to the nationwide reputation of the college and its library, and without these materials Professor Weber certainly would not have written his recent Hardy biography. It is no wonder that the librarian of Colby College, N. Orwin Rush, is "fully convinced that a special collection, properly handled, is a great asset to a college library." Vassar College, to give another example of this type, possesses two important collections that were developed by faculty efforts. One is the famous Justice Collection of material relating to the periodical press. It was gathered together by the Vassar historian, Lucy M. Salmon, whose own widely-used books on newspaper problems were chiefly based on materials in this collection. This collection, by the way, is kept up through purchases from the income of a fund and through contributions of books, pamphlets, and clippings from alumnae of the college; the collection is not segregated on the shelves. The other significant special collection at Vassar is devoted to Robert Owen. It includes books, pamphlets, and periodical articles by and about Robert Owen. The collection was established in connection with Professor Herbert Mills' seminar class in socialism about forty years ago and includes many important first editions and other rare items. Each year a few items are added.

Administration of Collections

The administration of such collections sometimes presents problems. Who shall have control and who is to do the actual work? In a small college it may seem preferable to center the special collections in the library and administrate them directly, of course with advice from interested faculty members. For the larger library more flexible arrangements may be wiser. At Vassar, for instance, the departments are entrusted with the care and building up of various special collections, but the librarian is entitled to exert as much supervision as she deems necessary for the general good.
The small and medium sized college will of necessity always try to keep the expense for special collections as far down as possible. I personally would not feel that I acted properly if I were spending large sums of our fairly limited library budget on our special collections. Here or there I buy an indispensable item for rounding out the Bardiana Collection but I certainly would think it outrageous to spend some hundreds of dollars for getting more incunabula. Other librarians feel the same way. Colby never spends more than $200 a year for the Hardy Collection. Haverford tries to avoid the purchase of any very expensive Quaker item that would only duplicate material available in other libraries around Philadelphia. Even a rich college library like Vassar is very cautious in acquisition for its special collections. In most of these colleges there are usually some friends of the library, be they organized or unorganized, to whose loyalty and generosity the purchase of large items might be referred.

Three Great Dangers

After this brief survey of special collections, it will not be difficult to arrive now at some general conclusions. There are three great dangers apparent to the critical observer. Robert B. Downs, in his latest report on notable materials added to American libraries,6 complains justly about the scattering of complementary and supplementary materials in widely separate areas of the country. "In a nation," he says, "as vast as our own, there may well be room for duplication of collections even in highly specialized fields. But a reasonable degree of coordination is obviously desirable."

Another great danger is that a library may try to swallow more than it can chew. It is hazardous to accept a special collection if you have no proper place to house it, no decent cases in which to display some choice items, no money at all to keep it up, no faculty experts to organize and develop it, and no staff to catalog and supervise it. Adventures of this kind are almost inexusable, for the acceptance of any large-scale gift implies that you will treat it and make it available in an appropriate fashion.

The third and probably greatest danger is to have special collections for which there is no interest or need whatsoever on the college campus. It would seem foolish to invest time and money on a collection that is not somehow related either to the traditions and the environment of the college, or to the history of bookmaking, or to the academic curriculum of the particular college, or to the scholarly interests of faculty members. Certainly it would be unwise for the average college library to take over a collection on, say, Arabic literature, if nobody on campus knows that language. No over-ambition, no competitive spirit, no desire for publicity, no personal vanity should ever induce a college librarian to acquire such a collection that would be deadwood in his library but might be an asset in a larger institution.

A New Stimulus

On the other hand, we should not forget that many of the special collections have a good reason for being. Of course, we regret the splitting up of materials that the scholar might like to examine at one place (even though in times of war this segregation of rarities may have obvious advantages). But we have also to keep in mind that many materials would never have become accessible to the public at all if the

donor had not intended to do a particular library a favor. The gentleman who gave Bard his Hardy items would probably not have cared to turn them over to Colby College but might have kept them out of sight if he had not desired to do something constructive for Bard. Also it may be said that many special collections in college libraries do not duplicate at all the work of larger libraries. The college library that collects materials on the part of the country to which it belongs and on the history of its own institution may fulfill a unique task. Randolph G. Adams, for one, is convinced that no other type of library is more suited for it. But the most pertinent argument for special collections would be the fact that they may add greatly to the educational value and the scholarly rank of the library. Special collections may offer the students working tools that no textbook or monograph could ever provide. The best of these collections may instil in the student some lasting enthusiasm. They also may strengthen the ties that exist between faculty and library. They may make the professor and the library staff work more distinctly towards a common goal.

Although we librarians are used to sigh about our being overburdened with work, it should not be overlooked that special collections may offer us a new stimulus. We are members of a profession that is overwhelmed with routine duties. Would the cataloger who spends most of the time just handling Library of Congress cards not be happy to get an opportunity of doing some real cataloging of truly great books? Is this not also a chance for the circulation assistant, who hands out average books all day, suddenly to get excited about dealing with some real rarities of printing or binding? For the reference assistant to answer some more intricate bibliographical questions than those that usually come to his desk? As for the librarian himself, Lucius W. Elder has expressed the feelings of many of his colleagues in saying about these special collections: “When the librarian has accumulated a building full of such things and when he has found out what to do with them, he may then pride himself on having liquified one of the chief debts of the library to mankind.”
There seems to be an element of uncertainty in the minds of prospective library school students as to what the reference librarian in an undergraduate college does. This uncertainty is shared by two other groups, namely, students in the midst of professional training and graduates of library schools whose experience thus far has been limited to other departments or other types of libraries. Representatives of all three groups have frequently asked me what reference librarians do. Strange as it may seem, there is usually a gleam in the inquirer's eyes as if he strongly suspected us of spending our days doing nothing more constructive than straightening the shelves.

There are two possible explanations for this attitude. First, the questioner may have come from a college where there was no well-defined reference service or if such service did exist, this individual may have met requirements without it. Second, the questioner may be one who has done that nebulous quantity of graduate study, after which some people come to the conclusion that all undergraduate work is insignificant. It follows naturally that this second person is convinced that there is no such thing as undergraduate "research" even in the broadest sense of the term.

It is likely that those considering library service as a vocation and those wishing to determine their aptitude for a certain branch of library science might profit by any description of college reference work which explains it, not in terms of theory but of experience. At the same time, professional people unfamiliar with college reference work or doubtful of its value might inferentially gain some understanding of its functions.

Reference questions asked by undergraduates might be divided into two groups, one headed term-paper or bibliographical questions; the other, curiosity or information questions. The latter type usually presents a specific problem, the explanation of which is necessary for a student's understanding of a written passage, a chance remark in class, or something less academic in the realm of his experience. The curiosity which engenders such questions must be recognized as pedagogically significant, for as Samuel Johnson perspicaciously remarked, "Curiosity is one of the permanent and certain characteristicks of a vigorous mind." Furthermore, I find that although the time required to answer such questions may be relatively short, the problems themselves are of considerable interest.

Information Questions

Aldous Huxley's erudite vocabulary set one young man on a dictionary hunt in order that he might explain a passage from

1 The Rambler no. 103, March 12, 1751.
Eyeless in Gaza. According to the context, the term ("seccotine") might have been medical. As the word was not in *Webster's New International Dictionary*, the next logical source seemed to be a good scientific dictionary. Both medical and chemical reference books failed to include the word, but *The Oxford English Dictionary*, IX, 347, gave a very satisfactory definition, one, incidentally, which entirely changed the student's first interpretation.

