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When I tried to think of a rhetorical skeleton on which to arrange my remarks, the first idea or theme that popped into my head was that libraries are like cemeteries. This is not an original discovery of my own, nor is it news to many of you. But when I thought of it and thought of the fact that you are all intimately associated with the operation, maintenance, support and service of libraries, that hardly seemed to me to be a gracious, attractive or conciliatory note on which to begin my remarks. I therefore abandoned it and decided instead that I would say that libraries are the most inefficient and wasteful part of an inefficient and wasteful system of education. But that this is not, in most cases, the fault of the librarian. It is true of libraries that they are like cemeteries in that they never stop growing.

My first public address was in the village of Meshoppen, Pa. It had a population of 927. On the Memorial Day in the spring I was invited as the acting pastor of the Methodist Church, at the ripe old age of 18, to give a patriotic address. This address was delivered in the cemetery. And for the first time I realized the obvious fact that cemeteries' population outnumbers any other population. It will not be long, if we continue our present trends in library development, before the population of libraries will outnumber all other populations in educational or charitable or public service institutions.

Size in Libraries

As a matter of fact, size in libraries—and I am talking particularly about college and university libraries—has often been pursued for its own sake. There are no prouder words for the university administrator or the librarian to utter than, “Our library is the largest in the South, or in the North, or the West, or the East, or in the state,” or in whatever region we happen to be located. Prudence in the matter of building libraries has not consisted in determining the optimum size of a particular library, but in planning the original building so that it can be expanded in at least six directions.

As a matter of fact, this growth in size in college and university libraries has very little reference to the function the library is supposed to perform. Many of us have learned in the last generation that some books are great books. We need to learn also that some books are dead books. Thus libraries resemble cemeteries in the fact that much of what they contain is good for nothing except to enrich the soil. If fifty per cent of what college and university libraries contain was spread on the fields, it would enrich education as well as the soil.

The college library grows through all sorts of strange procedures. It grows through the purchase of duplicates for instructional purposes, and these duplicates are often retained after the instructional...
purpose has been served. It grows through the bequests of alumni or retired members of the faculty whose devotion to the institution surpasses their bibliographical skill. Most of our libraries are loaded down, for example, with volumes of sermons which are included because the author belonged to the church which founded the institution. Or if our ancestry is civil instead of ecclesiastical, our shelves are stuffed with political orations made by the servants of our own states, to say nothing of the collection of "reports."

Again our libraries grow because either the librarian or the college president—or both—believe that the growth of the library enhances their professional reputation. I give you one ludicrous example—and it’s the only one I know in which the librarian is the victim. I could tell you 25 on university presidents.

In a theological seminary library, a professor was astonished to discover on the shelves a German periodical whose title as nearly as I can remember it was, Archiv für Pferdeforschung (Journal of Horse Breeding). The librarian had other journals called “Archiv,” and she wanted the library to grow.

Much worse is the havoc wrought by presidents, often aided and abetted by foundations, when they pursue special collections for prestige purposes. These collections are enshrined in a fine room, often as seldom entered as the de luxe mausoleum in the cemetery. Sometimes the cause of education is more seriously injured by the use of their contents than by their neglect. The meaningless and mediocre works of a local or regional author are glorified as a special collection, appropriately housed in a magnificent room. Then pressure is put on the professors to publish this "famous" collection. And the quality of scholarly publication is faced with a dilution which it can ill afford.

But much worse than the librarians, worse even than presidents, is the faculty in its influence on the growth of the library. In most institutions today the professor considers the development of the library solely in terms of his individual needs. Neither he nor his colleagues plan the future of the library in terms of the institution’s needs. At the best he will see that the library is equipped for study in his own field; at the worst he orders enormous sets of duplicates which are in effect library textbooks and which as such may have some instructional justification, then changes the orders each year—unless he himself has written a textbook in that particular field. He clamors for the library to build up a collection to suit his personal needs and then carries it off a book at a time to his own office. He favors decentralized libraries, while the sciences and the various fields of scholarship today become more and more intimately interrelated. I sympathize with the professor’s motives, but I cannot describe his habits as cooperative.

But much more dangerous to the cause of library planning is the professor’s library creed. He believes that the future will reveal needs which we cannot now know. He concludes from this belief that we must order everything and keep everything since someone some day may need it. He is right in his belief that the future will hold needs which we do not now envisage, but he is wrong in his conclusions. The library’s future is obscure because all the future is obscure. To deny that we can plan for the library is to deny that we can plan. We were given reason so that we might make reasonable predictions for the future—not to live like academic squirrels.

I know of no set of academic dogmas that are more dangerous to the progress of institutions of higher learning than this negative faith of the professor with regard
to planning the future of the library. It is time for it to be destroyed, and I believe that it can now finally be exploded. The professor will not take this attitude in regard to the development of his own department. He will not take this attitude in regard to the development of the curriculum. He does not say that we should keep the courses we taught 10 years ago because 10 years in the future we may need to have a course which we taught 10 years ago.

In no other area does he operate on the basis of this negative conviction. I believe that if librarians are insistent enough they can in this generation finally destroy this repudiation of human reason in what is supposed to be one of its citadels.

One of my friends recently told me with considerable pride that his library would soon have more volumes than any other university library in his region. He said, "We will no longer have to say 'we are next to the biggest library,' we will be the biggest." They are now building at his institution an addition to the library and I was confidently assured that they would need another addition in 10 more years. Back of this lies institutional competition, institutional pride and institutional jealousy. No one of them a laudable or praiseworthy attitude. It is based partly also on the fact that since trustees of educational institutions are inclined to believe that to be bigger is to be better, the president emphasizes the growth of the library in his annual report, even if he has real achievements to point to, and even though it would have grown if he had not been there.

University Libraries of the Future

The elimination of institutional competition in this area is in my judgment essential to the improvement of college and university libraries. The dream university of the future will possess or participate in four libraries. Of course this is my dream library—I am frank to confess you might have one with six. I am willing to settle for four.

The first would be a college or general education library, housed in a building designed for that purpose, and containing, I would say, not more than 50,000 volumes. I assume that the college has from 1000 to 5000 students. But if it has 20,000 it will not need four times 50,000 volumes. The volume needs of the general college library are relatively small and the way that colleges point with pride to tremendous numbers of volumes in their book collections fails to recognize the facts of life.

The second library in a university would be a research library, housed in a building designed for the purpose, one in which the individual graduate student or professor is emancipated into the stacks, but controlled scrupulously at the exit. Such a library can have a fixed number of volumes forever. It should be the current research library. It should have in it the volumes that are essential to the pursuit of research in the decade in which it is operating. It should not try to contain the reserves for the future, nor to perpetuate the catastrophes of the past. Since no one knows exactly how to establish the size of a fixed ceiling research library, I tentatively suggest 1,000,000 volumes because that is large enough to sound big and impressive, but not too large, I think, to be housed in a building that will not dwarf the other monuments on the campus. As a matter of fact, I realize that those institutions that establish on their own campuses a current research library, with the idea that it will have a fixed ceiling, will almost without exception set the number of volumes in terms of the number they now have, plus some small factor of one kind or another. I recognize this, but I am not reconciled to it. It is an irrational way in which to
set the limits of this library. But the main thing is to set the limit—to build a research library which in terms of the size of its book holdings can be perpetual.

This will end forever this rat race of constantly building additional wings and maintaining everything as if every book in the library were going to be called for tomorrow and had to be delivered to a professor within 10 minutes. I recognize, of course, that the professor wants the book the second he thinks of it. But does that establish any right or obligation upon the library to deliver it to him with that speed? Older civilizations as cultured as ours have survived the delay of half a day in the delivery of a book to the learned world.

This second library, the research library, would house the books that are needed at a specific time. It would be an active library. It would be a library for use. It would not keep the vestigial remains of either the teaching or the research interests of bygone days.

The third library would not necessarily be on the campus. It would be a regional library—a libraries' library. And this library would store; it would help to distribute; it would help to develop the research library resources of the entire region. It would hold for our common use the one copy only for the region. And it would hold also the little-used items that once in twenty-five years are looked at again in vain hope by some embryonic research worker who is misled by an attractive title. It would increase our knowledge of each other's holdings and would try to lead us into planning for the good of our region.

Such a library is envisaged in the embryonic midwest inter-library center. The Carnegie Corporation of New York voted a gift of half a million dollars to this center, and an additional quarter of a million if the latter sum could be matched.

The difficulties in the way of establishing effective cooperation throughout a region, with particular emphasis upon research, are great. But most of the difficulties are in our minds. They are our fears of one another, our distrust of each other, our pride in the dimensions of our own activity, and our general lethargy and timidity when confronted with the responsibility of creating something new. Here in the Midwest we are overcoming these difficulties.

This "we" is not editorial. It realistically reflects the sincere cooperation of midwestern librarians and presidents for their common good.

The fourth library has not yet been planned, but it is inevitable. The first regional library will be followed by others. These regional libraries must be related to national and international programs. Through some national institution, preferably the Library of Congress, the work of the individual regional libraries can be correlated. Moreover, we need some single channel and program for effective relationships with the outside world.

Let us assume that in a particular region individual libraries have parts of some important scholarly serial in duplicate. If turned over to the regional library, these parts might well become a complete set. With the complete set as a bargaining resource, the regional library could secure from abroad more valuable titles for its own region than the individual libraries could secure with their fragmentary sets.

Or, let us assume that the Library of Congress must decide how many duplicate sets of important foreign publications to import. A Library of Congress related to a network of regional libraries could make these decisions rapidly and effectively.

(Continued on page 207)
My remarks in this paper are directed toward the activities of the bibliographer working in a broad subject area such as the humanities, the social sciences, the physical, or the biological sciences. It is essential that we define the situation to be discussed and the meaning of the terms to be used. To this end our comments will be limited to the bibliographical problems of the large, university, research library. I venture to say that (a) the most important, and (b) one of the most difficult activities in such a library is the selection of books and other materials to be added to and to be withdrawn from the collections of such a library.

It is the most important because it is the most permanent aspect of a research library’s operations, and because errors of commission or omission in this activity are most expensive and most difficult to correct. Administrative organizations, procedures, good or bad public services, and good or inefficient personnel may have some permanent effects, but in these areas the deficiencies of the past can in many, though not all, instances be corrected without prohibitive loss of time or money. These are, in a relative sense, the ephemera of librarianship. Even buildings can be, and are, superseded by new and better ones. But the book collection—excluding losses, physical decay and discarding—stays. If well built, much of it increases in value as the years go by; if poorly built, remedial action becomes increasingly and alarmingly expensive as the years go by. What could once have been had for two dollars, is now five, ten, fifteen or twenty—and I speak of the ordinary grist of the research library—not the rare or unique materials.

Building the book collection in a university research library is one of the most difficult of all library activities because highly selective judgments must be made. To make selective judgments well requires both thought and knowledge. Neither of these is overly plentiful—even in the scholarly world. Books, unfortunately perhaps, cannot be divided as good or bad, useful or not useful. Such items must always be qualified: good for what? or for whom? useful for what? or for whom?

Our fundamental difficulty, in large measure, grows out of the characteristic pattern of use of a research collection. If we draw the curve of use plotted against the number of volumes in a collection, it is apparent that at one end of the curve we will have a very few books used many times each day, week, or month. The rate of use will fall rapidly depending upon the type of research, the extent of the research literature and other factors. The bulk of use will be covered by a relatively small collection. Let us say, for most areas, a few thousand or few tens of thousands of books will supply a very high percentage of the demand. It is only beyond this point in the provision of materials that we
begin to have the general characteristics of a research library; then we have the rare, the recondite, and the little-used—but indispensable—document. Our curve becomes asymptotic and the individual book in the vast bulk of our collections is used only occasionally—if at all. When the curve of use is horizontal the importance of selective judgments becomes more obvious. Other criteria than use must be brought to bear on selection.

I use "must" advisedly, for selection is vital; none of us has the resources to buy the materials we might at some time want, for scholars have the reputation—not entirely undeserved—of wanting almost anything at some time. Therefore we must buy those that are most “important” or those that we “need” most. There is a difference, for both need and importance have temporal aspects that introduce additional hazards for the bibliographer. Further, need must be defined in terms other than use or loans as we have just tried to demonstrate. We must consider the distinction of the author, the importance of the edition, the school of thought represented, the special content, the geographic area, and many other qualities. These factors must be delicately balanced against the library’s existing resources, the importance or nature of the research being conducted, the teaching or research trends of the university, and—by no means least—the funds available. Selection must rely in the future more on carefully appraised probabilities of use and less on intuitive, or other possibilities of use. Since the universe of available—and desirable—books is still very large, the purchase of one book means not only that a positive decision has been reached, but negative ones are made at the same time, for the same money cannot be spent twice. And funds in most libraries are always insufficient to meet the demand. In the years to come, withdrawals of materials from scholarly libraries will almost certainly become as important as additions now are. The bibliographical judgments for these activities will be even more difficult.

These are some of the more general aspects of bibliography at the research level that indicate, I trust, the importance and the difficulty of the task of the bibliographer as we are using the word here. I have yet to show why I think a bibliographer working in a broad subject area is important to a university library. To so indicate will require that I be somewhat specific on problems of selection and acquisition of library materials in a university library as they appear to me. My observations are obviously subjective and I can support most of them with only meagre, if any, objective data. I present them with no little hesitation and in doing so acknowledge my debt to my colleagues and predecessors.

Traditional Book Selection

The tradition of book selection in most universities may be described somewhat as follows. By some device or other, the bulk of the available book fund for the year was broken up into departmental allotments, the size of which varied according to various ingenious formulae or weighted factors such as the extent of existing library resources, the amount of publishing being done in the field, the cost of publications in the particular field, numbers of graduate and undergraduate students, numbers of faculty members, and the amount allotted last year, to name a few of the more common factors. The librarian kept a reserve to be used to cover general acquisitions, and to help with major departmental purchases. Each department then appointed a library advisor who either ordered materials on his own initiative or on the recommendation of his departmental colleagues, or the departmental chairman.
assumed this role. The difficulties of this scheme are known so well that a bare listing of some of them will suffice: borderline materials tend to be omitted, the library advisor or a segment of a department can acquire materials in a very narrow or restricted field to the exclusion of important basic materials, the advisors' bibliographical judgments vary greatly in quality from excellent to poor, there tends to be insufficient attention given by some, while others are overzealous. Some departments finding an accumulation of unspent funds at the end of the fiscal year will spend hastily. The cost of each item rather than its quality looms higher than it should because of the diminution of funds it creates for the balance of a year. There is a lack of continuity in acquisition policy, for the advisors change from year to year, etc. Virtues exist in the plan, but are more difficult to ascertain and to describe. Once the allocations are made the librarian is free of worry; the departments know where they stand on book funds and can plan accordingly; they can buy only what they want and thus stretch their funds more effectively over the requirements for their current research.

Now I do not wish to be misunderstood. The library exists only to serve its university now and in the future. It may have some obligation as a conservator of knowledge, but its essential role must be as stated. In such a role the faculty's bibliographical knowledge is not only important, but should be recognized as extensive and absolutely vital to the growth of the library. But the faculty and the university as a whole are important and the needs of future faculties must also be given some consideration. Perhaps this may be put more clearly by saying that I think there should be an acquisition policy and that it should be a university policy in which the departments concur. Such a policy of acquisition would, I think, be different than an amalgamation of the uncoordinated policies of most library advisors.

Since such a general policy cannot be static it calls for constant oversight, review, adjustment, amendment and interpretation. It may call for more or less bibliographical activity in some areas of minor or diverse current interest where faculty activity is either dispersed or is not high.

**Concept of the Bibliographer**

Perhaps my concept of the bibliographer in a broad area may now be somewhat clearer. He is the principal coordinating officer of bibliographical activity in his subject area. He deals with a broad area because no man can deal with all knowledge, and the subject interrelationships of an area are extremely important. He has a genuine interest in libraries and their problems. He knows the content of a general scholarly field well; he is a scholar in his own right; his interests must be broad and catholic; he must know books, book values, dealers, and dealers' specialties; his bibliographic judgments must be sound and reliable; he must enjoy reading dealers' catalogs and examining secondhand books; he must know the faculty of his area and what they are working upon; he must know where their judgment of books can supplement his and where it is apt to be deficient.

We believe he should not and could not displace the faculties' bibliographical work. The difficulties of acquisition in highly specialized subject fields and in many languages require highly specialized knowledge that only individual faculty members will possess. But the bibliographer can advise on general policy and stimulate faculty activity. He ought to know what is being ordered in his general subject area, and being a man of erudition and immense tact, he should be able to question unsound faculty recommendations, and convince the faculty member that his recommendation,
in fact, is unsound for reasons of cost, coverage, unnecessary duplication, etc.

He can largely ignore those areas where he knows the literature is being properly covered by members of the faculty or by members of the library staff, and concentrate especially on those areas which are important and yet which are not receiving such attention. Since his talents are many, he can and does anticipate many of the more conventional needs of the faculty because he sees the trade bibliographies first. He fills in the lacunae of years gone by, because he reads the catalogs promptly. He will take the time to canvass systematically the lacunae of special subjects; this the faculty will do only occasionally if at all, for in general, faculty members tend to give most of their attention to current materials.

He can both stabilize and alter acquisition policy as the university’s needs may require and he can appraise the importance of major acquisitions within the framework of that policy. Since all of this would kill any man who devoted himself to it all day long, we think he should give about one half of his time to teaching or to research in a department in his general area. Thus he can also serve the library in a critical liaison capacity, bringing to the library’s councils the views of a faculty—since he is one of them—and he can also bring to his fellow faculty members the problems of the library since he is also a librarian. (A dichotomy is implied here which I think should not and may not exist.) This, of course, is not the only possible pattern of relationships. There may be circumstances under which the bibliographer may divide his time between bibliography and library administration or service in some other special field.

Relying thus heavily on his judgment, the funds at his disposal should be made extensive, and the departmental allocations may be minimized in consequence. The university, instead of buying books according to the balances in allocated funds, can more nearly acquire materials that the university needs. The funds become more fluid. The faculty members wanting expensive or borderline materials can pass their requests on to the bibliographer without fear of its penalizing their allocations. Since he is in a very real sense one of them, he will surely be sympathetic. When it turns out that he is not, his voice is more than likely to carry a convincing authority with it.

As research and literature grow and become more complex, the research library becomes increasingly vital to the university, but its problems of acquisition grow and become complex also. If we are to solve them, we need diverse and able skills to help us. These skills in a university are to be found in the faculty, the library staff, and even among the students. If all the talents available are to be brought to bear on the problem, as I think they should, a high level coordinating responsibility is created. The director of the library, while responsible for general policy and its interpretation, cannot, under most circumstances at least, handle so large a task alone. The bibliographer working in a broad area of knowledge and advising the director represents, to my mind, the most effective way of achieving the necessary integration and coordination of acquisition policy in a large and complex university library.
The Acquisition Librarian as Bibliographer

By FELIX REICHMANN

Dr. Reichmann is assistant director, Cornell University Library.

Every scholarly activity, both in the sciences and the humanities, is based on the exact observation and the minute description of all pertinent phenomena. Seen in terms of the history of scholarship the origin is often a mere listing of facts, then the material is carefully described and classified according to certain characteristics. Finally critical methods of research are used to analyze the individual forms and trace their developments.

The discipline which investigates the book as a physical witness in the court of cultural history follows the above pattern. Bibliography, which originally meant the writing of books, is now understood to be primarily interested in the material aspects of a publication. The evaluation of the content is left to other branches of learning; here bibliography has only an ancillary function. Its main objectives are the listing of titles and a critical investigation of their physical appearance.

Systematic bibliography, to accept Theodore Bestermann's terminology, enumerates titles and arranges them according to some selected principle: the author, printer or publisher, a subject, a time period, or a place. Critical bibliography is the analysis of an individual publication or copy on a comparative and historical basis. Such an investigation presupposes a detailed knowledge of the history of publishing and book distribution in a given period. "It includes every incident, mishap or change of policy which may occur in the life of the book."

Three points in this brief description of bibliography bear directly on the general theme of this paper: 1. Bibliography tends to be catholic; at least three of the five main criteria for a systematic bibliography, grouping according to the printer, a time period or a place, cut across subject departmentalization. 2. Bibliography has a service function; it does not organize knowledge itself, but groups the records of knowledge for the use of the subject specialist. 3. It is intimately linked with the history and technique of book production and distribution.

Some of the most important aspects of librarianship are cognate to these principles. J. Christian Bay has well described its basic ideology as "human enlightenment in a historical continuity." It disregards by definition all subject boundaries and serves with equal zeal all branches of knowledge and all types of human beings. Its primary purpose is to organize the records of knowledge and to marshal the physical witnesses of human thought. Manifold are the ties between librarianship and the book trade in all its phases. We cannot attain a mutually satisfactory relationship with our most substantial supplier unless we fully understand his problems and difficulties. Not only are the two professions linked...
in one economic situation, but they also have so many similar objectives and activities that a discussion of the book trade finds its legitimate place in every broader treatment of librarianship. Lastly, bibliography is our cardinal tool, essential for many of our activities in all departments of the library. It is indispensable in book selection, in identifying a given title, in collating a given copy and it is vital in cataloging and reference.

The librarian as buyer, the great book collector and the bookminded subject specialist have much in common. Their buying activities directed by a knowledge of systematic and critical bibliography are rarely in competition but tend to supplement each other.

Michael Sadleir's witty definition of the connoisseur fits all three of them. "In nature the bird who get up earliest catches the most worms, but in book collecting the prizes fall to birds who know worms when they see them." Their judgment of a title or a copy is in many cases an identical one, but their decision for an actual purchase may vary because their motivations for buying are different. The private collector buys an item because he wants it, because it fits in with his aesthetic and literary tastes, because he enjoys the possession of a coveted book. He will be guided by his bibliophile enthusiasm; after the necessary critical evaluation of the copy has been satisfied by proper bibliographical identification, the final decision can be made on an emotional basis. The collector buys for himself and he will be forever identified with the great collection he has accumulated. The acquisition librarian buys a title because he assumes that somebody else will need the book and will use it. He will attempt to listen to cool reasoning only and will not permit the question: How much do I like this book? His criteria will be: 1. Who within the framework of my institution and its possible extension will benefit by this book? 2. What is the priority of this acquisition seen from the point of view of my budget limitations? He will remain anonymous; what scholarship he has, what bibliographical knowledge he has acquired will be expressed in his book selection.

Both collector and librarian will be much interested in the question of bibliographical rarity and will agree theoretically at least, that the qualifications for "rare" are hard to find and worthwhile to be searched for. The librarian, however, will emphasize the second quality more than the first. He will request that the given bibliographical "point" be a truly significant one, a potential source for thinking and research. For instance, the cancel replacing page 302 in Vol. II of Boswell's Johnson (1791) is of great interest because it substitutes a tampered text for Johnson's original, rather free remarks on marital infidelity. The misprint "Parllelen" instead of "Paral­lelen" on the title page of Saur's first Bible (Philadelphia 1743) is significant because it is a characteristic for the second printing of the title page; the particular circumstances, which had necessitated a hasty reprint of the title page and therefore had caused this misprint, have a documentary value for the religious history of the colonial Pennsylvania Germans. The librarian will agree that blank pages which are part of a signature (as in Schedel's Weltchronik of 1493, in Chapman's Homer of 1616 and in scores of similar examples) form an integral part of a complete copy, but he may buy it nevertheless, after having deducted the necessary discount of the price. But if advertisements do not form
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part of the signatures he may well disregard their absence as well as all the points which Newton has aptly called "pseudo bibliography". And lastly, he will do well to remember Lord Chesterfield's antibibliophile remarks: "The best books are the commonest and the last editions are always the best."

The question whether the subject specialist on the faculty or the acquisition librarian should have formal responsibility for the upkeep of the book collection has been hotly debated. Today many European libraries charge the professional library staff with the book selection; a corresponding trend among American institutions has been rather slow in developing. This question, like so many similar ones, can only be argued on the basis of satisfactory performance. An acquisition librarian who leisurely wears the cloak of professional dignity instead of working with his bibliographical tools will not do.

One argument for the centralization of book selection within the library is the oneness of knowledge. Subject departmentalization is a necessary administrative device, a kind of working hypothesis, but in the last analysis all learning forms an indivisible unity. Item 1, in a bibliography of English literature chronologically arranged according to imprint dates would be a good example for the overlapping of subject fields. This title would be in Latin, have as author a church father, carry an Italian imprint and be manufactured by a German printer. And all this together is the correct entry for the first appearance in print of an English author. The Dissuasio Valerii ad Rufinum ne uxorem ducat, a famous English XIII century tirade against marriage, is without any doubt the work of Walter Map. By some curious mistake of a mediaeval scribe, this short piece, possibly in view of its epistolary form, was included in a manuscript containing the letters of St. Jerome. This mistake escaped the attention of several scribes and also of some XV century printers. Among those who included Walter Map in their edition of the Epistolae S. Hieronymi were the two German printers Sweynheym and Pannartz who printed the first edition of the Epistolae, Rome, 1468.

The principle of central administration for the university's book collection is generally accepted. The administration of book selection, the most noble function of the library, should follow the same pattern. Although we acquire books individually, title by title, we select in terms of the collection as a whole. Book selection forms an integral part of a number of technical operations which are performed in the university library and should therefore remain in the appropriate administrative unit of the library. A title, which has been tentatively selected, must be bibliographically identified and searched in the catalogs and records of the acquisition department. The information thus gained is used for preliminary cataloging, for the collating of the copy when received, and it forms the substance for the final catalog entry. Lastly, every purchase is a straight business operation regardless of the high scholarly level which may have initiated the selection. Like an investment banker we operate with money which is not ours and have the obligation to use it to the best advantage in terms of the market possibilities. Book prices are flexible and the so called correct price must be calculated as a statistical average from dealer catalogs and auction reports. Book dealers rarely fit in academic subject departmentalization and only a central selecting agency can view the entire market and thus determine a decisive factor for the purchase: the price.


Purchase in all subject fields will be greatly facilitated if full advantage is taken of the vast bibliographical knowledge of many members of the book trade. The reliable book dealer is the library’s best and most efficient friend. He will call to our attention new publications from countries whose national bibliographies appear either late or incomplete, he will search for out-of-print items, and he is our ally in the fight against forgery. Practically every rare book which is no longer in its original binding must be carefully examined. Two incomplete copies of the same edition may have been used to produce a complete one, or facsimililies may have been substituted for some missing pages. Rigorous examination of small details will frequently suffice to expose the truth. Difference in paper, if not explained by the printing history of the book, change in the form of small defects, like worm-holes and water stains or their sudden disappearance will arouse our suspicion. The library may nevertheless decide to buy these items if the content, rarity and price should warrant it.

The situation with outright forgeries of an entire book, however, is quite different. Fortunately some examples of this type are known and well described. Some forgers try to place reprints on the market as originals by cutting out or erasing the colophon which bears the reprint date. A good example is Soliman and Persida of 1599, which had been reprinted by J. Smeeton in 1815. A careful bibliographical identification combined with a critical examination of paper and typography will generally expose the reprint.

A much more difficult case is the identification to the Boccaccio edition printed by Giunta in Florence in 1527. The book was reprinted in Venice at the beginning of the XVIII century by using XVI century paper and the original Giunta types. Only a careful bibliographical analysis will detect the reprint. Of similar nature is Cellini’s autobiography of 1728. Of XIX century origin are the famous Wise forgeries and the many Columbus letters of 1494 which run the gamut from crude attempts to superb examples of the forger’s craft.

Many bibliographies are too expensive to be duplicated and will be in the main library only. Therefore it is fair to assume that the acquisition librarian has best access to all bibliographies in the library’s holdings. He will be an avid reader of all national bibliographies, publishers’ announcements and dealers’ catalogs. It is a special reading technique which the book selecting bibliographer uses, a rapid and highly concentrated one. Every entry is under full scrutiny for a split second. It is evaluated instantaneously and, if rejected, immediately forgotten. With a thrill comparable only to the hunter’s emotions on stalking his quarry, the bibliographer will be on the look-out for a desirable acquisition with all senses fully alerted. Like Anatole France’s Silvestre Bonnard, he will readily admit: “I opened a book which I read with the greatest interest, it was a catalog of manuscripts.”

Subject bibliographies, especially those which have been compiled for acquisition purposes are an excellent buying guide and indispensable for the systematic growth of a collection and for the filling in of gaps. The purchase of books still in print can be completely based on such a list; however, the acquisition of out-of-print material will generally originate from available offers. To work exclusively from desiderata lists would be slow and expensive.

What is the purpose of this bibliographical work? Obviously, and fortunately, we cannot buy everything which is being published or comes on the market. Comprehensive purchases are technically quite simple; the selection is the difficult and intellectually challenging task. A laconic
interpretation of the selection policy for a research library was given by Dr. Wilmans, director of the Prussian State Library to the head of his acquisition department: "Buy documentary material." The generally accepted definition will include the following groups: bibliographies, sources and all monographs which have more than ephemeral value either because of the new research they contain or because of a new presentation of known facts. The instructional and research needs of the individual institution will control closer selection within the above framework.

The acquisition librarian will first satisfy immediate needs, but then he will go beyond the requirements of the faculty. By paying close attention to new fields of research and new methods of investigation he will try to anticipate the requests of the subject specialist.

The significant position of the acquisition librarian as coordinator of purchases in all subject fields is at the same time the source of his greatest weakness. Although he may be a scholar in his own right in one subject field, he will know next to nothing in some branches of learning and will be an amateur at the very best in other disciplines. His bibliographical experience will permit him to make many fairly reliable guesses, but it is not a full substitute for subject knowledge. Being fully aware of his own shortcomings, he will take advantage of the campus telephone on his desk. His foremost obligation is to convince the faculty of his institution of his eagerness to serve them, his appreciation of their advice and suggestions, his willingness to learn and his sincere interest in the growth of the library. He will then enjoy the enthusiastic support of his faculty and well exemplify Pierce Butler's resounding phrase: "In this age of specialization the librarian alone of all scholars is in a position to see both scientific and humanistic scholarship in the same perspective. Therefore it might seem that the librarian's chief and peculiar office is to promote in modern society a rational equilibrium and a mutual respect between these two forms of intellectual culture."10


Cooperation or Suffocation

(Continued from page 198)

When these bright days come, the work of the librarian and the administrator will change its nature. The college president and librarian can abandon the effort to outdistance their competitors in size. Instead they will devote their efforts to the improvement of quality and to the maintenance of a library that is truly contemporary.

When we shall have a network of regional libraries effectively related to a national library and to the libraries of the world, I do not know. But I commend this dream to the librarians.
The Foundations of Acquisition Policy in the Small University Library

Mr. Grieder is librarian, West Virginia University.