Two students came in one day with apparently nothing in common but a great deal of noise and a difference of opinion. They hurried to the encyclopedias and began a vigorous inspection of carefully chosen volumes. After a preliminary survey the two seemed dissatisfied and approached the desk. They were interested, one of them said, in the attempted Lenin assassination of the fall of 1918. They had discovered the date and some of the details but the most important fact—the name of the would-be assassin—was still unknown. Could I help them? We turned to *The New York Times Current History; the European War...* XVII (Oct.-Dec., 1918), 74. The person in question, we learned, was a woman, one Dora Kaplan.

The nineteenth century inclination to personify, adequately illustrated in the writings of Carlyle, Arnold, and Ruskin, led one student astray. He was reading an essay by Matthew Arnold in which there was a reference to the "Goddess Aselgeia." Not being familiar with this addition to the realm of allusion, the student and I began to consult dictionaries of mythology. A complete lack of any citation made me suspicious, so we turned to *Webster's New International Dictionary*... 2d ed., unabridged, p. 161. The entry we found was:

> aselgeia. N. [Gr.] Lasciviousness. M. Arnold

In a sense it is rewarding to answer questions like these because one can be almost certain when he has the right answer and the piece of work is done. However, there are reference questions about which one cannot have such definite feelings. One may not be able to lock this other genre in the drawer at the end of the day and say it is finished. But these requests—comprising mainly bibliographical problems—are the more important in the last analysis.

**Bibliographical Questions**

In several ways, I believe it is more difficult to handle this second classification of reference work with undergraduates than with scholars. Younger students have not had time to learn as many languages nor to obtain a subject knowledge necessary for such exacting work. As a first requisite, therefore, college reference librarians must provide sources principally in English, a task not always easy or possible. A few students, it is true, are willing or able to attempt additional work in one of the two important modern languages, French or German. Likewise, college reference librarians must be constantly aware of the difficulty and number of their references. In the upper college, to be sure, students occasionally write papers of twenty-five thousand words which demand extensive work on quite a mature level. After one has pointed the way bibliographically, these students proceed to evaluate sources and select the best ones for their purposes. But most papers, I find, are from two to five thousand words in length.
It is from the writers of this latter type that one gets requests for "a few of the best references" on subjects. Various suggestions may aid students in finding these "best references." First, is the author recognized as an authority? Critical bibliographies such as those which appear in the Dictionary of American Biography are extremely useful in determining this. Of course, biographical dictionaries or book reviews, when available, are also pertinent. The recency of an article or book, e.g. on television, may be significant. This requires attention to dates on catalog cards, in bibliographies, or in indexes. Chronological or subject scope may often be determined by the book's full title, the contents on the catalog card, or the subject tracing on catalog cards. The author's point of view and style must usually be learned from handling a given book.

A request for a bibliography on business conditions in Florence at the end of the Middle Ages illustrates how important a knowledge of foreign languages may be. Summerfield Baldwin in his Business in the Middle Ages, p. 100, impressed the reader with the national bias of works in various foreign languages and stated that there was no representative Italian work on medieval economics in translation. The wealth of Italian citations in the Cambridge Medieval History, VIII: 867-68, seemed to support this contention. There was a standard French work which covered the period, F. Perrens' Histoire de Florence Depuis Ses Origines Jusqu'à la Domination des Medicis, Paris, 1883, and, fortunately, French was the one foreign language the student could read. James Westfall Thompson's Economic and Social History of Europe in the Later Middle Ages (1300-1500) had some textual value and limited bibliographical apparatus but the same author's Reference Studies in Medieval History was quite useful. Henri See's Modern Capitalism; Its Origin and Evolution made significant contributions to our work as did also Roy C. Cave and Herbert H. Coulson's A Source Book for Medieval Economic History.

I have said nothing so far about the amount of help one should give to students and how much they should be expected to do for themselves. In the lower college, I believe, the reference librarian must provide a great deal of aid supplemented by rather detailed instruction. He may suggest the types of material which have probably been written on the student's subject. It is frequently necessary to explain why there are no books on a current topic whereas there may be excellent periodical or pamphlet material.

Nature of Problem

If the nature of the problem is such that one begins with an encyclopedia, it is possible to emphasize that this is just the first step and to encourage the student to use the bibliography, if any, which accompanies the article. This may lead to a variety of succeeding steps including the use of periodical indexes, the card catalog, the Essay and General Literature Index, catalogs of public documents, etc. Throughout this process, the student has the opportunity of perfecting the techniques for using familiar tools and of learning about new ones. Ultimately, this will lead to more and more independent work.

With students of the upper college, one should continue the educative process but with more advanced sources such as subject bibliographies. These students some-
times have purely bibliographical problems. They are not always asked to write papers as assignments but are frequently instructed to compile a bibliography from which a paper might be written. If the reference librarian is not careful, he will spoil the value of these projects. Even more than usual, he must restrict his help to that of a directional nature.

This brings us to the very important subject of cooperation with the faculty. Those professors who have a genuine interest and understanding in our problems may supply, upon request, a list of term paper subjects. One economics professor was particularly cooperative in providing this information. His whole course displayed careful organization. To each member of his class he handed a mimeographed list of topics with general suggestions for proceeding. It was announced in class that students might obtain additional aid from the reference assistant in the college library. Before students actually began to ask for help, I had had sufficient time to prepare several additional references on each topic.

The reader may well ask, “How does one get this cooperation from disinterested faculty members?” The answer is, “Get them interested in some way—even if only generally—in the library.” Several government and history professors were “invited,” if one may use the term, to the library to view exhibits of government publications and charts explaining catalogs and indexes of government documents. Several months later one of them very unexpectedly telephoned to ask if he might borrow one of the charts for a short time.

Under another occasion we prepared an annotated bibliography of State Department publications quite independent of any faculty request. When informed of it, one of the government professors was more than willing to distribute the mimeographed list to his classes. It is hoped that the time may come when we will be asked to do just such work as this for the faculty.

Instruct Students

Space does not permit a lengthy discussion of another important function of the reference librarian. That is the responsibility, partial or complete, to formally instruct freshmen or sophomores in the use of the library. Informal instruction has been suggested in all reference work. Last year the librarian and reference assistant of the Columbia College Library gave a series of two lectures, illustrated by lantern slides, to the sophomore class in cooperation with the contemporary civilization faculty. Each group to which we lectured comprised about twenty-five students. This year we are doing similar work but this time in connection with one of the English courses. We expect the results to be more productive because the instructors are giving the students definite assignments which will require them to use the information presented in the lectures.

It is hoped that those persons to whom this paper is addressed will have acquired a general outline of some of the responsibilities and duties of a college reference librarian. No one who has participated in the actual answering of questions or in any of the other activities described will ever call this phase of library work anything but challenging.
Summary of Current Practices in Colleges and Universities with Respect to the Management of Book Funds

By RALPH E. ELLSWORTH

Mr. Ellsworth is director of libraries, University of Colorado.

Last year while attempting to redefine the relationship between the business office of the university and the order department of the library, it appeared that a new summary of current practices on certain points would be helpful. Consequently, letters containing the following six questions were sent to the librarians of sixty university and large college libraries:

1. Does your university carry its book funds for departmental purchases as a part of the library budget or as a subdivision of the budget of each department or college?
2. If the latter is true, are the book funds mixed with supplies or are they separate?
3. Are you and the library committee allowed to transfer money from one fund to another freely or do you have to get permission of the president each time?
4. Does the library committee allocate or divide the book funds among the departments or is this done by other administrative officers?
5. Do you have, in addition to the general library book fund, a contingency fund which you may use at your discretion?
6. Is the bookkeeping for library book funds done in the library or in the business office?

Replies were received from the following fifty-three institutions:

University of Arizona, University of Arkansas, Bryn Mawr College, University of California (Berkeley), University of Chicago, Cincinnati University, University of Colorado, Cornell University, University of Delaware, University of Denver, Duke University, University of Florida, University of Georgia, Harvard University, University of Idaho, University of Illinois, Indiana University, University of Iowa, Johns Hopkins University, University of Kansas, University of Kentucky, Louisiana State University, University of Maryland, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of Mississippi, University of Missouri, University of Montana, University of Nebraska, University of Nevada, University of New Mexico, University of North Carolina, Northwestern University, Oberlin College, Ohio State University, University of Oregon, University of South Carolina, University of South Dakota, Southern Methodist University, Temple University, University of Tennessee, University of Texas, University of Utah, Vassar College, University of Vermont, University of Virginia, Washington University (St.
Louis), University of Washington (Seattle), Wayne University, University of West Virginia, Western Reserve University, University of Wisconsin, University of Wyoming.

Many of the librarians who contributed data for their institutions expressed an interest in the questions and suggested that the results be published. Thus, although from my point of view the project was undertaken as a basis for an administrative report, the following summary is presented. It should probably be stated at this point that a summary of current practice does not necessarily result in a guide to correct practice. It may be true that fifty million Frenchmen can't be wrong—but they sometimes are.

Question 1

The question of where, from a bookkeeping point of view, the departmental book funds should be listed may seem in itself relatively unimportant, and yet if the book funds are kept as a part of the departmental budgets rather than as subdivisions of the library book fund certain disadvantages result. First, it is more difficult and costly to transfer money from one fund to another than it is to rearrange subdivisions of one budget. Second, the plan is based on the assumption that responsibility for determining the amount that each department is to spend for books rests with each department rather than with a library committee whose function it is to see a department's needs in terms of the whole institution. It may well be that the assumption is not well founded.

Forty-two of the fifty-three institutions carry their departmental book funds as subdivisions of the library budget, six carry them in both places, and only four keep all book funds in the departmental budgets. The universities that keep their book funds both in the library and the departmental budgets usually do so because of the existence of special endowment funds which are to be spent for books, supplies, salaries, etc. The universities which keep all their book funds in the departmental budgets are: Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, and New Mexico.

Question 2

Whenever book funds are kept in the same budget categories as supplies and equipment, separate accounting for each is difficult. The result is that if over- or underspending is to be prevented, the library order department and the business office of the university will have to check with each other before either makes a commitment against the common fund—a procedure which is clumsy, to say the least. Only four of the fifty-three institutions merge their book and supply accounts. These are: Colorado, Delaware, Harvard, and New Mexico. Harvard is in this group only because of special endowment funds. Colorado has changed its policy this year.

Question 3

Librarians are generally agreed that there should be flexibility in the interdepartmental handling of book funds and that due to the appearance of special bargains in the book market or to the changing needs of departments within a given year it should always be possible to shift funds from one department to another. In forty of the fifty-three institutions, money can be shifted freely, in eight only in exceptional circumstances, and in five not at all. It would be interesting to find out how the five institutions get around the rigidity of their systems.
Question 4

The question of whose responsibility it is to allocate the book funds among the departments is debatable. The ultimate authority, of course, rests with the president, but he seldom has time to study the needs of the departments or the conditions of the book market and hence is seldom in a position to handle the problem. Theoretically, it would seem logical to place the responsibility on the librarian and the library committee, who can devote the necessary time to the problem and who can present a well-considered program for the president’s final action. Forty-five of the institutions queried do place the responsibility on the librarian and the library committee, while seven do not. The latter group includes Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Harvard, Indiana, Nevada, and New Mexico.

Question 5

Because the library needs of the departments cannot always be anticipated at the beginning of each fiscal year, because special bargains sometimes appear on the book market at times when the regular departmental funds are committed, and because it is time consuming, and therefore expensive, to have to secure the approval of a number of departments when a publication that involves several departments is being considered, it would seem reasonable that the librarian have a contingency fund which he can use to take care of special situations. This fund would be in addition to the money available for general reference books, periodicals, and bibliographies.

Thirty of the institutions studied have such funds, while the following do not: Arizona, Bryn Mawr, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Maryland, Montana, New Mexico, South Carolina, Southern Methodist, and Vermont.

It does not follow that in the latter group of institutions the three conditions stated above cannot be met even though no contingency fund exists. The librarian can always go to the department heads and ask them to relinquish some of their funds for the use of other departments and he can always seek departmental approval for dividing the cost of buying an expensive publication—since it is unlikely that he would be buying such a publication without departmental sanction. The objection is that the process is time consuming, that it prevents quick action, and that the mechanism is clumsy.

Question 6

Many assertions have been made in the library literature about whose responsibility it is to keep the accounts for the departmental book funds. The business officers of the universities usually doubt the librarians’ statements that they (the business officers) cannot keep these accounts as easily and efficiently as they can for the other things and services a university purchases. Librarians, on the other hand, have claimed that because of the nature of the book market, because of the necessary language equipment involved, and because of the use made of the records by the order department and others on the library staff and the faculty, it is best to have the detailed accounts kept in the order department of the library and to let the business office rely on the library for these records.

In ten of the institutions studied all the accounting for book funds is done in the library, in five it is all done in the business office, while in thirty-seven it is done in
both. In some cases among the third group this may mean outright duplication of records, while in others it means that the library keeps the detailed accounts while the business office keeps only the summaries. In other words, the library order department acts as a branch of the business office.

Solution to the problem must be sought on the basis of two questions: first, is it possible for the business office to keep the records accurately and intelligibly, and second, is it possible that because of the various uses made of the records that they should be kept in the order department of the library, even though the business office can handle them properly? The problem should be studied by someone who is thoroughly acquainted with modern accounting and bookkeeping techniques and also with the problems of an order department.

The data presented show how a substantial group of universities and colleges have solved certain problems which arise from the handling of book funds. They do not tell us what practices should be followed. That can be determined not by a consensus of opinion but by careful research. If the publication of this report stimulates such research it will be justified, otherwise not.¹

¹ As a result of the submission of the report, the University of Colorado has revamped its entire program for handling book funds and has brought its practices in line with those generally followed by the universities listed in this summary.

---

Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the A.C.R.L.

Recommended by the Committee on Constitution and By-Laws for Action at Milwaukee, June 1942

The text in italics below is the proposed change in the Constitution and By-Laws.

Article VI. Board of Directors. Section 2. Members. The Board shall consist of the president, vice president, retiring president, secretary, treasurer, three directors-at-large, the directors elected by sections, and the Association representatives on the American Library Association Council who are serving the last year of their terms. The chief officer (or, in his absence, the vice chief officer, or the retiring chief officer, in this order) of each section is an ex officio member without vote.

The members of the Committee on Constitution and By-Laws are Mary H. Clay, Emily Garnett, Edmon Low, Charles V. Park, and Samuel W. McAllister, chairman.
The Status of College Librarians

Mr. McEwen, librarian, Carleton College, presented this paper at the annual meeting of the College Section, Minnesota Library Association, October 4, 1941.

There has been considerable discussion during the past few years of the status of the librarian and of members of library staffs in colleges and universities. It has been discussed in courses in library schools, in books on college library administration, in journal articles. Dr. Branscomb\(^1\) notes that we do not have the objective data necessary to a critical analysis of the problem. We need dependable statistical studies of the problem, studies involving classification of types of institutions. We need to know in how many and in what kinds of institutions the librarian is technically a member of the faculty, an administrative officer, or both. We need to know his rank as a member of the faculty and whether that rank follows automatically with the position of librarian or is the result of special circumstances. We need to know whether department heads, the assistant librarian, and the professional library staff members who are not department heads are classified as members of the faculty, administrative officers, or as part of the clerical staff of the institution. The data, to be significant, must indicate the exact meaning of the technical rank assigned to college librarians. If they are classified as members of the faculty, does that mean full voice and vote in faculty meetings, participation in academic functions, freedom to use facilities reserved for members of the faculty, inclusion in special privileges granted to members of the faculty?