What appears to be a recent tendency to think of university library problems in terms of the great research collections has somewhat obscured the fact that certain questions and dilemmas sometimes take on a different aspect and emphasis in small libraries. While the large universities in the aggregate may have more students and more books than the smaller ones, the latter nevertheless represent a good share of public and private education enterprise, and their library problems deserve consideration. In this connection the American Library Directory, 1948, indicates that one-half the state universities of the country possess fewer than 300,000 volumes, and that these institutions for the most part are in areas having no large private foundations with good libraries. The universities of New Hampshire, Maine, Georgia, Mississippi, Oklahoma and the mountain states—except for Colorado—may be cited as examples.

The matter of size is not necessarily an index to the degree of adequacy with which their collections meet the needs of these institutions, until the aims and programs of each school and the contents of each library are duly considered. However, there are good reasons for supposing that many people, including the administrators of most of them, regard these libraries as inadequate, and are working diligently to increase book funds and to extend the resources of their collections by other means—gifts, cooperative enterprises and the like. For student bodies of approximately equal size, demanding and needing books and services for similar work, the small libraries could not offer the same degree of adequacy as the larger ones.

Everyone knows how greatly enrolments in almost all schools have expanded since the war. In 1939-40 seven state universities with below-median libraries—Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Utah and West Virginia—had enrolments ranging from 3245 to 6935 students; in 1946-47 the range was from 6019 to 9846. This increase is still more impressive when it is noted that the universities of Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oregon and Virginia all had fewer than 7000 students in 1939-40, and that four had less than 4000. It appears that in size the first named universities are now comparable to the latter as they existed in 1939-40, and that they have in some cases far exceeded them.

Whether they are subject to the same library demands is another question. Examination of catalogs indicates that they are not as yet offering equivalent curricula, though new programs are being added, and probably the greater variety of interests accompanying a larger enrolment and the crowded condition of almost all outside universities have created considerable pressure.
for more professional and research offerings in every university with a closely restricted program. It is entirely reasonable to suppose that these demands will continue to be voiced, and will perhaps become more pressing, particularly if the currently favorable market for teachers, engineers, chemists and other technicians, as well as for physicians and dentists, continues for any length of time.

The preceding paragraphs are not intended to present invidious comparisons, but to point up the fact that many “small” universities are no longer small, and that they may expect their constituencies to consider them capable of offering everything that the “large” schools offer. The dilemma is sharpened by the fact that libraries which were—possibly—capable of meeting adequately the demands of prewar days have not experienced a corresponding gain in either size or book budgets. The following table shows the relative positions of the two groups in these respects.
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nonexistent in the small library.

A second factor is the gravitational force of great research collections in drawing the attention and the benefactions of donors, and the prestige value of adding something of special merit or interest to a great library. Harvard for years bought almost all its books from special endowment funds, not from university appropriations. Sometimes a large library may receive as gifts more volumes than it purchases. The publication of the Friends of the Library group of the University of North Carolina, for example, shows how valuable this source can be.

Exchanges are also of importance, and if the piece-for-piece rule is observed even approximately the large library is likely to have more good material to send out than the small. This may include the publications of the university press, as at Cornell, a resource rarely available to the small school. Periodicals published by various units within the university also represent valuable exchange assets.

In three important respects, then, the large university library is more likely to have a definite advantage over the small one in acquisition matters. Its basic collections are more nearly adequate, it attracts more interest from donors who may have either money or books to give, and it has better resources for exchange negotiations because of the variety of material it receives from gifts, from the university press, or from a serial publication list of special distinction.

**Predetermined Decisions**

In addition to these concrete factors, there is another aspect of acquisition policy which deserves mention. This is the fact that great libraries to some extent enjoy, or perhaps suffer from, predetermined acquisition decisions which cannot be changed without great difficulty, if at all. These commitments result first of all from the existence of important research collections which have attracted scholars and students, and which have received much publicity at least in scholarly and research circles, and thus are a potent force in maintaining the fame of the library and the university. Taube cites several such commitments from various libraries which attempt to collect "all available material relating to Maine" or "everything printed in America before 1820" or "everything relating to the literature and history, particularly local history, of Italy since 1870."

The Farmington Plan assignments illustrate very well the special interests of the great university libraries—as well as other research collections, of course—and it is extremely improbable that any of them would assume these heavy responsibilities without having pre-existing specialties in the subjects involved. While the building of an exhaustive research collection presents serious financial problems, it nevertheless does mean that the acquisition policy in that field is permanently determined and subject to no substantial changes. No special field in a great library can be de-emphasized without seriously depreciating all previous activity in it, antagonizing at least some of the faculty, and perhaps violating the legal and moral obligations attached to the acceptance of a gift which initiated the collection. The small library, if it has special interests, generally circumscribes them more closely geographically, chronologically, or in some other way, so that the resulting commitments are not too great to manage with the available funds. The pre-existing deci-
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sion covers a small area of the large field, and general acquisition policy as it develops more or less independently of this permanent pre-existing policy must deal with the remainder.

A further point in this connection is the fact that some great libraries are so inclusive that the average trade book is very likely to have a strong presumption in its favor. An example has just come to hand in the State University of Iowa, which has placed standing orders for publications of most university presses and some commercial publishers. Such libraries could probably obtain every volume published by the university presses, Harper, Macmillan, and dozens of other well-known firms, as well as many minor ones, without serious qualms. This, again, requires great sums of money, but it does not involve the constant choice between books of apparently equal authority and value so characteristic of small library practice.

This willingness to accept books is not only a result of the wider subject coverage of the large library. In all probability it stems also from the fact that large universities and small ones often do not seem to treat parallel curricula in the same way. Courses of similar scope are developed more intensively and are likely to need a wider variety of reading, and to require more research and writing, in the former, perhaps because professors have an opportunity to examine most or all of the new books in a given field as they come to the library. What seems merely a good working collection in the great library may be regarded as a specialty in the small one because of this different approach to instruction.

The specializing tendency and the inclusive coverage of the large library thus tend to create an almost automatic acquisition procedure for many books, periodicals and other items. While the essential nature of the process of book selection may be similar in the two types of libraries here contrasted, there are important factors which carry special weight in each. Our concern here is with those which affect the small collection, roughly, those lying below the median figure for state universities—about 300,000 volumes. Undoubtedly some of the things which apply to large libraries will also be true of certain small ones. On the other hand, some collections running well above the median figure may find themselves in a situation here attributed to those lying below it. No absolute general definition of a “small” or a “large” library is possible, since it depends upon the purposes and aims of the library and its parent institution. In dealing with generalities, the danger of exception is ever present. It is the writer's belief, based on experience in a very large research library and in a small university collection, on discussion with other librarians, and on the examination of professional literature, that the points set out here, and the premises behind them, are substantially accurate.

If these views can be accepted, the conclusion follows that the formulation of an acquisition policy and of everyday criteria for selection requires a different approach in the small library than in the large. With both inadequate collections and inadequate funds it is especially important that the policy and procedure be based on the realities of a particular situation, and that every factor in the latter be considered with the utmost care. Only thus can the librarian fulfill his essential aim, which is to create through the most effective use of his resources the library best suited to the needs of the university as they are expressed in its formal program and in the individual requirements of students and faculty.


JULY, 1949, PART I
Like all phenomena of human activity library growth is either accidental or planned, generally both. The chief accidental factors in the present case are the special interests of alumni or other donors who may give books or money for special uses; the requirements of scholars on the faculty with particular interests who demand, and often themselves supply, research materials for their own private studies and those of their students and co-workers; and the expressed needs and desires of teachers and students for literature to facilitate everyday teaching, the pursuit of hobbies, or recreational and avocational activities of one kind or another. These accidental influences are very powerful factors in library development. It is probably true that their pressure increases as those who exert such influence attain positions of greater eminence in the outside world or carry more weight in university affairs. Great scholars can successfully demand more than the average instructor or assistant professor. All great universities and some small ones, as well as some colleges (e.g. Colby) have benefited greatly by the collecting work of their own faculty members or of other benefactors. For most small university libraries, however, the intrinsic values of these donations of money or books are not nearly so great as in the case of gifts made to larger ones. In fact, a special collection carrying appreciable financial obligations is not always welcome in any library; but the larger the collection, as a rule, the better it can undertake the financial obligations involved.

The accidental factor mentioned above, the everyday instructional and personal needs of faculty and students, is likely to be one of the most potent forces in acquisition policy generally, and of special force when both books and money are in short supply. The part it can properly play is worth extended consideration. In a library which does not intend to be a "trustee for the learned world" on any large scale the decision to purchase specific items is derived chiefly from the librarian's awareness of an active, felt need, or on his opinion regarding the future development of a need which as yet is potential. In other words, he buys what is needed or what is, in his own view, or in the opinion of men whose judgment he respects, likely to be needed in the predictable future.

The most accurate indices to actual existing needs are the expressed opinions of the faculty or the students. Where funds are low it may be considered that the filling of such demands is a first charge on book funds. The apportioning of money to schools, colleges, or departments for book purchases is a recognition of this view, although another important factor is the desire to place book selection largely in the hands of subject experts when the library is unable to employ them on its own budget. It is rare, however, for all book funds to be so allocated; in most schools some portion remains at the discretion of the librarian, and in spending it he can work to strengthen the collection along lines laid out in his own mind. Moreover, if he has the confidence of his faculty he is able to influence the expenditure of departmental funds to a considerable degree, so that his ideas have a greater weight than might at first be apparent.

To acquiesce in every suggested purchase from departmental funds, to comply with every demand for added money from general book funds until they are exhausted, and to buy everything possible which is expressly requested by students and faculty is the path of least resistance. It is, so to speak, the pragmatic approach to acquisition. Unfortunately it is not a safe course, for the demands made by teachers or student groups are not always proportionate either to their abilities or to their value in the university. Initiative, aggressiveness
and pure gall are often the determinants which regulate their requests, rather than the real importance of their work or their interests. Those who ask most are not always the most deserving, nor is the filling of their needs necessarily the best investment for the good of the whole university.

The wise expenditure of general book funds and the exercise of the librarian’s influence in directions which will produce the most profitable development of the library demand a more objective standard for judging proposed purchases. This standard, against which acquisition must be measured, can refer only to the program of the university in the most concrete and specific terms possible. Statements of philosophy, if we take the preamble appearing in many catalogs to be such, are generally of little value. Everyday decisions or long-range policy can hardly be formulated on the basis of education objectives like good citizenship, leadership, responsible adulthood, or sound scholarship. These are highly general attributes which higher education aims to develop and foster through the curriculum and the other activities of the university which are brought to bear on its students. Dr. C. H. Brown, in an article which should be reread especially by the librarians of small universities, expresses a view based on years of experience in a first-rate research library:

The library is a service institution. The needs of a library can be ascertained only by a study of the present and future needs of faculty and students, which in turn must be based, if a final analysis is to be made, on the needs of society or, in many cases, on the needs of a segment of society. All of us must give attention to the needs of the social groups which our particular college are to serve.

The commitments commonly existing in great research libraries were mentioned previously. It must be recognized that the small university library also has responsibilities which cannot be abdicated. These are more likely to inhere in the character of the whole university than in the special character of the library; for a small library with scanty funds can hardly afford to build a character for itself other than as an instrument for the carrying on of a curricular program and the research investigation of subject fields closely tied in with the work of the school or the economic, social, political and historical interests of its own region or its own constituency. To put the matter in another way, the best use of severely limited resources must refer directly to either an institutional or a regional interest or program of work. It cannot with maximum profit be diverted to general or remote interests, except as they must be brought into the more specifically related program in order to orient the latter and to prevent the development or continuance of a provincialism and narrowness of viewpoint.

It is impossible here to study in detail the specific commitments which may or may not be justified in the small university. Generally speaking, the undergraduate program is of first importance, despite the almost universal feeling that a university is primarily a foundation for advanced research and professional training. Small universities usually offer very limited graduate programs; anyone wishing to pursue doctoral work lying outside the four or six or eight fields which may be offered must go elsewhere, and the local school’s responsibility to these people ends at the baccalaureate, or possibly at the master’s level. If, to these advanced students who must go outside their own schools for further study, are added the vast majority who never go beyond the A.B. degree it can hardly be denied that their undergraduate preparation must be a first responsibility, no matter what the theory of university education may

be. Nor can it be denied that to the residents and taxpayers of a state having a small university the undergraduate program is of overwhelmingly predominant interest. Following this are graduate and professional fields varying in local importance.

The small university has, besides its undergraduate program, a choice in developing its special interests. As a rule they develop, and should develop, along the lines of greatest pressure in the university, i.e., those determined by the interests and needs of its constituents, e.g., law, medicine, engineering, local history, etc. As a rule subjects having no close local ties are probably best left to the great research institutions which can afford to build libraries and hire teachers to handle them properly. Examples are medieval history, classical philology, general economic history and the like.

A perception of these forces and of these emphases is necessary to an intelligent acquisition policy, as well as a soundly based opinion on the precedence which should be accorded each component in the whole university program. It is often impossible or very difficult to obtain a statement from high administrative authority as to specific lines of development which are emerging, or are likely to emerge in the future, and there is some doubt that administrators, rather than the teaching faculty, should have a predominant voice in developing the curriculum. No professor will admit that he recognizes and accepts the fact that his specialty—say the history of Arctic exploration or the Arthurian legend—is unlikely to be much exploited in the library and that he is reconciled to doing his research elsewhere or by interlibrary loan, microfilm copy, or some other device for getting at the resources of good large libraries. Yet a librarian can hardly spend severely limited funds wisely if he is unable to form conclusions regarding lines of development most likely to meet present and future demands, or if he is unaware of existing weaknesses.

The unfortunate fact is that parts of the average small university library must remain shallow in order that those subjects and those types of literature which are of special value to the specific program of the specific institution may be well developed. This is not to assert that such a situation, with its restriction on independent researches and its limiting effect on student and faculty interests is ideally desirable; it is merely an existing fact which must be recognized. The development of a new subject field at the expense of either the resources of undergraduate education or the materials needed for the study of subjects already forming important parts of a university program is not likely to be profitable to the institution as a whole, whatever it may mean to the individual librarian or faculty member. Dr. Brown has this to say regarding the necessity of limiting the aspirations of a library:

A requirement for an adequate library for graduate study which must have first consideration is a clear-cut definition of the fields which are to be covered by the college. Universities have an unusual opportunity to develop intensively certain fields both in pure and applied science and in the humanities. By limiting their fields, they can become outstanding in certain areas. No library now can be all things to all people. There is some possibility that in a given case we can build up an adequate library for research in a limited number of fields. If we make the mistake of adding to these definite fields all the areas of human knowledge, we shall be lost.8

8 Ibid., p. 102.
Allocation of the Book Budget: Experience at U.C.L.A.

Mr. Vosper is assistant librarian, University of California at Los Angeles.

In the winter of 1945 a new administration of the University of California Library, Los Angeles, found it desirable to review the basis for allocating the annual book budget. The reasoning behind the inherited system, one that had apparently been in force since the earliest days of the library, was not apparent. There was no obvious relationship among the sums allotted to various departments or fields, and because of a practice of carrying forward from year to year a record of previous departmental overdrafts and credits, individual allocations were awkwardly carried out to the second decimal.