But the interest of this paper does not require statistical studies as its basis. It may suggest, rather, an interpretation of that data when it is available. It deals, as well, with certain problems on which it would not be practicable to secure statistical data. We are concerned here with two main questions: (1) What status do college librarians want? (2) What can college librarians do to achieve it? As is evident from every discussion of the problem, this is an area of joint responsibility on the part of the college president, the head librarian, and other members of the library staff. As a paper at a meeting of college librarians, we address ourselves solely to our own responsibilities in the matter. The problem is considerably different for the large university and for the college librarian for reasons that will be apparent. We are here concerned primarily with the problem of the college librarian. The term college librarian is used to refer to all professional members of the staff.

Status is commonly defined as relative rank or position. Satisfactory status would then mean for the college librarian a relative position in the situation and com-

\(^1\)Branscomb, Harvie. *Teaching with Books*, p. 95-96.
munity in which he lives and works which would express satisfactorily his sense of his relation to that situation and community.

We are assuming from the current concern for status an existing situation which is felt to be less than satisfactory and turn our attention first to an attempt to understand this dissatisfaction.

What Status Do College Librarians Want?

Certain outstanding characteristics of satisfactory status will be clearly recognized, involving the natural wish for security and for recognition from the most important groups with whom the individual is concerned. Any individual wants his position to be a fair expression of his significance and value in the situation concerned. Here the college librarian is handicapped.

The mysteries of his craft, the intricacies of cataloging, even according to the old rules, the adventure of bibliographical search, these are dear to his heart and important to his function. But they are largely lost on the great majority of those among whom and with whom he works—members of the faculty, administrative officers in other aspects of the college's program. For these others do not commonly have opportunity to see his mysteries in operation, let alone understand them. Their contact with the college librarian is primarily expressed in one form—getting a book they want. Nor can we expect the professor, as he waits at the circulation desk, to meditate often or long on the wonderful organization, the meticulous scholarship, the professional skill that must be expressed in the process of making that book available to him. In the normal experience of getting a book he thinks no more about cataloging than he would about the generating plant and the linesmen while he was snapping on a light. He expects smooth functioning in both instances. And the librarian can humbly say to himself "They also serve who only stand and wait." But it will not make him feel that his significance and value in the academic scene are properly recognized.

Desire for Acceptance

Secondly, any individual wants a feeling of group-belongingness, an assurance of acceptance as one with his fellows. This feeling of group-belongingness may appear to be the outgrowth of a common professional interest but its expression goes beyond the professional activities to the whole social life of the group. Invitations to dinner parties, bridge clubs, teas, are as important as service on committees as marks of this acceptance. Here again the college librarian is handicapped. The university library staff may be large enough to provide within itself for this aspect of status. A member of a large staff has status as a librarian in a group of librarians. But the college librarian belongs to a small minority group on campus and may even be the only representative of his craft.

Status in the whole college scene is set by the majority group—the faculty. By this we mean that the sense of group-belongingness most characteristic of the college campus is organized around the life of the faculty group, which group professionally share common interest in teaching and research. The college librarian naturally seeks social acceptance from this majority group. But the librarian is commonly excluded by the nature of his task from any complete acceptance in this fellowship.
Status as we have discussed it thus far may seem to be primarily identified with the individual's desire for recognition, with social status. It is obvious that this is an important part of the status college librarians want.

There is another approach to the problem, however. In order for any individual to feel secure and therefore to achieve satisfactory status, there must exist for him some clear understanding of the nature of the areas in which he functions. Knowledge of the character of his problems, definition of the limits of those problems, and the goals which their solution concerns, brings confidence in attacking them and a sense of security follows in the process. The more sharply defined the area and meaning of his task, the greater will be his sense of security and status in it.

Area of Activities

The public librarian defines the area of his activities for himself. He studies his community, defines the objectives of library service to his community, builds his professional activities, his routines, his functions as a skilled craftsman in the direction of those objectives.

But the college librarian's problem at this point is much more complicated. Many of his professional activities, many of his routines are like those of the public librarian. And he has been taught to regard himself as a professional librarian. But the college library functions as a service agency to the educational process. The dominant area of activity in the library as in the college is academic. The validity of any routine must be determined not with reference to its place in librarianship but rather on the basis of its meaning and effectiveness in and for the academic community and primarily in its relationship to the teaching and learning process as defined by the college.

The definition of his problem and the sense of security achieved through such definition is therefore much more difficult for the college librarian. His area of activity as librarian overlaps the area of teaching but only in part. Some of his functions are obviously in both areas but not all of them. And frequently neither he nor his profession nor the college has any clear definition of these relationships.

Emphasis on Professional Training

Recent emphasis on professional training for librarianship has largely assumed that the area of the librarian's activities could be defined, and that a professional course of study would give the librarian the knowledge and understanding of the field requisite for effectiveness in almost any job in any library. But that assumption clearly breaks down when, as in the college library, the area of librarianship overlaps the academic area and the academic area is obviously the major determinant. In such a situation is the college librarian to regard himself as primarily a professional librarian, and hence as primarily an administrative officer in the college? Or is he to feel, seeing that the teaching process is the heart of the college and that the library exists on campus to collect, preserve, and make readily available the facilities of print for use in teaching—is he to feel that his function as a librarian is essentially a branch of the teaching process and hence think of himself as primarily a member of the faculty? The sensible college librarian will do both and therefore be uncertain at many points in his definition of his function, resulting in a sense of insecurity and lack of status.

This particular uncertainty is aptly
illustrated in Randall and Goodrich's discussion of the status of the college librarian. In the first edition of their book there appears this statement:

As a matter of fact, the proper status of the librarian seems to be rather administrative, in the class of the deans, the secretary, etc., than pedagogical, in the class of the actual teaching faculty.\(^2\)

In the revised edition, which has just appeared, the sentence quoted is preserved but is qualified, to say the least, by concluding sentences added to the paragraph:

Even though the librarian conducts no classes, his teaching function is important. If a distinction in rank is to be made, his professional responsibilities should place him with the faculty group rather than the administrative.\(^3\)

What status do college librarians want? Primarily they want status, any satisfactory status. They are concerned about it because their situation makes difficult any wide recognition of their specialized function, marks them off as a minority group separated from the satisfactions of group-belongingness, places them in overlapping areas of function which are not clearly defined. In this situation it is possible, of course, for the college librarians to partially satisfy their desire for status by turning their backs on their problems. They can say,

We are librarians. It is only natural that these faculty folk, benighted individuals who have not had the advantage of special studies in bibliography, should be unaware of our real function in their midst. We don't care. We will go to the librarians' conferences and associate with other librarians. There we will be recognized. We will solve the problem created by the overlapping of library and teaching processes by turning our attention directly and solely to the proper professional problems of all good librarians, and let the faculty take care of the teaching process, and forget the overlapping.

The speaker would suggest that this attitude, increasingly rare but not yet extinct, affords only partial and temporary solace and no solution.

Why has there been a concerted effort in recent years on the part of college librarians to acquire faculty status? Because faculty members have status. Because faculty status, once achieved, brings the desired sense of inclusion and acceptance, which involves a recognition of the significance of their specialized tasks and which assists somewhat in clarifying the extent to which library processes and the teaching process do overlap.

What Can College Librarians Do to Achieve it?

The interest of the speaker in this subject arose from the observation that librarians are, for the most part, concentrating on one technique in achieving this desirable end. That technique is the attempt to secure formal recognition and appropriate rank as members of their faculties through action on the part of college administrators. The extent of progress in this attempt is the subject of the statistical studies suggested at the outset. We ought to know what the situation really is. And the speaker heartily approves that attempt. Formal status and appropriate rank are really important—often absurdly important—to members of faculties, and formal granting of that status to college librarians will in itself assist in solving the problems we are dis-


\(^{3}\) Ibid., revised edition, Chicago, 1941, p. 31.
cussing. But one is reminded of the story, which every librarian will recognize as Abraham Lincoln's. You will remember that Lincoln asked how many legs a dog has if we count the tail a leg. The response was "Five." But Lincoln replied, "No, four, for calling a tail a leg doesn't make it one."

**Formal Classification**

Formal classification of college librarians in the college catalog as members of the faculty will solve the problem only if with it there comes actual status in the minds of those who alone can give it—the teaching faculty themselves. We have said that the sense of group-belongingness most characteristic of the college campus is the shared interest of the faculty in teaching and in creative and productive research. Any complete acceptance of college librarians as full colleagues must therefore await proof that the librarians are genuine participants in these shared interests. Librarians may therefore teach a course, or courses, in subject fields in which they are equally qualified with other members of the faculty. And librarians may undertake independent research in fields of special interest. Some activity in these directions seems to the speaker highly desirable for most college librarians. It will not be practicable or desirable to staff college libraries exclusively with people equipped to offer courses in the curriculum. But there would seem to be every reason to expect individuals who wish to make a career of college librarianship to be deeply interested in some subject field, perhaps but not necessarily in bibliographical problems within that subject field, and to expect that interest to issue eventually in research of a level that will gain the approbation of their colleagues outside the library. But again, such activity, whether in teaching or research, must be the result of genuine interest and ability and not a device to secure status.

Individual college librarians can therefore, it is believed, be recognized as colleagues through the results of their own participation in the basic interests of the faculty in teaching and research. But it will be as individuals, as individuals who are doing research or teaching courses, that that acceptance will be won. And it is obvious that acceptance need not carry over to the recognition of the professional and educational character of the work of those individuals as librarians.

**Directly Attack Confusion**

A third aspect of the solution seems equally clearly indicated, if more difficult of achievement than those we have discussed. College librarians can directly attack the existing confusion in the relationship of their work to the teaching process. The primary responsibility here may fall on the head librarian but it need not be his alone. If almost all contacts between members of the faculty and the librarians are at the circulation desk and are limited to getting a book, we can hardly expect our teaching colleagues to see the importance of our tasks in their work. But the situation can be changed. We know that our tasks are important in their work. But we have not clarified that function in our own minds. And we have not educated them in what we have clarified. Is it not time that we listed and defined some of the functions performed by college librarians which are definitely adjunct activities in the teaching process? A faculty member sends a student to the library to find information on a specific subject. The librarians, as
teachers, commonly require the student to think through the problem of finding the specific material, suggest the necessity of reading material on all sides of a controversial question, call attention to the effect of the lapse of time on the treatment of the problem. The good librarian will seldom be satisfied with finding the book, turning to the page, and saying to the student, "Here it is." The librarian may feel with some justification that he gets no credit for his pains. But that credit waits on the clarification of his function and an understanding concerning it with the faculty. Students come to the library to work on term papers. What is the librarian's teaching task here? To what extent is he responsible for the education of the student in the methods of study involved in such an undertaking? He commonly advises the student to define his problem first, turn to the dictionary for definitions of terms involved, to the proper encyclopedia for a preliminary but organized statement of the nature of the problem. He then may assist the student in forming a reading list. He does not do that for the student. All this is teaching, is it not? And these are only samples.

Objective Measurement of Functions

Is it not time that we devised some relatively objective measurement of those functions and substituted such measurement for the type of statistics commonly kept in college libraries? What does it mean to say that the reference librarian answered so many "search questions" and so many "general questions" last year? Granted that we have no substitute for them at present, what do our circulation records actually mean, even if they are broken down in terms of the Dewey Decimal Classification?

Is it not time that we thought through the areas of responsibility of college librarians with reference to faculty research? To what extent can a small staff provide expert bibliographical knowledge at a level that can be useful to our teaching colleagues? Should we be informed of special research interests of every member of the faculty? If so, what can we do when we have that information? It may be the special responsibility of the head librarian, with the cooperation of the college administrator, to undertake the task of re-education of the faculty in this area. But the actual definition and the new activities that would grow out of it, require concerted and cooperative effort.

The final result of such a program might be that we would still be unsure occasionally whether we were tail or leg. But with formal recognition of some faculty status, with some individual participation in teaching and/or research, and with a clearer understanding of the extent and meaning of the overlapping between our work and that of our teaching colleagues, the speaker believes it would not matter very much.
Review Article


In 1933 the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago undertook a general study of the relation of the public library in the United States to government. The third and last volume of this so-called trilogy, Public Administration and the Library by Arnold Miles and Lowell Martin, is not directly connected by the authors with the second volume, People and Print by Douglas Waples, but it is very closely associated with the first, The Government of the American Public Library by Carleton B. Joeckel.

Dr. Joeckel directed his study to government rather than to administration:

Our field of interest is primarily in the library as a piece of governmental machinery and its efficiency as such. The practical problems of internal administration—the detailed operation of the machine—have in general been considered to be beyond the scope of the inquiry. In other words, the field covered may be regarded as extending from the state and city down to and including the governmental authority in direct control of the library. Below that level there has ordinarily been no attempt to go.

In the light of both this distinction and the title they have chosen, one might expect the authors of Public Administration and the Library to continue the inquiry from the “governmental authority in direct control” to “the practical problems of administration,” an expectation that is encouraged by their statement of general purpose: “the examination of public library organization and management in terms of emerging principles of public administration.” Public administration is defined as “management in the area of public controls and services,” and management, in turn, is referred to Fayol’s “planning, organization, command, coordination, and control” and Gulick’s “planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, representing, and budgeting.” “The fundamental point,” according to Miles and Martin, “is that the librarian is a public administrator. . . .” In accomplishing his purposes the librarian performs administrative operations essentially similar to those of other public agencies.

Extended consideration of these “administrative operations,” however, is disclaimed in the preface: “The area of internal library management is only touched upon, and the important task of developing the theory of internal library administration remains to be accomplished.” In the sense in which Dr. Joeckel used the terms, Miles and Martin devote a third of their space to topics in administration; two thirds to topics in government.

Recapitulation

The bulk of the book is in part a recapitulation and in part an extension of The Government of the American Public Library. Chapter two offers the best summary treatment in print of the library functions of state government: services to state departments and agencies; services to local agencies in providing supplementary book and bibliographic aid, library promotion and supervision, and state library planning; and direct services to the pub-
lic, particularly in rural areas. There is also a statement of the principles that should govern the organization and reorganization of state library services.

Obstacles to the extension of library service to unserved areas are judiciously reviewed in chapter three. Attention is also given to the problem of reorganizing both urban and rural services in larger units, parallels and precedents being drawn freely from other fields.

In chapter four the authors tilt with the controversial subject of the public library and education. No new data are adduced. The chapter advances rather as an exercise in dialectic, reviewing arguments pro and con, to the conclusion that "competition, duplication, and incompleteness in the community's educational system, whether at the adult or the juvenile level can be avoided. . . . It is through voluntary coordination of effort that progress must be made."