Obviously wise planning in the use of his book budget is the librarian’s foremost responsibility. Other important matters bespeak his attention, but only by careful attention to the book budget can he build an effective book collection. For these reasons it was imperative that we do some thinking at U.C.L.A. As a preliminary step comparative information and experience was sought, but because the surprisingly modest literature of this much discussed subject did not answer the questions in mind, a letter was sent to 14 university libraries asking for general advice and for particular details of local practice.1

The replies to the questionnaire are not subject to statistical analysis, nor do they immediately reveal any common or best pattern. From the cumulative experience, however, some generally useful information was received, and several basic principles or practices for division of the budget can perhaps be derived: (1) Centralized control over all book funds is essential to good planning. (2) Flexibility is a primary requisite of any system. (3) There should be some reasonable balance among like parts. (4) A relatively large reserve fund should be maintained for emergency buying. (5) There should be a relatively sizeable fund at the librarian’s disposal for general and interdepartmental buying. (6) There is considerable value in

a single budget for all subscriptions. (7) Separate financing for current buying and for retrospective buying may be desirable. (8) Division of funds among fields should be made with as much objectivity as possible, but common sense is probably more useful in this task than any presently known statistical formula. (9) Bases for division of the budget and results of the division should be public information, not only for the local faculty and staff but also for other librarians.

(1). It is virtually a truism that the librarian or the librarian and his advisory committee should have central control over or knowledge of all funds for book buying. Only in this way is good administrative planning possible. In the few cases where budget grants are made directly to departments it is agreed that this poses awkward problems.

The U.C.L.A. Library Committee has officially stated that it must take into account all book funds in its planning. This committee is appointed by the Academic Senate to “participate with the librarian in matters relating to the library budget, the formulation of library policies, the allocation of space, and the apportionment of funds” and to “serve as liaison between the faculty and the library administration in all matters of library policy....” A system of branch libraries reporting to the librarian has been established in very recent years, and for this reason the committee has been concerned also with book funds budgeted directly to professional schools and colleges.

(2). The need for flexibility is commonly recognized, but librarians of at least two major universities complain that they must still grapple with rigid allotments to teaching departments. A system of allocations that is frankly experimental, with regular arrangements for review and for emergency alteration during the year, as well as for necessary change from year to year, permits more ready help to new fields and more effective advantage from unusual opportunities in the book market.

The book market, particularly the anti-quarian, is hardly predictable, and the wise librarian is the one whose funds are fluid and can be shifted to meet the market. Unfortunately departmental interests are often strongly entrenched and a librarian has trouble removing long standing privilege or advantage. As one librarian replied, “A department accustomed to receiving $1500 annually feels distress if this amount is cut to $500, even though it can be shown that few books have been bought during the past year by the unit concerned, and indeed that in the present state of the book market . . . it would be impossible to spend more than $500 advantageously.” The most vicious result of course may be that some funds remain unencumbered, to revert at the end of a fiscal period, even though other funds prove inadequate.

The same librarian was disturbed by another common and bad practice whereby some departments may break the allocation down again within the department and thus permit “an undesirable hoarding on the part of individuals which matches the hoarding of the departments themselves.” Such a multiplied inflexibility can result in the inability of a solvent department to buy books in a new aspect of its field. Department politics come into play, and junior men in new areas of research or teaching have extreme difficulty getting funds even though their needs may be greater because new.

Present practice at U.C.L.A. is to notify departments or committees in July that allocations are tentative, subject to review on February 1 when overly fat allotments can be trimmed and needy ones fattened with special grants. Departments are also informed that the pattern of initial allotments in the present year will not of necessity be
followed in the next year. Fresh allocations are now made each year.

(3) As was suggested earlier, the primary value of any system of allocations is that it helps the librarian plan the growth of his book collections from year to year. Some librarians who make no formal allotments, do keep record of expenditures by subject divisions in order at least to keep track of developments. There is a common pragmatic approach which says that funds should be turned over readily to active departments and the weak ones let lag behind. This is the “squeaking wheel” principle which is of course easy to accede to, but carried too far this principle removes from the librarian any moral obligation for assuring a well-rounded collection or for planning beyond the present. One librarian representing an extremist, but fortunately minority, point of view replied that “Unfortunately, some of our library schools have befuddled the thinking of college librarians and there are many . . . who think it is their responsibility to select books. This is presumptuous.” More frequently however it is apparently assumed that the librarian should take a strong part in assuring balanced growth. The failure of a weak department to buy, even for a few years, can cripple the work of other departments and result in permanent gaps in the collections. As another and more vigorous respondent said, “Obviously, research in almost any science will depend upon strong collections in related fields.” Some respect for balance among allotments in related fields will help keep this problem under control.

The new system at U.C.L.A. sets up a sequence of six quite arbitrary levels of allotments (i.e. $100, $300, $650, $1000, $1500, $2000). Some attention is then given to keeping related fields with comparable book needs in the same category even when other factors, such as size of faculty, etc., might suggest otherwise.

(4) There was virtually complete agreement among all queried that a sizeable amount of the budget should be retained as a reserve fund to use for emergency opportunities or for expensive or en bloc purchases. Several librarians strongly urged this case. Said one, “If the library wants to be in a position to provide a maximum amount of assistance . . . it is essential that a substantial portion of the book appropriation be reserved and not allocated to teaching departments.” Replied another, “I should strongly recommend that whatever you do, you maintain a sizeable fund for bloc purchases, making long-range planning possible.”

This aspect of budgeting has been of particular importance at U.C.L.A. because as a young library (founded 1919) it still has particular need for back files of journals and can advantageously make bulk purchases without undue concern about duplication. Consequently, the Library Committee has traditionally held a large sum in reserve each year. The only recent alteration has been to make the reserve fund more fluid. In the past each purchase against the reserve fund had to be voted on by the whole committee. Faculty committees are notoriously difficult to assemble, and polling by telephone is suspect because of inadequate discussion. Consequently many rare opportunities to buy journal sets in the open market were lost through delayed action. Recently, therefore, a second series of allocations has been made in addition to those for regular book purchases. These funds, locally called “free sets funds,” are given in original amounts of $300 each to nearly every department. The department may then on its own initiative, subject only to the librarian’s agreement, spend this money for back journal files or other expensive purchases. Its funds expended, the department may call on the
committee's reserve. This allocation also is subject to review on February 1. As a result of this flexibility we have had far greater luck in the antiquarian market. Moreover, there is somewhat more assurance that all fields will share equally; at least the opportunity is clear.

(5). With equal unanimity it was agreed that the librarian should have disposition of a fairly generous sum to buy books of general interest or books that fall between fields. At least two librarians particularly advised that this aspect of the budget should be strengthened and small allocations made to departments.

Present practice at U.C.L.A. is to direct 10 per cent of the whole budget toward this end and to amplify this amount with any extra funds available at the February reviewing period.

(6). The response to the questionnaire generally supported also the Wilson and Tauber report that "The funds for periodicals [and] continuations . . . , unlike those for books, are usually treated together as part of the general library budget instead of being allocated among the various university departments." This approach is important because of the many omnibus learned journals and because the library policy toward continuing subscriptions needs to be consistent.

The evidence thus gained was sufficiently strong to effect a change at U.C.L.A. to the use of a general budget for subscriptions.

(7). Librarians of several of the larger libraries pointed out that allotments to departments are intended to cover only books currently published in the various fields, not older materials. Retrospective buying is then financed by special grants. The advantages of this approach are that special attention is given to the vital task of keeping currently abreast of publication and that the filling in of gaps can be effected on a planned and systematic basis.

The matter is under serious consideration at U.C.L.A. where there is always violent strain to make the budget cover both current books and the seemingly endless need for older materials that is a heightened problem in a young institution.

Although there is not a strict separation of current from retrospective buying, there is regular provision for grants to finance special projects. In some cases these provide for general or interdepartmental needs, as for folklore and the history of science. In others they are intended to strengthen weak or neglected aspects of a general subject area. Thus attention can be given to the needs of an instructor brought in to teach new courses, or a department intending to commence doctoral work can bring its book collections up to standards agreed on by the graduate dean and the librarian.

(8). Some of the most interesting of recent writing on this whole subject is in the Coney and Ellsworth discussions of the possible use of mathematical formulae. Both writers marshal information on the various factors capable of statistical analysis, such as size and maturity of the faculty, research activity, number of students in various grades, etc. Much useful information can be secured by this method, and the use of even partial formulae can help to break up a solidified status quo. The present conclusion of these discussions, however, is that the major factors are still unknowns and that the weighting of factors brings a large amount of subjectivity into even this type of approach. Among the
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Use of Punched Cards in Acquisition Work: Experience at Illinois

Mr. Brown is acquisition librarian, University of Illinois Library.

After six months of study of various punched card systems, the University of Illinois Library at Urbana adopted Keysort cards for its acquisition records. Now that the system has been in operation for three months it is possible to make a preliminary survey of its advantages and disadvantages over the previous system.

This study of procedures was made with the hope of finding some solution to problems caused by necessary increases in salaries and the critical shortage of personnel. Mechanization of routine operations as far as possible to increase efficiency seemed to be the best answer. The adoption of the Keysort system was the result, and it is giving us the answers we want at greatly reduced costs.

The former procedure may be briefly described as follows. After the usual record searching and bibliographical identification processes were completed, a purchase order in triplicate was typed. The original copy of the purchase order was sent to the agent, the duplicate copy was filed by agent, and the triplicate copy was filed by fund. This library has over 100 different funds or allocations on which books are purchased. The list price of the book was typed on the carbon copy of the purchase order and used as the figure for setting up an encumbrance against the fund on the ledger.

Then, as invoices were received and approved, the actual cost was substituted for the estimated cost on the fund copy of the purchase order. Encumbrances were lifted from the ledger in the usual manner by canceling an amount equal to the amount of the voucher. Naturally, the actual cost rarely equaled the estimated cost exactly and therefore, a reconciliation was necessary at intervals. In order to get an accurate estimate of outstanding orders, it was necessary quarterly to examine the carbon copies of all purchase orders to find out which items had not yet been received and paid for, getting a new outstanding order figure on each fund, and effecting the necessary reconciliation on the ledger. This was a time consuming process and was a bottleneck in getting bills paid.

The main disadvantages to the old system were:

1. The process of checking off the invoices against a copy of the purchase order was time consuming and cumbersome.
2. Considerable time was involved in filing the carbon copies of the purchase order by fund.
3. It was not possible to have invoices paid in the usual 30-day period.
4. No effective follow-up system on purchase orders was possible.
5. There was no way to clear the deadwood from the outstanding orders file.
6. There was no way to bring together all the order cards on a particular fund or all the order cards for items ordered from a particular agent.
The McBee Company's Keysort cards seemed adaptable to procedures which would abolish these disadvantages at a reasonable cost and without disturbing the size of the file. Therefore a Keysort card was designed specifically to give us the information desired. This new order card, reproduced at right, is used as follows:

(1) An order card is made for each title to be purchased.
(2) The usual searching and verification is done and the fund and agent are stamped on the order card.
(3) The purchase order is typed and the date ordered and the purchase order number are stamped on the card.
(4) A clerk codes the card by the numerical code for author, fund, agent and date ordered. In addition, if the order is rush, the hole marked A is slotted. If the order is from a foreign country, the hole marked B is slotted.
(5) The card is filed in the orders and receipts file to await receipt of the book.
(6) When the book and invoice are received the date of bill and cost are entered on the card, and the date received is stamped by the accession clerk.
(7) The field which had previously been coded for date ordered is now coded for date received.
(8) The accession clerk also slots the hole marked "Part" if the order is only partially completed or "Com" if the order is completed.
(9) The card is refiled in the orders and receipts file and remains there until the book is cataloged.
(10) When the book has been cataloged the order card is pulled and placed in the dead file.

With this new system it is possible at any time to pull out the cards ordered on a particular fund. For that reason it is no longer necessary to go through the process of checking off the invoice against the copy of the purchase order. Now, as soon as the invoice is approved, it is entered as a disbursement in the ledger and paid.

In order to take care of the reconciliation of actual costs with estimated costs at the end of each quarter of the fiscal year, all the cards in the orders and receipts file are rearranged by fund, the items received are eliminated, and the remaining cards consist of orders which are still outstanding. In order to get the new figure of outstanding orders it is necessary only to add up the list prices from the cards on each fund and correct the ledger accordingly. At the completion of that process the cards are rearranged alphabetically by using the author code.

By sorting by date ordered, it is possible to follow up orders at any desired interval. At the present time we are following up rush orders on a 30-day basis, domestic non-rush orders on a 60-day basis and foreign orders on a 6-month basis. It is very simple to drop out all the orders placed during a designated month, eliminate those which have been received and write claim letters on the remainder.

The only disadvantage to the present system, discovered so far, is that it requires the disarrangement of the orders and receipts file for approximately two days every three months. This is not considered serious.

Some figures concerning the time required in this process may be of interest. Time records were kept carefully for a three-month period. It requires an average...
Precataloging—
A Must for the Modern Library

Mr. Dewey, formerly head cataloger, John Crerar Library, is a student at the Graduate Library School, University of Chicago.

"WHY IS THE cataloging so slow?"
This is a question that has been repeated for many years. In the public library, the few books that stay in the catalog department only a few days are still too slow in reaching a demanding public. In the college library (as elsewhere) many books may remain on the shelves for months awaiting Library of Congress cards. In the research library, where many titles are in foreign languages and where costs are extremely high, speed—except for "rush" or "haste" titles—is generally nonexistent. Even the rush books take 24 hours. There are no L.C. cards for too many titles. The filing gets behind. Staff shortages play havoc with schedules. Large and unexpected gifts slow up the process still more.

Temporary cataloging has been advocated as a solution for this problem, and is undertaken in the case of some of the more important titles in many libraries. Generally, however, even temporary cataloging shows up in the card catalog only after days or weeks. This is due principally to the fact that permanent classification and shelflisting of the volumes are usually parts of the "temporary" process, making it necessary for the cataloger to examine the books themselves. This slows up the process. When temporary cataloging is undertaken as rush work it is a nonroutinized activity and therefore unduly expensive. Any rush work is expensive; what is needed instead is a simple system that is fast and cheap. If temporary cataloging is to solve our problems it must be cheap enough to be applied to all titles.

Within the next few years most of our large libraries will be obliged to install modern temporary or precataloging systems. The time has long been with us when fast temporary cataloging was needed by our readers, and the time has now come when they have the right to demand and expect it. There is no reason why a reader desiring to know what new books on television are in the library should find the catalog to be a month behind in listing these books.

Why should a reader studying the effects of the Taft-Hartley Act on our economic system not have the new book received yesterday instead of the one published two months ago? If the library acquired the second edition of Frear's Chemistry of Insecticides and Fungicides yesterday, why should a reader be forced to use the first edition? If we acquired Uhlenbruck's Die Herzkrankheiten two months ago, why should the Reference Department have to borrow it on interlibrary loan from Yale? Or why should a professor have to submit an order card for a certain new book because it isn't in the catalog, only to receive a note several days later saying that it was there all the time? Why should an order librarian search the card catalog for 12 titles only to discover in the outstanding orders file that four of them are already on order, and in the "received but not cata-
loged” file that four more are already in the library? Why should not the public catalog give all this information? That it does already in several large libraries, among them John Crerar and the libraries of Rochester and Virginia universities, is a sign that other libraries can be equally responsive to the needs of their patrons. It is the purpose of this article to pass along the experience of the John Crerar Library in providing temporary cataloging for all of its books.

In December 1946 the Crerar catalog department decided to work through the medium of fast temporary cataloging toward a system of fast permanent cataloging. It was decided that temporary cataloging should appear in the catalog in a matter of hours instead of days after books arrive; that when the temporary cataloging could be left as permanent cataloging, that would be fast cataloging; and that when inadequate temporary cataloging had to be replaced it should be done with speed and efficiency.