**Library Finance**

Library finance is the subject of chapters five and six. The topics treated include the current tax situation, the future of library revenue, the independence of library revenue, types of intergovernmental financial adjustment, financial assistance and central control, state aid, and proposals for Federal aid. The essential facts of this difficult subject are selected and marshaled with great skill. These admirable chapters need to be read, pondered, and applied by every public librarian.

Chapter seven epitomizes the arguments for and against the board form of library organization. This concludes the portion of the book dealing with library government.

Topics in library management are noted cursorily throughout the volume and four are selected for somewhat fuller treatment. The relevance of centralized purchasing to library extension, with which it is combined in chapter three, escapes the reviewer, but the observations offered on this head are sensible and deserve wider application. The discussions of budgets and cost accounting are appropriately embedded in the chapters on finance and gain from the association; they justify the authors' method of exhibiting a subject first in its full setting, with parallels from other fields, and gradually narrowing it down to the point or points of immediate applicability in library practice. Discussion of the fourth topic, library measurement, has never been surpassed in relevance or insight by any treatment of equal length.—Ralph A. Beals, Public Library of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.
That libraries are giving generously of their facilities to the war effort is apparent in the reports that have been received. Accelerated programs are already in operation in many institutions making necessary adjustments of personnel and book budgets. Key centers of information and training have been set up in 140 colleges and universities and the libraries of most of these institutions are sponsoring war information libraries. Libraries in institutions not key centers likewise are establishing offices for the dissemination of war information to faculty and students. Faculty members and their wives are lending their services to these information centers. Booklets and bibliographies describing the new services are being distributed and in many institutions package libraries are provided for state-wide distribution. In at least one urban community a wartime council, which includes all of the libraries of the area, has been formed and a union checklist made of the materials in the cooperating libraries which might be of special value to industry or to civilian groups. Plans for the conservation of materials and the safeguarding of staff have been worked out in inland and coastal institutions and in some instances on a state-wide basis.

A regional library conference which includes the states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia will be held at the Inn, Buck Hill Falls, Pennsylvania, on October 22-24. The theme will be “The Library in a War Economy.” Charles W. Mixer, librarian of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, is chairman of the Program Committee.

Bard College Library, Felix E. Hirsch, librarian, has been completely modernized. The building has been redecorated, fluorescent lighting and oil heating introduced. The basement has been rebuilt; a large study hall, a library office, and the Bardiana Room for special collections have been added, and stack space sufficient for a considerable number of years provided.

The philosophy collection of the late Professor David W. Prall of Harvard University, established as a memorial to him by his sister, Margaret C. Prall, has recently been received at Queens College Library, Flushing, N.Y., according to Charles F. Gosnell, librarian. The collection comprises some fifteen hundred volumes, including works of the leading Greek, Roman, French, German, British, and American philosophers. As its graduation gift to the college, the senior class of February 1942 has given the library a fund of two hundred and fifty dollars for adding current material to the collection.

All libraries administered by agencies of the Department of Agriculture and all units of the department providing library and bibliographical service were consolidated by Executive Order 9069, dated February 23, 1942.

To expedite an institution-wide faculty study of the University of New Hampshire’s program and procedures, a faculty workshop has been organized in the library and two faculty members have been appointed to serve in the capacity of reference librarians.
The Philadelphia Bibliographical Center and Union Library Catalog has announced through its Committee on Microphotography the publication of a Union List of Microfilms, A Basic List of Holdings in the United States and Canada. The list, which comprises more than five thousand items, represents holdings of over 100 institutions. Copies of the list may be purchased through the Center, Fine Arts Building, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. Cost $4.00.

The Committee on Bibliography of the Pacific Northwest Library Association is supervising a survey of library resources in the states of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington and the province of British Columbia. The librarians of each library are listing and evaluating their resources. John Van Male, on leave from the Denver Bibliographical Center, is to conduct the field work and compile the results. This survey which has been under contemplation for some years as a basis for future regional planning and as a means of coordinating library specialization and of avoiding duplication, has been undertaken sooner than was originally intended because of the present war emergency and the need for a complete mobilization of regional library resources. The survey is being financed by the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center.

A meeting on library cooperation was sponsored at the University of Utah on March 2 by Herbert A. Kellar of the Library of Congress. Practically all of the libraries of that area were represented.

The Library Association of Portland Library, Nell A. Unger, librarian, is to receive the income from a fund established in memory of the former United States Senator, Jonathan Bourne of Oregon, by his sister, Emily Howland Bourne. The income will be used to purchase materials on the Pacific Northwest and related subjects.

The summer session at Mills College will feature a casa Pan Americana for the special study of Latin American affairs, under the direction of Samuel I. Inman. The library is preparing a collection of books for the Pan Americana house, in which the students will live along with the Latin American instructors and scholars.

A new library for St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn., is near completion, according to Alf Houkom, librarian. The college alumni group, of less than five thousand members, contributed practically all of the building cost of $310,000. The building is arranged so that for the present it will include also a student recreation room, post office, book store, and a few classrooms. The library may later expand into the quarters now occupied by these nonlibrary activities with a minimum of interior alterations. There will be seven stack levels with a book capacity of about two hundred thousand volumes.

Downing P. O’Harra, librarian of the Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita, Kan., is making a survey of the reading done by students in that institution during the school year 1940-41. His study will attempt to show the average
number of books drawn per student, the number each student borrowed, and the relationship between course grades and the students’ use of the library.

Kansas colleges and universities, including the five state institutions, are offering courses in library science this summer. These courses are designed to meet the new requirements of the state department of education, which stipulate that teacher librarians in class A high schools must have at least eight semester hours of college instruction in this field.

A new building has been erected at Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis., Hanna E. Kruger, acting librarian. It will have a stack capacity of forty-five thousand volumes and will seat 40 per cent of the student body. It was completed in March 1942.

A joint meeting of the Southwestern and Southeastern Library Associations will be held in New Orleans in October. Latin American studies will be stressed.

Representatives of five of the New Mexico colleges and universities are preparing plans for a uniform curricula of library science instruction in these institutions. By offering the same preparation to teacher librarians they hope to contribute to the standardization of high-school libraries in the state.

The Kentucky Library Association is one of the most recent associations to organize a college and reference library section. The organization was formally completed in October 1941. Margaret I. King, librarian, University of Kentucky, was elected chairman, and Virginia Winstanley, University of Louisville, was elected cochairman.

The University of Louisville will share in a trust fund set up in the will of the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis. Justice Brandeis was for many years a benefactor of the university and during his lifetime presented to the library all of his personal papers and correspondence. Evelyn J. Schneider is librarian.

The Bryan Collection, which has been on deposit for several years at the University of North Carolina Library, Charles E. Rush, librarian, has been given to the university by Colonel Charles S. Bryan. The collection comprises about eighteen hundred volumes. It is noted chiefly for its material on the Confederacy, local North Carolina history, and for its long runs of early Newbern, N.C., newspapers. It is established as a memorial to Colonel Bryan’s grandfather, James West Bryan.

The maintenance of a liberal inter-library loan service at Duke University and the University of North Carolina enables the two institutions to render valuable assistance to research workers at other schools in the region. As an indication of its interest in this program the Carnegie Corporation has recently granted the two universities for an experimental period a limited fund which will enable them to purchase books of a specialized character not already in the collections but needed for research.

The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Guy R. Lyle, librarian, has issued a thirty-page handbook called Using the Library. A Faculty Handbook. It contains a directory of the library staff and faculty library committee, a floor plan of the library, information about circulation, reference, and reserve room practices, the card catalog, interlibrary services, and other information use-
ful to the faculty. Copies may be secured on loan from A.L.A. Headquarters Library.

The University of Florida Library, Walter B. Hill, librarian, is now using the International Business Machines in its order and circulation departments. The new $70,000 law library of the university was dedicated on November 21 with appropriate ceremonies.

The Florida State College for Women, Louise Richardson, librarian, has recently completed two additional stack floors, which will approximately double the shelving space of the library.

Ralph A. Beals, Personnel assistant librarian, Public Library of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., has been appointed director of libraries of the University of Chicago and professor of library science in the Graduate Library School. He will succeed M. Llewelyn Raney, who will retire on October 1, after fifteen years of service as director of libraries.

Carleton Bruns Joeckel, professor in the Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, since 1935, has been appointed dean of that school. He will succeed Louis Round Wilson, who retires October 1. Dr. Wilson has been dean of the Graduate Library School since 1932.

James M. Kingsley, Jr., assistant librarian at Cooper Union, has been appointed assistant to Harry Miller Lydenberg in the operation of the Biblioteca Benjamin Franklin recently opened in Mexico City. The library, similar to the American Library in Paris, will provide American books, periodicals, pamphlets, and other educational and informative materials for the use of those interested in the cultural, social, industrial, and governmental activities of the United States.

Herman H. Henkle was appointed director of the Processing Department of the Library of Congress, effective February 1. He succeeded L. Quincy Mumford, who returned to the New York Public Library after a year’s leave of absence spent in organizing the department. Henkle went to the Library of Congress from Simmons College, Boston, where he was professor of library science and director of the School of Library Science.

Amelia Kreig, who resigned recently as assistant director of the University of Illinois Library School, is now head of the cataloging department of the Seattle Public Library.

Clara Mackauer, formerly librarian of the Institute for Social Research, University of Frankfurt, Germany, has been appointed librarian of the Pacific College Library, Newberg, Ore.

Zaidee Brown retired in August 1941 as librarian of Rutgers University Library. She was succeeded by Margaret G. Cook, assistant librarian.

Fulmer Mood’s name was misspelled Wood in the September 1941 installment of News from the Field, where his appointment to an assistant professorship in the School of Librarianship, University of California, was announced.

Edith M. Brainard, president of the Kansas Library Association and librarian of Southwestern College, Winfield, Kan., has resigned her position to become librarian of the Itasca Junior College, Coleraine, Minn. Helen A. Dooley has been appointed to the Southwestern position and Julia McCarty, vice-president of the association, has succeeded to the presidency.

Benjamin E. Powell
In Anticipation of Reconstruction

(Continued from page 206)

By the end of 1942 the Association will own a supply of 1939-42 issues of many of the most important research journals. The committee assumes that the supply will be adequate to cope with the requests from at least the outstanding foreign research centers and that European and Asiatic scholarship therefore will not be entirely deprived of the product of American research during the war years.

Augmenting Purchased Supply

The committee would like to be able to accomplish more than this and has realized from the first the necessity for augmenting the purchased supply of journals with an active campaign for gifts. The lack of large-scale storage space has made the postponement of such a campaign seem wise. In the meantime the committee is doing everything it can to insure the success of this future campaign.

The supply of learned journals is never large and even under normal conditions tends to disappear rapidly. With today's abnormal demand for material for pulp this supply will be rapidly absorbed unless definite steps are taken to protect it. The December issue of this journal carried, as did other library periodicals, a brief statement of the aims of the committee in the preservation of scholarly journals. Many of the journals themselves are currently printing a similar statement in an attempt to notify individual scholars. These statements have brought forth offers and promises of gifts and have undoubtedly prevented some destruction of the supply. The committee feels that the institutions and individuals represented in the Association of College and Reference Libraries are the logical source of further assistance.

Though a large-scale campaign isn't yet possible small campaigns can be accomplished and will contribute greatly to the success of the final program. At least in one instance a local campaign is already in progress. Flora B. Ludington, the librarian of Mount Holyoke College, has reported such a campaign and its success should encourage librarians of other institutions. A brief statement of the problem in faculty meeting, supported by personal appeals to individual faculty members, will bring offers and promises of current journals. A letter to the emeritus members of the teaching staff will make available another supply. The library duplicate collection can be combed with the committee's interest in mind, setting aside odd numbers or complete volumes of the important American journals.

The committee will be grateful for any activity of this nature, sure that it is attracting and protecting a quantity of important research material that would no longer be available for collection in even a year or two. A list of some four hundred journals, judged to be those for which the committee will receive the most requests, has been prepared. Requests for this list, questions concerning the project, and reports of cooperative activity should be directed to Wayne M. Hartwell, Executive Assistant to the Committee on Aid to Libraries in War Areas, Rush Rhees Library, University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.

268 COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES
A meeting of the Board of Directors of the Association of College and Reference Libraries was called to order at 8:00 P.M., December 28, 1941, at the Drake Hotel, Chicago. The directors present were President Donald Coney, Vice President Mabel L. Conat, Secretary Benjamin E. Powell, A.C.R.L. Directors Etheldred Abbot and Winifred Ver Nooy; Section Directors: Fina C. Ott of College Libraries Section; Lois E. Engleman, Junior College Libraries Section; and Mary Floyd, Librarians of Teacher-Training Institutions Section. Section chairmen present were Eugene H. Wilson, Agricultural Libraries; Anna M. Tarr, College Libraries; Maysel O'H. Baker, Junior College Libraries; Charles V. Park, Libraries of Teacher-Training Institutions; Fanny A. Coldren, Reference Librarians. Others present by invitation were Louis Shores, chairman, A.C.R.L. Committee on Budget, Compensation, and Schemes of Service; Ralph E. Ellsworth, chairman, A.C.R.L. Committee on College and University Library Buildings; Samuel W. McAllister, chairman, A.C.R.L. Committee on Constitution and By-Laws; Thomas P. Fleming, A.L.A. Committee on Importations; Charles H. Brown, chairman, A.C.R.L. Committee to Apply to Certain Institutions a “Study of the Use of Books in the Different Courses in the College Curricula”; Charles M. Mohrhardt, chairman, A.C.R.L. Special Committee on National Defense Services; Carl M. White, editor, College and Research Libraries; E. W. McDiarmid, associate editor, College and Research Libraries.

In view of publication in the September 1941 issue of College and Research Libraries, the minutes of the last meeting were approved as published.

Ralph E. Ellsworth presented a brief report on the proposed work of the A.C.R.L. Committee on College and University Library Buildings.

Thomas P. Fleming, of the A.L.A. Committee on Importations, reported that his committee has been concerned (1) with the status of 1942 subscriptions to foreign periodicals and especially with efforts to secure permission from the State Department and Great Britain for the acquisition by American research libraries of essential scientific and technical journals; and (2) the release of books and journals now held in Bermuda by the British.

The activities of the A.C.R.L. Special Committee on National Defense Services were summarized by the chairman, Charles M. Mohrhardt. An earlier report of the work of this committee appeared in the December 1941 College and Research Libraries.

The report of the Committee on Budget, Compensation, and Schemes of Service was presented by Chairman Louis Shores. After considerable discussion, it was VOTED to accept the evaluative section of the report and defer acceptance of the score card. The importance of regarding the committee's report as a suggestion for self-evaluation rather than as a device for accrediting libraries was stressed.

Chairman Brown of the Committee to Apply to Certain Institutions a “Study of the Use of Books in the Different Courses of the College Curricula” reported that he expects to resume work after June. It was VOTED that the committee be continued but be permitted to remain dormant until the expiration of the chairman’s term as President of the American Library Association.

Carl M. White, editor of College and Research Libraries, presented a mimeographed report which called for board study and advice relative to the future policy of the journal. The questions in point were whether the journal should be edited as a
journal of discussion or of review—review here being interpreted as a medium for the publication of lists of serials, documents, reference books, and other review articles. After considerable discussion, it was voted that the journal be continued primarily as a journal of discussion.