The last two goals are still a long way off, but the progress toward them that results from the achievement of the first is encouraging. Like so many libraries having official catalogs, Crerar has always provided temporary cataloging of a sort in its catalog. Through 1946 this consisted of a temporary card, copied from the original order card, which showed that the title was on order (it being necessary to check the file of outstanding orders, which consisted of the order cards themselves, to determine whether or not the book had actually arrived). As soon as the book was cataloged and assigned a call number, the call number was written on this card in the official catalog so that the book could be located in the stacks if desired. About four weeks later the printed card replaced the temporary card.

Since this temporary card was a carbon copy of the Library of Congress card order it seemed entirely within the realm of possibility to type an extra carbon for filing into the public catalog. But whether or not this was a desirable procedure was another question. What problems would phone and telautograph calls by delivery departments for uncataloged books bring to a harassed cataloging department whose backlog was growing by leaps and bounds? Yet the very fact of a growing backlog made it all the more imperative to make these books available to readers by some sort of temporary cataloging. And since a temporary card was provided in the official catalog for the staff it seemed logical to provide one for the public.

Consequently in January 1947 the catalog department began to file temporary cards into its public catalogs and began to assign to all new titles, at the time of ordering, a serial number called a temporary call number, by which the books would be shelved in the department until they were cataloged and shelflisted, and which would be used by readers asking at the delivery desks for these books. In order to assign this number in advance of ordering, the catalog department added, to the group of “three by five” slips it was typing, a temporary slip for the public catalog, and a slip for a control file to be arranged by the temporary call number. The control file showed whether or not the book had arrived and, if so, whether it was still waiting in the catalog department, or had been given to a particular cataloger, or had gone to the stacks under a permanent call number. A clerk was hired to circulate the books from the catalog department in response to telephone and telautograph requests and to fill a need for more assistance at the shelflist with what time remained.

The system worked well from the beginning. It was possible to file the pre-typed temporary slips in the public catalogs.
within a matter of a few hours or less after the arrival of books in the order department, since they needed to have nothing done to them. Circulation has been at a brisk rate and averages around 100 titles weekly. A special form is inserted in each book circulated, giving the name of the cataloger or location to which the book should be returned. Any cards in the book are retained in the catalog department as a charge. Each book is plated or stamped with ownership marks before being circulated. An experiment involving the filing of slips into the medical department catalog at the time of ordering the book has proved successful, with advantages for readers and reference staff alike, who seem to prefer to know that a book is on order than to find no mention of it in the catalog at all.3 This slip is not marked when the book has arrived.

In the summer of 1947 steps were taken to transfer the system to continuous Kantslip Standard Register multiple carbon forms. These forms, now in use, provide a number of advantages over the old “three by five” slips of paper and carbons. They come in continuous strips of 1000 copies, perforated to tear to “three by five” size, and eliminate the time formerly wasted in manually assembling the sets of slips and carbons. Used in the electric typewriter, they provide six clear carbon copies. A set of forms consists of the dealer’s purchase order; Library of Congress card order; control copy (perforated every fourth slip to serve also as an order book showing date of receipt, bill payment record, cost, and permanent call number); temporary author cards for official and public catalogs; a temporary slip for a special public subject catalog arranged by the first two figures of the Dewey Decimal Classification (assigned at time of ordering), thus providing an immediate subject approach to all new titles; and a card, of stiff paper, that stands visible in the book while it is shelved in the catalog department. This is used to charge the book to the delivery department for loans, and later stands in the shelflist to hold the call number until the printed card is filed. The cost of these forms is about two cents per title.

For requesting free material that is to be permanently cataloged, a special set of forms was obtained. These employ in place of the dealer’s purchase order a special “Request for Free Material” slip which has thus far successfully secured a high proportion of the materials solicited. One of the carbon forms in this set is used to acknowledge receipt of materials.

A third set of forms, lacking the purchase order form, is used as temporary cataloging for unsolicited gifts.

From the point of view of readers and reference staff the great advantages of the system lie in knowing whether any given book is in the library or on order, what new books in various subject groups are in the library, and in being able to secure such books with normal speed through the normal delivery channels. Let us see what advantages there are for the processing staff.

Because these forms provide author and subject cataloging from the moment of arrival of books in the library (or before) without any effort on the part of the catalogers, they eliminate the need for rush and haste cataloging of all materials except reference books. The “waiting” shelves in the catalog department have thus become a stack area adjacent to the department, directly after a similar copy in the order forms used by Columbia University Libraries.
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thus making the department itself a work room instead of a storage room.4

The arrangement of books in a single numerical sequence makes it possible to locate quickly any uncataloged materials not yet in the hands of the cataloger. This need has been described by Dorothy E. Chamberlain as "one of the problems of a large cataloging department" in the opening sentence of her article "In-process Records,"5 and forms the basis for her subsequent discussion. Miss Chamberlain advocates the "in-process catalog" as the solution to this problem, vetoing "the ideal method [of putting] a temporary card in the public catalog for every title" on the grounds of its involving "considerable time and money [and possibly not being] worthwhile." It is the assignment of the serial number to the temporary cards and the arrangement of the books by this serial number that make the temporary card system superior to the separate in-process catalog. Its cost as an extra carbon is negligible, and the filing cost is certainly low enough to be worth while. The adoption of the system by large cataloging departments will make possible the elimination of the expensive "in-process catalog." The alphabetical function of the latter will be assumed by the public catalog,6 and its locating function by the numerical control record. This latter record makes it possible for the order department to release all books to the temporary stack immediately, without waiting for bills, etc.

For fiscal reasons this record must be kept in the order department. However, even in libraries where order and catalog departments are not in close proximity to one another and possibly not even on the same floor, the numerical control record would not have to be duplicated or even supplemented in the catalog department. Assuming that delivery personnel have access to the temporary stack, the control record need be consulted only for material not in place there. At such times it would show either nonreceipt, name of cataloger or permanent call number. To enable the control record to show this information it is necessary only that all catalogers' requests for materials be routed via the control record. The recording of the cataloger's name constitutes a charge canceled automatically by the recording of a permanent call number in the control record.

The catalog department benefits tremendously by limiting the amount of material sent to each cataloger to what he can catalog promptly. The cataloger is no longer faced with the task of sorting, organizing and selecting from masses of material, and the time formerly spent in doing this is available for cataloging. As the books are received in the catalog department their order cards are filed in a "Library of Congress orders out file" (in the case of unsolicited gifts, the forms are typed first) until the order is returned by the Library of Congress. The order cards with the L.C. order slips are marked by the head cataloger with the initials of the cataloger to whom the title is to be cataloged, or justified the withholding of temporary cards to the stacks following arrival in the order department, to be called up and charged to the individual cataloger when desired.

In libraries having official catalogs, the alphabetical function of the "in-process catalog" will be assumed by both the official and public catalogs, for no library can any longer deprive its clientele of books just because they have not been permanently cataloged and classified, or justify the withholding of temporary cards from the public while at the same time providing them for the use of the staff. Some observers of the system in use at the John Crerar Library have argued that Crerar can very well afford to publicize "uncataloged" books because it, as a research library, does not lend books to its readers but circulates them inside the building. A more mature opinion would hold that any library whose policy is to circulate its books should be happy to circulate them as soon as possible. If prompt "permanent cataloging," whose ultimate purpose is to circulate books, is not immediately neces-
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4 It would be possible to transfer the books now in these temporary stacks to the main stack area. This would mean that all new titles would be sent directly to the stacks following arrival in the order department, to be called up and charged to the individual cataloger when desired.

5 College and Research Libraries 7:335-8, October 1946.

6 In libraries having official catalogs, the alphabetical function of the "in-process catalog" will be assumed by both the official and public catalogs, for no library can any longer deprive its clientele of books just because they have not been permanently cataloged and classified, or justify the withholding of temporary cards from the public while at the same time providing them for the use of the staff. Some observers of the system in use at the John Crerar Library have argued that Crerar can very well afford to publicize "uncataloged" books because it, as a research library, does not lend books to its readers but circulates them inside the building. A more mature opinion would hold that any library whose policy is to circulate its books should be happy to circulate them as soon as possible. If prompt "permanent cataloging," whose ultimate purpose is to circulate books, is not immediately neces-
assigned. A clerk then takes these cards to the control file in the order department and records the date and the cataloger’s initials. The clerk then delivers the books to the cataloger.

At the Crerar, assignments of titles to catalogers are made on the basis of difficulty, form or language, as subject work is done by the classification department. In a library whose descriptive and subject work is done by the same cataloger the assignment of titles would of course be carried out principally on a subject basis. The head cataloger selects daily order cards for only as many titles as he feels can be cataloged promptly by each cataloger. When more orders are returned from L.C. than can be promptly cataloged, the less important ones are filed into a deferred file from which assignments are made later when more time is available. Occasionally this deferred file is checked against the L.C. Cumulative Catalog to secure L.C. card numbers for those titles whose \( Np \) status has changed at the Library of Congress.

When an L.C. card has been obtained, all necessary added entries\(^{7}\) are verified in advance of distributing the order cards to the catalogers. Consequently when the cataloger receives the book all he needs to do is check it with the L.C. card for accuracy and pass it on to the classification department. Where no L.C. card has been obtained, no advance verification of added entries is undertaken for the cataloger, so that while the cataloger himself does as much advance work as possible before sending for the book, it does remain at his desk longer than if an L.C. card had accompanied the order card. However, the interval is still so brief that it has seemed unnecessary to show in the control record the name of the cataloger, and this is no longer done.

\(^{7}\) The order department systematically indicates the results of its searching of main entries on all order cards.

A similar system is in operation at the Yale University Library where deferred classes of material, especially gifts, go to a numerically arranged stack in an experiment recently reported by Dorothy F. Livingston.\(^{8}\) Miss Livingston states that the procedure has enabled the department to clear up nearly all the back work in every class. She attributed this to systematic organization whereby the cataloger’s desk is not choked with materials, and to the resultant increase in efficiency and morale. At Yale the numerical system is applied only to deferred titles after arrival in the catalog department. Our experience at Crerar demonstrates that to achieve maximum benefits it should be applied to all titles and as early in the processing routine as possible. Even for the new books that are promptly cataloged there is bound to be a period of one or more weeks during which they are not represented in the catalog if temporary or precataloging is not applied. However, we say “amen” to Miss Livingston’s findings. We have almost forgotten what it is like to be personally surrounded by a mass of printed matter, but what memory remains is decidedly unpleasant. We feel no nostalgia for the days when there was a wild scramble for the uncataloged book for which some reader had had the temerity to ask.

At the expense of holding slips out of the temporary subject file of new books for a day or two, it has been found advantageous at Crerar to circulate these slips to the reference staff before filing, so that they may see the titles of all new books received in the library. However, temporary author cards go into the catalog without delay.

One of the many minor advantages of the system is the ease with which delayed Library of Congress order slips can be...
disposed of. These of course bear the printed temporary call number, and when no order card is found for them in the L.C. orders out file, they are immediately checked against the control record which usually shows that the title has already been cataloged, disposed of as a duplicate, incorporated into a series, etc. Before the numerical control was established it was necessary to leave a special dummy in the L.C. orders out file indicating what had happened to the order card.

The system as adopted at Crerar offers many possibilities for expansion in new directions. It has been extended to current periodicals shelved in the periodical reading room, so that a catalog entry is available for all new periodicals. A special symbol is typed preceding the temporary call number on the set of forms, and a reader presenting a number so prefixed is directed to the periodical reading room. The typing of temporary periodical entries was formerly a separate operation. When a periodical volume is finally sent to the catalog department for cataloging it may be located by its temporary call number.

The catalog department is now considering extending the system to vertical file material for which those in charge of the vertical files feel that there is some possibility that full cataloging may eventually be desirable. Until the final decision is made, the temporary entries, with "VF" prefixed to the number, will enable readers to locate desired pamphlets, and will prevent the ordering of duplicates. When a final decision is made to catalog fully, the material will go through the normal routines without further ado.

In pursuit of the second goal, we note that some of the temporary cataloging entries are so satisfactory that we wish they could stand permanently, especially for materials for which subject shelving is of no special importance. This is true for practically all materials at Crerar where the stacks are closed to everyone. It is probably true for at least a part of the collections of every library. Why should not some of the more specialized materials, some of those in foreign languages destined to be used infrequently, stand on the shelves in serial order?

The most valid objection to letting the temporary cataloging stand for some titles is the thinness of the paper stock of the temporary slips. So far no method of reproducing stiff cards in adequate quantity at a single typing has been turned up. It is always necessary to both type and reproduce; only with the multiple carbon forms are the typing and reproduction accomplished simultaneously. There is no question but that the slips are too flimsy for permanent use or that their number is inadequate for added and subject entries. Heliograph, Mimeograph, Duplimat, and similar processes offer the most hope for stiff permanent cards, but the catalog administrator must be certain that a high enough percentage of titles would be left permanently on this "temporary cataloging" and shelved by serial number to compensate for the extra time spent in multiple reproduction as against the time saved by the multiple carbon method. The writer feels that when administrators are willing to shelve parts of their collections serially on permanent "precataloged" cards the day of fast cataloging will be here. The day of fast (and cheap) temporary cataloging is here now.
To­ward a Sound National Program in Cataloging

By BEVERLEY RUFFIN

In current library literature, reference is made to three phases of cataloging history: The period which precedes the turn of the nineteenth century; the middle period, embracing the first four decades of the twentieth century; and the period since 1941.

The Early Period: The Librarian as Cataloger

The early period falls roughly into two parts: A pioneer period, extending to 1876, when institutional practices were in the process of a slow evolution, and the period from 1876 to 1908, during which time everything in the profession, including cataloging techniques, was being organized and codified for the mutual benefit of practicing librarians. This period was so full of vitality, so overflowing with conflicting ideas, so realistic in its approach to ideas greatly conceived and executed that it has been labeled the romantic age in the history of American librarianship.

In both the pioneer period and this romantic period we find the library administrator as cataloger. In the earlier period the listing of books was a minor activity in this librarian's daily routine. It represented a means to the accomplishment of some library objective. At Harvard the first catalog, published in 1723, was for the purpose of acquainting certain prospective donors in London with the book holdings in the infant college in the colony of Massachusetts. The primary object of this catalog was the acquisition of books. At Yale the first catalog, dated 1745, was compiled because the new head of the college saw "that the students were deprived of much benefit and advantage of the library, for want of a proper catalogue of books." This catalog was dedicated "To the students of Yale College," so that they might "readily know and find any book, upon any particular subject." The sole object of this catalog was to meet the needs of the college student.

By 1876 librarians had developed a lively interest in cataloging. The activities of the newly organized American Library Association centered on such technical subjects as the analytic indexing of periodical literature, the classification of books in libraries, the relative merits of book and card catalogs, and the perfecting of Cutter's Rules for a Dictionary Catalog. Under the impetus of the new movement, administrative heads became expert technicians. Cataloging had emerged not only as a major activity in librarianship, but was a major field of emphasis in the professional activities of the library administrative heads.

Soon after the turn of the century, this constructive phase in the history of cataloging reached its peak. Cutter's Rules had gone through four editions; and the Ameri-
can Library Association had published its *Catalog Rules* and List of Subject Headings.* Centralized cataloging at the Library of Congress was underway, and the classification schedules and the standardized subject headings used in this national institution were becoming accessible to libraries throughout the country. Administrative heads assumed less and less responsibility for the cataloging activity of their libraries, many of which by this time had become functionally organized. In the words of Charles A. Cutter, the golden age of cataloging with its challenging difficulties and exhilarating discussions was over, and a great change was to come upon the status of cataloging in the United States.  

Cutter’s prophecy came true. The printed codes on the techniques of cataloging, which had been produced since 1876, brought about a demand for a body of specialists, skilled in the manipulation of these techniques. The burden of the cataloging activity was assigned to these specialists, and the narrow concept of cataloging as the process of preparing entries for a card catalog slowly crystallized.

Since such importance thus became attached to catalog entries for books, it is only right that we should have some knowledge of their technical evolution. Before 1876 we find that the character of cataloging was peculiar to individual institutions. The early history of cataloging was therefore a history of local developments. The compiler of a book catalog was free to choose his own set of rules. Individuality in catalog entries thus held its own against the day of catalog codes, and uniformity had yet to be achieved.

In their early manifestations cataloging techniques were crude and rough, but they were plastic. Evolution was thus possible.

The instrument through which their development can be traced is the printed book catalog. In a study of the early book catalogs of Harvard and Yale the writer traced a series of representative catalog entries through 150 years of parallel development in cataloging techniques. These entries were checked insofar as possible in consecutive catalogs for fullness of entry as to author’s name, title, imprint and physical description. Added entries (including subject entries), as well as related cross references, were also considered. The entry for Plutarch’s *Lives*, for example, was traced through 66 college and society catalogs, dating from 1723 to 1873. The data resulting from such a study give evidence to the historical evolution of cataloging theory. A definite body of principles had emerged by 1876, and a demand for specific and uniform rules followed.

In answer to this demand the British Museum had published as early as 1841, along with its *Catalogue of Printed Books*, its *Rules for the Compilation of the Catalogue*. These rules came into print again in 1866. They continued, however, to be local in their purpose and in their application.

In the meantime, in 1853, Charles C. Jewett, librarian of the Smithsonian Institution, published his report *On the Construction of Catalogues of Libraries*. Although based on the practices in use at the Smithsonian Institution, this manual had the distinction of being published for the express purpose of assisting librarians in the compiling of printed catalogs. The
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*Jewett, Charles C. *On the Construction of Catalogues of Libraries*. 2d ed., 1853. The first edition, printed in 1852, was limited to a few copies which were distributed among those likely to suggest improvements.*
science of cataloging was thus groping toward uniformity on a national scale. The complete divorce from the institutional point of view came about in 1876 with the publication of Cutter's *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalog*. In his preface Mr. Cutter presents this publication as a first attempt to investigate the principles of cataloging and to set forth the rules in a systematic way. Thus our so-called theory of cataloging was born, and put into use by means of "settled rules of action." Even so, the leaders in the profession for yet another quarter-century centered their major attention on the perfecting of cataloging rules and other techniques having to do with the cataloging and classification of books. These efforts culminated in 1908 in the publication of the A.L.A.'s *Catalog Rules*.

The Middle Period, 1908-1941: The Technical Specialist as Cataloger

If the golden age of cataloging was over by the turn of the century, what took place from that time until the beginning of the 1940's? What happened in the first four decades of the present century? What implications lie in the fact that this middle period was ushered in with the publishing of the first edition of the A.L.A.'s *Catalog Rules*, and that it was set for a knockout blow coincident with the appearance of the second edition of these same cataloging rules? Answers to such questions can be found only if one is familiar with the characteristics of the era under discussion. What are these characteristics? Attention may be called to three which are deemed to be of primary importance.

We shall note first that this middle era was a period of productivity in cataloging. Bibliographical machinery for the proper cataloging of books had been set up for action by 1908. Full time specialists directed by master technicians were put to work. Department heads organized the routine of their operations. Card catalogs resulted: trays of cards, cabinets of trays, and acres of catalog cabinets. Duplicate card catalogs appeared: official, for the use of the staff; departmental, for the convenience of seminar groups; union, to show different institutional holdings. The millions of catalog cards, which were being processed by typewriters, by varied kinds of mimeographing equipment and by printing presses, were also the sources of information for shelves of printed catalogs, indexes and bibliographies.

The A.L.A.'s *Catalog Rules* had to be supplemented by codes for the cataloging of periodicals and for serials. Codes were issued for music and for maps. L. C. classification schedules multiplied. The Dewey decimal system changed its mathematical symmetry to ragged outlines resembling those of a giant amoeba. Lists of subject headings also multiplied: supplements to those used at the Library of Congress; new editions of the same; a subject heading list for pedagogical materials, another for chemistry, and still another for physics—all striving to keep up with the jargon of a fast moving social and academic milieu.

Unable to discard its obsolete parts and staggering under increased size and weight, card catalogs nevertheless have rendered a remarkable service. These catalogs, varying in size from a single tray to hundreds of cabinets, are evidence that productivity was a marked characteristic of this period.

Classicism was a second characteristic of this period. It was Andrew H. Osborn who first applied this term to cataloging. By classicism Dr. Osborn means that the making of card catalogs was regulated by a body of technical rules. Simplicity in the application of these rules seemingly gave way to elaborate and highly compli-
icated technical procedures. Therein lies the danger. Yet it has been said that, insofar as cataloging is concerned, every rule grew out of a definite need, either brought forward by the users of the catalog or else inherent in the complex character of the processing machinery. Be that as it may, it might well be agreed that only by adherence to uniform rules for cataloging well-defined types of materials was the mass production of catalog records made possible during those 40 years. Mass production of any sort rarely takes place without sacrificing quality; it also does not cater to individual tastes or needs. It was the mass production of L.C. cards, therefore, with their apparently needless elaboration of technical detail, that brought on a storm of protest. Jewett's program for a national standard had overshot the mark. As a consequence the interests of the individual institution were obscured and neglected.

There were other destructive forces at work. In institutions where authority had been placed above reason, decadence had set in. Such a condition inevitably stifled the professional growth of the individual cataloger. Protest against an authority based on prestige rather than on ability and sound judgment often took the form of inertia, with morale dropping to a low ebb. Destructive elements obtaining from such situations can hardly be gauged solely from the evidence found on catalog cards. The results were far more detrimental in their total effect.

Decadence also resulted from a management which was divorced from administration. By this I mean that the manager of the catalog department, i.e. the head of the department, was not in a true sense an administrative officer in the library. The head of the department was a catalog librarian, not an assistant librarian. He, or she, was delegated to look inward at the cataloging processes. The welfare of the library, with its social implications, was other people's business. Thus the catalog librarian's allegiance was fostered on the department rather than attached to the library as a whole. There was little chance to discuss library policies and less chance to act on them. There was no contact with governing officials over and above the head librarian, whose position thus took the form of a complete bottleneck between two groups. The department head was forced to view his product from the inside. Having more often than not come up from the ranks as a technician, he took on the activities of a manager without the privileges and attributes of an administrative officer. Such an organizational pattern increased the dangers inherent in an age of classicism.

A third major characteristic of the period from 1908 to 1941 was an excess of raw material. Cataloging machinery could not absorb the unforeseen avalanche of material on hand to be processed. In his "Memoranda on Library Cooperation," Herbert A. Kellar spoke of this material as a tidal wave which threatened to inundate the library world. He noted that almost 500,000 items, excluding manuscript, were received in 1940 at the Library of Congress. This institution, according to a report made by Lucile Morsch in 1941, was cataloging at a rate of 53,000 titles a year. An annual arrearage of 30,000, reported for this library at that time seems an understatement in the face of such figures. In other research libraries of the country, the situation at the Library of Congress was more or less duplicated. The impact resulting from such conditions affected the tempo in libraries of every sort. The crisis in cataloging had arrived.


The Renaissance in Cataloging History, 1941-

Thus we see that at the end of four decades of intensive activity, librarians suffered their first great defeat in their effort to supply a complete catalog record for all printed materials of nationally recognized importance. Whose was the blame? Of the large functional groups within the profession, the catalogers, in the very wealth of their handiwork, had supplied the most concrete source of evidence for examination as to work effectiveness. With the critical eye of the profession already ferreting out case after case in which catalogers had shown a lack of judgment in the making of catalog cards, a veritable storm of protest against the rules themselves broke loose with the publication in 1941 of the new edition of the A.L.A. Catalog Rules. This storm had long been gathering. Indeed it was pretty well under way by 1941. The battle cry was sounded by Dr. Osborn in his description of the “Crisis in Cataloging,” and the publication of the new rules simply marks the turning point in a controversy in which catalogers caught the blame. Catalogers, before and after this turning point, faced a barrage of destructive criticism largely from administrative officers and other noncataloging librarians, few of whom acknowledged any share of responsibility for the impending crisis. Not only was the cataloger as a person isolated and stigmatized, but the catalog itself was ridiculed and avoided. In the discussions which appeared in print, the inevitable foibles of classicism were exposed. The cataloger’s attempts to defend his position often revealed his narrowed point of view and showed his curtailed powers in setting up the very cataloging policies for which he was being held responsible.

More recently a phase of constructive criticism has predominated the scene. Administrative and reference librarians are admitting a share of the responsibility for the crisis. Catalogers themselves have engaged in an analysis of their procedures in an effort to sift the wheat from the chaff. One notable effort of this type is Julia Pettee’s article in the Catalogers’ and Classifiers’ Yearbook for 1945, in which she considers the basic principles of our author catalogs. Here she points out instances where simplification, rather than complexity, has been achieved. An example in case is the use of rules governing the assembling of all variants of a literary unit under the responsible personal or corporate author. Miss Pettee evaluates cataloging rules in order to estimate their worth rather than to find evidence of decay. She offers up her findings for continued use in the cataloging of books, rather than as defense machinations in a professional warfare.

In the field of administration, proposals for the reorganization of catalog departments have ranged from the combination of order and catalog department, now an accomplished fact in many libraries, to the complete elimination of the catalog department in libraries, with the idea of turning over the descriptive cataloging to the order department and the subject cataloging to the reference department. Such radical proposals as this latter one serve at least to arouse healthy, if heated, discussions of cataloging, which we must remember has in recent years been designated the profession’s number one problem.

Destructive criticism brought forth defense measures. Constructive criticism is being translated into action. A renaissance, breaking through the bonds of classicism, has caused a resurgence of ideas which are revitalizing old techniques and creating
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new ones. The Library of Congress has taken a series of important steps which should result not only in a simplification of cataloging rules, but will insure a greater degree of good judgment in their application. Any improvements in standards made at this great cataloging center will be followed by libraries throughout the country, even as some of their not so wise practices have been followed in the past. On the other hand some institutions are breaking away from L. C. practices which are not applicable to their own situations, compromising on those common elements necessary in centralized and cooperative cataloging. Many small libraries have turned to the H. W. Wilson Company for unit cards more nearly suited to their needs.

Institutional purchasing in fields of specialization, and other cooperative programs, have placed certain controls on the acquisition of library materials, even if they have not directly affected the annual increase in arrearage. The unification of order and catalog departments under a single administrative head has succeeded in eliminating certain duplication of records and in making it possible to shift personnel from one section to another according to the pressure of work. This unification has also had some effect upon the character of materials accepted for processing. As a rule catalogers have had no control over items accepted for processing. It would seem that they would take advantage of the present situation to go on the offensive for a change. Their own position in the rank and file of librarians has made them exceptionally vulnerable to attack. With arrearages accumulating on their doorsteps, no other group is in a more strategic position to secure damaging evidence concerning the admittance of items which are physically unfit and bibliographically unsound.

With the unification of cataloging and order work under the charge of an assistant librarian, an administrative hierarchy, hitherto lacking, has been created. This administrative assistant—a partner in the firm, as it were—works with the librarian in the making of library policies, turning then to cataloging as one major means of furthering the objectives which he has helped to set up for the institution as a whole. Since, however, this administrative assistant is responsible to the librarian for a group of administrative units, of which cataloging is one, he must work in close harmony with the head of each unit. If he is to contribute vitally to the best interests of the library, he must not only have the attributes of an administrator but he must also be familiar with sound theory and practice in cataloging. For much of this, he can look to the department head, who is still to be a master technician with a knowledge of such technical organization and skills as have been developed to the present time. This head of the department will continue to supervise the work of trained catalogers who will handle the bulk of the material to be processed.

Conclusion

The revolt which broke loose in 1941 has also concerned itself with the training of these catalogers. Indeed, the whole structure of education for librarianship is under revision. Fast moving changes are seen in library school catalogs and announcements. A wealth of ideas on library education is reflected in current library literature. Conferences on the subject gather in all parts of the country. At the Southern Conference on Library Education which took place in Atlanta in the spring of 1948 two alternative plans were considered: (1) whether to have one basic program suitable for the education of all beginning librarians; or (2) whether to have a curriculum

(Continued on page 235)
Microcards and Punched Card Filing

Mr. Rider is librarian, Wesleyan University.

About once a month for the last three years the writer has received a letter from someone suggesting what a splendid idea it would be to file microcards by one or another of the punched card sorting techniques. I have had to reply that the filing of microcards, or for that matter the filing of any sort of catalog cards, was not practicable by any of the punched card systems with which I was familiar, and in the case of most of these letters I tried to explain why. Since the volume of this punched-card-filing correspondence is now rather bulky, and since the subject is one that, for obvious reasons, is of considerable practical interest to librarians, it has seemed worth while to put in the record this brief discussion of it.

It must be repeated at the start that this discussion reflects only such mechanical sorting methodologies as are now in use, for around the corner there may be something so new and so different as to make mechanical catalog card filing practicable. By practicable we, of course, do not mean possible, for mechanical card filing is already possible enough. By practicable we mean more efficient.

Proponents of the mechanical filing of catalog cards have failed to realize at its full value the fact that all punched card systems were developed to be, and still are, sorting systems, not filing systems. There is a very real difference between these two words, and in this difference lies the impracticality of punched card techniques for filing. If we are faced with a file of ten million cards, divided up into a thousand or more categories, or combinations of categories, some of them consisting of a few hundred cards only, some of them containing perhaps hundreds of thousands of cards, and we want to segregate from that file any one of these categories it is obvious that we have a sorting job to do, not a filing job. By punching many holes on these ten million cards, or by intricately notching one or more of the edges, in either case according to a predetermined code, we can sort the cards mechanically.

The filing of catalog cards presents an entirely different problem. From a library catalog we never have occasion to sort out, in answer to any patron’s request, hundreds of thousands of cards. For one to want even a hundred cards at any one time under any one category (i.e., under any one author or subject heading) is an event of great rarity. Most of the time what one seeks in the catalog is one card—or two or three cards. By using present catalog methods, we may, on the average, take a minute to find that one card that we seek—granted, of course, both a well-made catalog and an intelligent searcher! On the other hand to search that one card out of the catalog mechanically, although it is something that is technically possible, is possible only at a prodigious waste of time and money. Furthermore this waste is one that mounts up in every phase of the mechanical sorting process. Let us analyze it.

First, merely as a preliminary to mechanical searching thereafter, every card that we file in our catalog must be individually
punched or notched to meet the sorting requirements of our predetermined code. I have no cost figures on this particular phase of punched card technique, but surely this item is in no sense an inconsiderable one. It is strongly to be suspected that it would be considerably more costly than the typing of the catalog card was.

Second, this punching or notching takes up an appreciable proportion of the total space on the card. Notching systems demand for themselves the exclusive use of almost one-half of the total over-all area of the card. Hole-punched systems, can in some cases, be sprinkled over the face of the card without interfering too much with its normal use: but with ordinary catalog cards such an over-all sprinkling would probably be impracticable, and with micro-cards it would certainly be. In other words, with every catalog card which is intended to be mechanically filed, a definite—and a very substantial—proportion of the total area of the card has to be allocated to notches or punch holes. If this proportion be half of the area then it means that, in the case of micro-cards, we would have to double the number of cards in our file (which means in turn doubling not only the cost of the micro-cards themselves but also the cost of the filing equipment and file space rental used by them) simply to effect—we hope—some saving in an important, but still only subsidiary, cataloging cost, i.e. card filing and searching.

We now come to a third question. Is it possible for us to codify, according to any practicable notching or punched hole system, the interminable ramifications and variations of heading which are to be found in any large dictionary catalog? Personally I doubt it.

It is one thing to have a punched hole pattern that will fish out mechanically, from a file of personal name cards, all blue-eyed males 65 years old using false teeth—or any other similar combinations of sortings that one may desire to make. But it is quite another thing to have a punched hole sorting pattern that will mechanically fish out for us, out of ten million cards, two entries under the authorship of "Frederick Alexander Stapleton, 1822-83."

It is true that permutations do quickly run into astronomical totals. It may be true that a ten million card catalog does not have more than a million different headings. Unfortunately for punched card coding systems, those million headings have a complexity of diversity that solidly defies any sort of purely numerical transliteration. Most punched card systems deal primarily with surnames. But a full-fledged dictionary catalog requires the mechanical separation not only of surnames, but of full name entries (equipped with birth and death date differentia); and the separation of these from subject headings, some of the latter as many as 12 words long and themselves coupled with numerical and symbolic differentia, from title entries each several words long, from series entries and other entries. Remember that all of these different forms of entry are now mixed in a single concatenated but minutely differentiated sequence. I would hate to be given the task of plotting a pattern of holes to unravel it.

We have not yet arrived at the fourth phase of our problem, the heart of it, the real nub of punched-card catalog card impracticability. All mechanical sorting systems demand that all the cards involved in a given sorting process be removed from their drawers and run through some kind of a sorting machine. This machine may be the simplest sort of gadget imaginable (in one system a long steel needle suffices to do the trick). Or it may be a very complicated electrical contraption, equipped with all sorts of counting, tabulating, throw out, and cross-checking devices. All these
devices have, however, as their common denominator the above stated demand for removal. And it is this demand for removal that finally throws out, as impracticable, all mechanical methods of catalog card searching.

Let’s take a specific example. You as a reference librarian are asked to ascertain if your library possesses a copy of Pennsylvania Genera of Permian Brachiopoda by one William Selzer. Which process for the answering of this question is the easier one? To do what you do now, i.e. to go to your ten million card catalog and to look in it, under the author entry, “Selzer, William,” for a title beginning “Pennsylvania Genera?” Or to resort to a mechanical searching process, which means to take all of your catalog’s ten million cards out of their ten thousand catalog drawers and to run them through a mechanical sorting machine (then putting them back into their drawers again) until finally the machine comes to that one “William Selzer” card that you are looking for, and is automatically thrown out for your inspection? The answer is obvious.

Not so obvious at first glance, however, are a host of additional collateral difficulties.

We must remember for one thing that a large library catalog is usually servicing not one card searcher but a dozen—or a hundred—searchers simultaneously. If each one of these hundred searchers is to be mechanically served, it is clear that not one but a hundred sorting machines are going to be required, working simultaneously to find for each patron the single card—or the two or three cards—that each one wants. But for each patron (with ten million cards to be gone through) the automatic searching process is clearly going to be a matter of hours, taking the handling time of dozens of library attendants, and creating an enormous confusion of cards and files simultaneously going through the machine searching routine.

Finally, fifth, what of the physical wear and tear on your cards if they are going to be run constantly through these sorting machines? Obviously this running through is going to involve a certain amount of card erosion.

All of which would seem to sum up to this: that mechanical card filing applied to library card catalogs sounds appealing, but as yet cannot be deemed a practicable proposition.

National Program in Cataloging

(Continued from page 232)

for each type of librarianship—school, public and college or university. Insofar as cataloging is concerned, are there not lessons to be learned from the past? Since Jewett’s time have we not got rather far away from the institutional point of view? In the brief account here presented of certain phases of cataloging history, we have learned that the institutional point of view prevailed in the pioneer period of cataloging history, that it steadily lost ground after 1876, and that since 1908 it has been overwhelmed by a national pattern in card production—a pattern which has been actually detrimental to the welfare of some institutions. In the present renaissance in cataloging history, we hope that the cataloging interests of all types of libraries will find an adequate niche in a sound national program.

The Divided Catalog in College and University Libraries

Mr. Thom is general assistant, processing division, Harvard College Library.

For some time librarians have been concerned over certain alleged shortcomings of the dictionary catalog, concentrating much of their attention on its increasing bulk and complexity. Proposals for reform have been suggested. These range all the way from pleas for simpler filing to the possible abolition of the card catalog itself. One scheme, that of splitting the single catalog into separate author, title and subject files, has received considerable attention and has actually been put into effect during the past decade by a number of important academic libraries.

Many administrators are looking at these experiments in division with curiosity, but there is little to guide the librarian who is trying to decide whether or not to divide his own catalog. Since 1938, 11 papers of varying importance have appeared, most of them of necessity limited in scope and subjective in their discussion of the advantages claimed and the problems involved.¹ The most recent article, however, presents an example of the type of study hitherto lacking. It is the report of an investigation, conducted by Amy Wood Nyholm at the University of California in 1944, of readers' reactions to the divided catalog. Although it does not answer all questions about the divided catalog, it provides some new data on the problem of the users' approach.

The present study was designed to contribute toward the objective appraisal of the division of the catalog. It concentrated upon certain aspects of the problem relating primarily to administration. The following questions, posed at the beginning of the project, reveal the general trend of the investigation:

1. What percentage of academic libraries have divided their catalogs?
2. What were their reasons for doing so?
3. Has division justified the hopes of its advocates?
4. Have any libraries abandoned division in favor of a return to the single file? If so, why?
5. To what extent is it necessary to duplicate entries, and what kinds of entries are most frequently duplicated?
6. What is the effect on the physical bulk of the catalog?
7. What is the effect on cataloging costs?
8. Does division facilitate the work of the staffs concerned?

For practicability, the field was limited to member institutions of the Association

⁵ Dean, Hazel. "Shall We Divide Our Catalog Vertically?" Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook 8: 43-47, 1939.
of American Colleges, and to colleges and universities approved by the Association of American Universities. In all, 642 libraries were canvassed. The inquiry was concerned solely with the main public catalog on each campus.

A questionnaire was drawn up with considerable help from interested and very cooperative librarians. Before making use of it, however, an explanatory post card with return card attached was sent to each of the 642 libraries to discover which of them had the divided catalog. The card also inquired about willingness to cooperate in the project.

Prevalence

Answers to this preliminary inquiry were obtained from 457 institutions, 24 of which had divided their catalogs. Questionnaires were then sent out, and these were completed in whole or in part by 23 librarians. The divided catalogs were found in 20 states. The greatest concentration in proportion to the number of institutions was in the Far West, where 11.1 per cent of the libraries queried have adopted division.

The earliest instance of division occurred in 1928 when a new college in the Far West organized its library with a divided catalog. From 1928 to 1937 there existed but three divided catalogs among the group studied, but in the following decade, 1938 to 1947, 20 more catalogs were divided. The frequency curve representing the cumulative increase in the number of divided catalogs rises sharply from 1938 to 1941, at which point the ascent becomes less abrupt. In 1944, when three catalogs were divided, the curve starts up again and then climbs moderately but steadily. The slight hesitation in the line just after 1941 perhaps reflects the unsettling conditions resulting from America's entry into the war. That the trend toward division is still alive is evidenced by the fact that although the preliminary post card did not inquire about future plans, thirteen respondents volunteered the information that they were "considering" division.

The collections covered by the divided catalogs range in size from 33,000 to 1,300,000 volumes. The percentage of such catalogs increases sharply as the size brackets climb. This was brought out by dividing the 642 libraries queried into three arbitrary size groups: small, medium and large. The summary below shows the percentage of libraries with the divided catalog within each category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Size (Volumes)</th>
<th>Number of Libraries Queried</th>
<th>Percentage Libraries with Divided Catalog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 100,000</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 499,000</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 499,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The arrangement whereby author and title entries are housed in one section and subject entries in another prevails throughout. Only one library, a very small one, was found to have tried division (1934 to 1937) and then to have changed back to the single arrangement. In this instance the three file system (author, subject and title) was in effect during the period of division. The dictionary catalog was restored because of the confusion caused by the need for looking in three different places for information. Some people did not understand the difference between subjects and titles, and between authors and names as subjects.

Reasons for Division

Sixteen specific "reasons for division" were submitted to the respondents who were asked to check the items that applied to their respective libraries and to rank them in order of importance. Twenty librarians ranked their responses while two merely listed them. One of the latter also
indicated that the reasons checked by him were “probable reasons.”

Difficulties connected with complex or illogical filing constitute the leading reason for division. Eighteen of the 22 respondents reported that their students were confused by filing complexities, and 14 claimed that even patrons familiar with the rules wasted too much time. Nine mentioned filing errors, and seven the excessive amount of time consumed in filing. Ten librarians gave some item within this category top rank among their reasons for dividing.

The type of filing code in use before and after division is of considerable interest in this connection. In the process of splitting their catalogs, at least 11 libraries adopted a more strictly alphabetical filing scheme than they had used previously.

The relieving of congestion at the catalog cabinets was second among the reasons for division, but it was by no means a close rival to filing difficulties. Although mentioned by 15 librarians, it was given first place by only three, while many relegated it to third or fourth place. The “congestion” referred to results from the conflict between those who merely wish to obtain call numbers or to find out if the library has specific authors and titles, and those who wish to study subject cards at some length.

The alleged need to vitalize the subject approach to library materials was in no instance the primary reason for division but 11 librarians had the idea in mind when drawing up their plans. It was evidently believed that subject cataloging was not yielding results proportionate to its expense. This particular key to a library’s collection was not fully utilized by the students because it was buried, so to speak, among the other types of entries.

Problems of space and physical layout ranked fourth among the reasons for division. This category scored only slightly lower than did the previous reason. Nine libraries had such problems, and three resorted to division primarily to solve them. In the words of one respondent: “Our catalog was full and could not be enlarged. Therefore we withdrew the subject cards and set up a new catalog about 25 feet from the author-title catalog.”

Another library, apparently not having room for its entire catalog along the wall of the delivery hall, has placed its subject cards in the reference room on the other side of that wall. There is easy access between the two files.

It is not unusual for catalogs to outgrow their original places and to begin to creep along walls and into adjacent rooms. However, when a catalog is divided for this reason it is usually divided at some point along the alphabetical sequence of the entries, rather than according to the function of the entries. One may wonder, other considerations aside, why the latter type of division should be considered superior to the former. In both cases, the user must walk back and forth between the two sections. The claim has been put forward by at least one advocate of functional division that the reader works considerably more within the author-title grouping, and within the subject grouping, than back and forth between them.

That “other libraries were obtaining good results from division” was stated by eight libraries to have been a factor in influencing them to divide. No less than four respondents gave this reason first rank, but in the final scoring it stood only fifth.

The category of reasons relating to the promotion of staff efficiency did not score very heavily. Eight libraries named one or more of the reasons within this group, but none gave any of them first place. The statement “reference department desired separate subject file for facilitation of its work” was checked on five returns. Four
libraries believed that a separate author (or author-title) file would benefit the catalogers, and an equal number believed that such a file would aid the acquisitions librarians. However, the low score obtained by this category would seem to indicate that division was planned primarily with the students and not the staff members in mind. It might also be inferred that the librarians for the most part did not find the dictionary arrangement a handicap in their work.

Student apprehension at the sheer size of the catalog (quite apart from confusion at internal complexities) is a subjective and elusive factor. However four librarians named such apprehension as a reason for dividing, and one of them gave it first place.

*Attainment of Objectives*

The questionnaire embodied a rating scale for the purpose of obtaining staff opinion on the divided catalog in use. Twelve objectives of division were listed, and for each, the respondents were asked to check one of the following degrees of attainment: "matters made worse," "no improvement," "a slight improvement," "a marked improvement," "a very great improvement."

Slightly over 43 per cent of the 23 respondents claimed that division has relieved student confusion at filing complexities to a "marked" degree, and none claimed a "very great" improvement in this respect. Seven librarians, or 30.4 per cent, reported a "slight" gain, one saw no improvement, and another believed that matters have been made worse. The "not applicable" column was checked by one respondent, but for this item such a response can be equated with "no improvement," for if there had been a gain to report it is difficult to think that it would not have been mentioned. Three librarians did not answer this question. Of the 18 libraries that had specifically aimed for this objective, nine claimed that it had been attained to a "marked" degree.

Slightly over half of the respondents claimed that finding has been facilitated to a "marked" or to a "very great" degree for those familiar with catalogs. Of the 14 libraries that had the relief of this class of patrons in mind when dividing, nine reported a "marked" improvement or better. Filing errors were reduced to "marked" degree or better in 60.8 per cent of the libraries, and 56.4 per cent claimed a similar degree of success in reducing filing time. Two large libraries, however, reported that filing time has increased. Seven of the nine libraries that had divided in part to reduce filing errors, and every one of the seven that had done the same to reduce filing time, reported in the two most favorable columns.

Twelve, or 52.1 per cent of the libraries, found that congestion has been relieved to a "marked" extent, and one library reported a "very great" improvement. Of the 15 libraries that had mentioned congestion as a reason for dividing, 11 claimed that relief has been attained to a "marked" degree or better. In regard to the emphasizing of the subject approach, one librarian saw no improvement, six reported a "slight," twelve a "marked," and one a "very great" improvement. Seven of the 10 institutions that had consciously aimed in this direction reported either "marked" or "very great" progress.

Division does not seem to have facilitated reference work to any great extent, for 10 libraries reported a "slight" improvement in this matter, five claimed a "marked" improvement, and one claimed a "very great" advance. One respondent held that the situation has deteriorated, and two checked the "no improvement" column. Seven librarians thought that division had facilitated the work of the catalogers to a
“marked” degree, while two reported in the “very great” improvement column. Two others, however, indicated that matters have been made worse. Division seems to have been more successful in facilitating acquisitions work than in attaining any of its other objectives. Fifteen libraries reported in the two highest columns, while of the four institutions that had deliberately sought to increase efficiency in area of activity, three claimed a “very great” improvement.

Of the four libraries that had divided, partly because the sheer outward size of the catalog created apprehension in the minds of many students, only one reported that division has brought about as much as a “marked” diminution of such apprehension. Three libraries had divided partly because of the absence of an official catalog, but only one of these thought that the change rated even as high as a check in the “slight improvement” column. The one library that had hoped its subject file would serve as a compromise between the dictionary and the classed arrangement, reported “great success” in this matter.

Seven libraries were found to be no longer under the administrators who had been responsible for the division of their respective catalogs. However this fact had no significant effect on the attainment ratings submitted by these institutions.

Duplication of Entries

A list of 18 types of works thought most likely to call for extra entries was submitted to the respondents who were asked to indicate their policy with regard to each of them. Practice varies widely; no clear cut norm stands out. Of 21 libraries, three do no duplication at all while one duplicates for 15 types of works. Ten libraries, a bare majority, make duplicate entries for between two and five classes of works.

Two-thirds of the libraries make extra cards for autobiography and for works formerly requiring no title entry because of the coincidence between subject and title. The percentages of libraries making extra cards for the other main classes are as follows: works where catchword title formerly served as subject, 42.8 per cent; art books where the artist is regarded as author, 38 per cent; letters, 33.3 per cent; biography of authors, 28.5 per cent; laws, statutes, 19 per cent; “autobiographical” publications of governments, societies and institutions, 19 per cent; critical works and commentaries, 19 per cent. “Autobiographical” publications of such organizations as scientific expeditions, ships, firms, exhibitions and presses are given duplicate entries by only one, two, or three libraries.

It is interesting to note that four libraries make extra cards for critical works on personal authors. This class of literature probably bulks as large as that of biography of authors in the type of library under consideration. The same four libraries (all heavy duplicators) make extra cards for the latter category as well. Such extensive duplication cannot but have some perceptible effect on the bulk of the files and on cataloging costs. It is not surprising that two of these libraries contributed such remarks as: “probably do some duplication that is not really needed,” “duplication is expensive,” and “may discontinue duplication of cards.”

Seventeen libraries also duplicate cross references when the corresponding entries are duplicated. Concerning this undertaking, one of the respondents quoted just above adds: “This could not be done thoroughly because of the great expense.”

No relationship was discovered between the degree of success claimed and the amount of duplication done. College A, which reportedly attained all 12 objectives of division to a “marked” degree or better, does no duplication whatever, while college U, whose librarian could not say that divi-
session has been as much as a "marked" success in any respect, also refrains from duplication. One institution which duplicates in three instances recorded seven objectives attained to a "marked" degree or better while another library which does the same amount of duplication believes that only one goal has been attained to this extent. The library which does most duplication reported four "marked" or better successes, while another library making similar claims, duplicates for only one type of work.

The respondents were asked to estimate the per cent of increase in the number of title cards, and the per cent of increase in cards of all types. The response was unsatisfactory; only a handful of librarians essayed such estimates. On the basis of these fragmentary replies it would appear that an "average" policy of duplication would increase the number of title cards by between five and 25 per cent, and the total number of cards by about five per cent.

Concluding Remarks

On the whole, the divided catalog has been found a more effective tool than the single catalog, but its superiority does not appear to be outstanding. The attainment rating scale registered a heavier vote in the combined "matters made worse" and "no improvement" columns than in the "very great improvement" column. And in the two most favorable columns, some of the more important objectives failed to score as highly as did certain lesser ones. Simplicity for the student was the great objective, but apparently not the great success of division. Perhaps a psychological "main entry" bias was an inhibiting factor in limiting all the catalogs studied to the invariable author-title and subject duality, and in precluding the exploration of other possibilities.

It is suggested that every effort be made to increase the effectiveness of the dictionary catalog before resorting to division. If the latter course is decided upon, a division into a name file, a title file, and a topical subject file might well be tried. Lubetzky, in his contribution to the subject, advocates this scheme. Such an arrangement carries simplification further than does the usual type of division, and renders duplication unnecessary.

News Notes on Library Buildings

Librarians now in the process of planning a new building might well make certain that their architects examine an article found in the June issue of Standardization, the news magazine of the American Standards Association. This issue contains an article by George L. Diggles describing the attempts of the American Standards Association to standardize some 25 sizes of fluorescent lamps. At the present time the Association has grouped these 25 sizes into five general types. Apparently bulbs which are developed for each of these five types will not fit fixtures for the other four types.

The problem reported by these standards is not one that will trouble librarians directly, but it is one that our architects will want to know about. Most architects, of course, follow closely the work of the American Standards Association.—R. E. Ellsworth.
What Kind of Books?  
What Kind of Readers?

Mr. Asheim is assistant professor, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago.

When the subject of the present conference—"More Books; More Readers"—was told to me, and I was asked to present a paper which would relate in some way to the topic at hand, it seemed to me that the only possible reaction that I could voice would be one of skepticism concerning the implicit assumption underlying the conference theme. As it hardly seemed proper for me, as invited guest, to accept the invitation and then promptly to question the beliefs of my hosts, I was in a quandary as to how to approach the subject of my paper. It was a great relief when I discovered that the title suggested for the paper seemed to support my belief that the theme of the conference cannot mean what it says. "What kind of books? What kind of readers?" poses some basic questions concerning the starry-eyed idealism of the official statement—questions which came immediately to my mind when the theme was announced. Apparently, then, I should not be completely out of tune with my listeners if I should enlarge upon those questions in the body of my paper.

Strictly speaking, it would seem that any attack upon the "more books-more readers" ideal should be directed at the public library rather than at the academic library. The drives for larger circulation, for new registrants and for wider appeals to the public are mainly the concern of the public library. After all, the public to whom the college and university library caters is limited by definition: it consists of the student body, the faculty, and the alumni of the particular institution. I think it has never been seriously proposed that the college library make a concerted effort to attract to its collection the members of the community-at-large who are not in some way connected with the school. More books may be a problem in the college library, but are "more readers"?

In three very important ways the college and university libraries have an interest in the "more readers" question which makes it pertinent to evaluate that goal even before such a group as this. First, the college librarians are keenly aware that all of their potential users are not reached; that even within the limits which the special nature of the library imposes, there is not a 100 per cent response from its community. Therefore many college librarians consider the drive for more readers to be a legitimate goal as long as any part of the student body or the faculty remains unvisited by the library. The first goal, then, is to reach those students who are not now patrons of the library.

Secondly, college librarians are even more concerned with the fact that library use is merely a mandatory chore for many students. They know that a great majority of their patrons read only assigned pages.


2 For the sake of convenience, the terms "college library" and "university library" will be used interchangeably throughout this paper to denote all libraries connected with institutions of higher learning.
in prescribed books; that many never set foot in any part of the library except the reserve room; and that the few nonassigned titles which do circulate are seldom free-reading, but are generally used for the writing of term papers or in some other connection with assigned class work. Librarians feel that such grudging and disinterested use of library materials is the least desirable use to which its facilities can be put. They should like to see their students really interested in the book, reading with pleasure, however serious the purpose served. The college librarian is interested in enticing students to read on their own—for recreation, for information, for self-education—without the imposition of class assignment to rob the reading act of the benefits of spontaneous choice and desire. The second goal, then, is not just to reach new readers, but to make real readers of those we already have.

Thirdly, college librarians know that while students and young people in their teens form a large proportion of the library clientele even in the public library, that neither the college nor the public library retains more than a fraction of them as patrons five or ten years later. They realize that once formal schooling is dropped, book reading is also dropped by the great majority. That these young people have taken occupations as self-supporting adults, that they have assumed family responsibilities, that other rival interests vie for their time is acknowledged. These are all good reasons for failure to read, but librarians doubt that they are the real reasons. For those who do continue to read are also subject to the same demands upon their attention and rivals for their time. "No time" is the reason given by people who do not want to read. Invariably it has been found that time exists for many other noncompulsory activities in which the respondent has a greater interest. Librarians fear that they, along with our modern educational system, are partially responsible for this condition. If reading were made more attractive to the students; if they were taught to turn to the book almost as second nature; if a more concentrated effort were made to make lifelong book-users, perhaps school-leaving would not automatically mean book-leaving. Thus, the third goal is not merely the extension of reading to nonreaders, nor the enrichment of the readers whom we now have, but the retention of current readers as library users after they are no longer members of the college student body.

At present, the college library's most typical approach to all three of these problems has been through the establishment of browsing rooms, or general reading collections. Most collections of this type are admittedly and deliberately stocked with noncurricular reading to attract those whose classwork does not force them to use library materials; to supplement class assignments with recreational reading which will cater to personal interests; and to demonstrate the many-faceted appeals and services which the book can provide in addition to the purely educational ones. In such a collection, colleges and universities attempt to provide attractive and friendly personnel in an attractive and friendly atmosphere stocked with, if you will pardon the pathetic fallacy, attractive and friendly books. These, they feel, are the three basic requirements for luring in new readers, broadening the interests of the readers it has, and establishing a habit of book reading which will be lasting.

The theory behind such a collection appears logical enough. Most university libraries have closed stacks and complicated charging and request procedures. Many students do not even know what kinds of things are available in the collection. It is assumed that many of them might read...
much more if materials meeting their needs and coinciding with their interests were brought to their attention and made accessible. The establishment of a collection of books of general interest which are readily accessible when wanted, and which may be examined by the reader and easily charged out, eliminates an unnecessary barrier between reader and book and guards against the loss of many potential readers who otherwise might never find the useful and worthwhile titles for which, all unconsciously, they may be seeking. And the student who learns to turn to the library for his leisure reading—the student who learns what pleasure can be obtained from the book, even though his use of it may be educational or informational rather than recreational—will be the student, it is believed, who forms a lifelong habit of good reading which school-leaving will not break.

The widespread approval of such collections by librarians is not shared by all educators or educational systems. There are those who would deny the responsibility of the college library to step outside the curriculum to win readers; who would insist that extracurricular activities and interests are sufficiently met by nonacademic agencies and that the problem of what kind of reading people do 10 years after they leave school can best be tackled by an educational system which teaches serious reading habits rather than by one which strengthens nonintellectual predispositions.

The college of the University of Chicago represents a case in point. Under the Chicago plan, the college students are presented with a heavy program of prescribed reading which covers the "best that is known and thought" in the major intellectual disciplines. It is a heavy schedule, stringently selected and rigorously imposed. The basic readings must be purchased, in symposia of selections gathered into syllabi. The additional readings are classical and standard titles available on reserve and in the stacks of the several university libraries. The assignments are such that the student is not left with much leisure in which to browse through the popular titles of the day. If he has time to read, there is a program of reading waiting for him. Under such a system there is no logical place for a browsing collection in the usual sense. The system has no faith in the educational benefits to be derived from reading which cannot be defended as contributing to the purposes of its prescribed curriculum. Therefore, with space at a premium and the need to justify the use made of every available room in the library building, the abandonment of the "browsing collection" is a logical step. Today, the University of Chicago Library no longer has a browsing collection—for the University of Chicago is an educational, not a recreational, institution.

Such a viewpoint, resulting as it does in the reduction of the number of libraries rather than in their multiplication, is a shocking one to most librarians. They point out that reading, even of books outside the prescribed list of "greats," is an important activity, and that the provision of materials for such reading and the inculcation of reading habits for whatever purposes they might serve the reader, are responsibilities of the library. They enlarge upon the benefits of recreational reading for which no scholarly justification may be found at all. They indicate that "free" reading, in the sense of reading to which the student turns of his own free will rather than because of prescribed assignment, often has a greater effect upon the

2 Note the wording of the phrase "contributing to the purposes of its prescribed curriculum," which indicates that reading is not limited merely to that which is assigned. It is limited to that which will serve the same high and serious purposes as the curriculum itself; and it is not part of the school's program to strengthen, foster, and perpetuate the undiscriminating and unenlightened tastes of preuniversity days.
student just because it is not prescribed. They deplore the implicit intellectual snobbery which would place beyond the pale everything which does not fit the particular standards set by a self-appointed group of experts.

The University of Chicago approach, however, does not deny the benefits of purely recreational reading. It willingly admits that there are other aspects of life in addition to the academic, and that a well-rounded individual does not limit himself to the single one. It recognizes that rental libraries, popular bookstores, corner newsstands and drugstore book departments serve useful functions in our society. But it takes the stand that the university's function (and therefore the function of the university's library) is educational, and that noneducational needs should be filled elsewhere. The very fact that other media and other agencies are established which effectively rival the library in these areas of the noneducational underlines the special responsibility of the university library for concentrating upon that area of communication which is its special province and in which no other agency does exist. The uncritical, the recreational, the standardized materials are multiplied through all the several popular agencies of communication. The serious and permanent materials which supply the range and depth of content to which the scholar should address himself are nowhere made available except in the library. The library should not lose its distinctive character by trying to take over responsibilities which more properly adhere to other agencies. The library of the university should be just that; not another curbservice collection of popular ephemera.

The immediate objection to such a circumscribed program is that it will result in a loss of patronage, and that the library will soon be serving only the few select students who are already capable of appreciating the advantages which good reading has to offer. There is no denying that a library following such a policy would lose some of its patrons. But it would lose mainly those who do not want a university library to be a university library, but rather a more accessible department store. If it is the function of the university library to lead students to the best reading, than the best reading is what it should collect. It is not its business to increase the number of patrons for that kind of casual reading which Coleridge called one of the great destroyers of intellect.

There is a good practical objection which immediately enters the debate at this point. It does no good, the argument runs, to have a well-selected collection, chosen with taste and discrimination, if no one ever uses it. The library can only lead those to better reading who are present to be led. The first step must be taken where the reader is, not where you wish he were, before the second step toward better reading can be taken. It is a case of immediate vs. ultimate goals. The important thing is to get the patron into the library and then to teach him to choose wisely and well. Therefore, and this argument is put forward by college libraries as well as by public libraries, the provision of much that is second rate and mediocre is necessary in order to lure the reader into the library. After he is in, reading his Thorne Smith, we can introduce him to writers of greater literary and cultural significance.

Unfortunately we have no proof that the reader who is not interested in significance can be led to it. We have no good studies which trace through time the development of literary taste in a user of a library. We need some good intensive case histories which follow a patron through his library career, to see if it is really true that the devotee of Thorne
Smith automatically learns to enjoy Herman Melville—or even Mark Twain—just because of the physical presence of titles by these writers on adjoining library shelves. The cynics are of the opinion that the patron who starts as a reader of Thorne Smith will, after 20 years, be reading the latest Thorne Smith, or reasonable facsimile. They point out that the Kathleen Norris fans who showed a sudden interest in Emily Brontë were led to the classic, not by the cultural influence of the library, but by a fanatic addiction to Laurence Olivier's cleft chin. The burden of proof rests with those who claim that, in order to raise the standards of the patron, we must lower the standards of the library.

Advocates of this position should recognize the serious responsibility that such a view places upon them. If it is true that the library establishes habits of reading which the student carries with him throughout his life, then is there not the danger that the library actually teaches him to turn to the second rate and the mediocre rather than to the best? For note the interesting contradiction in terms. While such a view acknowledges the library's ultimate function to be the provision of the good (however defined), it advocates the acceptance of the less good as the means to attain it. Such a stand can be justified, it seems to me, only if you believe that book reading per se, is a better activity than any other. Advocates of reading though we be, I think that even librarians would not claim that reading is always better for everyone than something else would be.

The American Library Association, in its statement of postwar standards, lists five objectives of library service (and I presume, of the book) which are conceived of as the library's primary areas of concentration. These five are: (1) education, (2) information, (3) research, (4) recreation, and (5) esthetic appreciation. Let us ask a question or two concerning these areas to see if even here the book is indisputably the most important source to which to turn. First—education. Is it always better for the seeker after education to read a book rather than to hear a lecture, or view a practical laboratory demonstration? Second—information. Is a book a more satisfactory source of information of all kinds, or are there occasions when it might be better to consult, let us say, a physician, or a clergyman, or a plumber? Third—research. Does the book supersede controlled laboratory experimentation, operational verification and empirical demonstration? Fourth—recreation. Is it always better to read a book—especially in the ill ventilated and dimly lighted mausoleums which libraries too often provide for that purpose—than to take a hike, or play a game of tennis or putter in the garden? And fifth—esthetic appreciation. If you could only do one or the other, would it be better to hear a symphony, look at a statue, attend an art exhibit—or read books about them? I do not stay for an answer, but obviously the superiority of book reading depends upon the purpose to be served, the circumstances surrounding the reading situation, the individual concerned—and the excellence of the book.

All of which leads us back to a position outlined earlier: that the function of the college library is not merely to provide reading, but to provide the best reading. Reading in itself is not a better thing unless it contributes something worthwhile which no other source can contribute. The case for the book cannot be made on the grounds that it is just as good as a movie or a soap