It was also voted that within the next year the committee to Consider with a Joint Committee from the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation the Project for the Publication of an Encyclopaedia of Sports and Games. It was voted to continue the committee and to allocate the funds necessary for the continuation of the project during the next several months.

Treasurer's Report

**Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>1941</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Jan. 1, 1941</td>
<td>$711.37</td>
<td>$711.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotment from A.L.A.</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>1847.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional section choices</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>23.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2211.37</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2583.17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College and Research Libraries</td>
<td>(-500.00)</td>
<td>(-500.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectional expenses</td>
<td>(-500.00)</td>
<td>(-200.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College section</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College section</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>33.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Librarians section</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training section</td>
<td>77.20</td>
<td>77.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General promotion</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee expenses</td>
<td>(-200.00)</td>
<td>(-100.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jt. Committee on Ency. of Sports</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Budget, etc.</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other committee activity</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' expenses</td>
<td>(-300.00)</td>
<td>(-249.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>124.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special travel</td>
<td>85.58</td>
<td>85.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>39.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1600.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1050.48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance on hand December 1941: $1532.69
it was voted to approve the budget for 1942 as outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Jan. 1</td>
<td>$1532.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotment from A.L.A.</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional section choices</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3057.69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College and Research Libraries</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectional expenses</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee expense</td>
<td>(300.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget, etc.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopaedia of Sports</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other committees</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' expense</td>
<td>(300.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1900.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated balance</td>
<td><strong>$1157.69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Secretary was authorized to ask each chairman for an estimate of his section needs for 1942 and to pass this information on to the President.

Instead of asking all of the committee chairmen to estimate budget needs for the year, it was voted that the President should continue to approve for payment by the Treasurer the usual expenses incurred in committee activities.

Chairman Samuel W. McAllister of the Committee on Constitution and By-Laws reported on possible methods of establishing connective tissue between the A.C.R.L. Board of Directors and A.C.R.L. Representatives on the A.L.A. Council. The board recommended, without vote, that this committee consider the possibility of making third and fourth year councilors ex officio members of the A.C.R.L. Board of Directors. If this appears possible, the committee is authorized to recommend the necessary constitutional revisions.

On December 28, 1940, the A.C.R.L. Board of Directors voted “to admit to A.C.R.L. American Library Association life members joining prior to 1939 and institutional members without charge or allotment in 1941.” It was voted to continue this decision until such time as further action may be taken by the A.C.R.L. Board of Directors.

It was voted that the general session program of a subcommittee to the A.L.A. Committee on Library Revenues be ratified.

After brief discussion, it was voted to discontinue (a) the Special Committee to Cooperate with the Commission of Junior College Terminal Education; and (b) the Committee on Departmental Libraries and Library Service to Departments of Colleges and Universities.

The President presented to the board the prospect of a petition from the Engineering School Librarians for section status in A.C.R.L. It was voted that the Secretary attend the meeting of this group on Tuesday, December 30, and renew the division's earlier invitation to join the A.C.R.L. division.

At the request of President Coney, it was voted that the general session program of the Milwaukee meeting be arranged by the general directors of A.C.R.L.: Etheldred Abbot, Willard Lewis, and Winifred Ver Nooy.

Upon motion, the meeting adjourned at 11:40 P.M.

**Benjamin E. Powell**

Secretary, A.C.R.L.
A.C.R.L. Nominating Committee 1942-43
(For Nominations for 1943-44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.C.R.L. Budget, 1942, approved by Board of Directors, December 28, 1941.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Jan. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotment from A.L.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional section choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Research Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectional expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Librarians Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Training Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopaedia of Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers’ expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.C.R.L. Nominating Committee 1942-43 (For Nominations for 1943-44)


Mary Floyd, Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College Library, Richmond

B. Lamar Johnson, Stephens College Library, Columbia, Mo.

Charles F. McCombs, Main Reading Room, New York Public Library, New York City

Robert Alexander Miller, Indiana University Library, Bloomington
Nominations for A.C.R.L. Officers, 1942-43

General Association

President: Mabel L. Conat, Public Library, Detroit
Vice President: Clarence S. Paine, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
Robert A. Miller, Indiana University Library, Bloomington
John S. Richards, University of Washington Library, Seattle
John R. Russell, University of Rochester Library, Rochester, N.Y.
Charles B. Shaw, Swarthmore College Library, Swarthmore, Pa.

General Director: Robert Usher, Tulane University Libraries, New Orleans
Willis H. Kerr, Claremont College Libraries, Claremont, Calif.
Lewis F. Stieg, Hamilton College Library, Clinton, N.Y.
Anna M. Tarr, Lawrence College Library, Appleton, Wis.

Sections

Agricultural Libraries
Chairman: Lucia Haley, Oregon State College Library, Corvallis
(These officers have already been elected.)

College Libraries
Chairman: Julian S. Fowler, Oberlin College Library, Oberlin, O.
Secretary: Nellie M. Homes, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

Junior College Libraries
Chairman: Wave L. Noggle, Virginia Junior College, Virginia, Minn.
Secretary: Mary H. Clay, Junior College Division Library, Louisiana State University, Monroe
Mrs. Mildred Peterson McKay, Colby Junior College, New London, N.H.

Reference Librarians
Chairman: Mary N. Barton, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore
Secretary: Jack Dalton, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville

Libraries of Teacher-Training Institutions
Chairman: Eleanor W. Welch, Illinois State Normal University Library, Normal
Secretary: Barcus Tichenor, Ball State Teachers College Library, Muncie, Ind.

University Libraries
Chairman: John J. Lund, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.
Secretary: Harry Clemons, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville
Director: Charles E. Rush, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Association of College and Reference Libraries
Officers for 1941-42

General Association
President: Donald Coney, Librarian, University of Texas, Austin
Vice-President: Mabel L. Conat, Reference Librarian, Public Library, Detroit
Secretary: B. E. Powell, Librarian, University of Missouri, Columbia
Treasurer: Constance M. Winchell, Reference Librarian, Columbia University, New York City
Mrs. Vera S. Cooper, Librarian, DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.
John S. Richards, Associate Librarian, University of Washington, Seattle
Charles F. McCombs, Superintendent, Main Reading Room, New York Public Library
Hazel E. Armstrong, Librarian, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute
G. Flint Purdy, Librarian, Wayne University, Detroit
Fanny Alice Coldren, Reference Librarian, University of California at Los Angeles
William H. Jesse, Assistant Director, University of Nebraska Libraries, Lincoln

Sections

Agricultural Libraries
Chairman: Eugene H. Wilson, Assistant Librarian, Iowa State College, Ames

College Libraries
Chairman: Anna M. Tarr, Librarian, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.
Secretary: Foster E. Mohrhardt, Librarian, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.

Junior College Libraries
Chairman: Maysel O'H. Baker, Librarian, La Salle-Peru Township High School and Junior College, La Salle, Ill.
Secretary: Wave L. Noggle, Librarian, Virginia Junior College, Virginia, Minn.

Libraries of Teacher-Training Institutions
Chairman: Charles V. Park, Librarian, Michigan Central State Teachers College, Mount Pleasant
Secretary: Frances G. Hepinstall, Librarian, State Teachers College, Buffalo

Reference Librarians
Chairman: Fanny A. Coldren, Reference Librarian, University of California, Los Angeles
Secretary: Edna J. Grauman, Head of Reference Department, Free Public Library, Louisville

University Libraries
Chairman: Harold L. Leupp, Librarian, University of California, Berkeley
Secretary: Winifred Ver Nooy, Reference Librarian, University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago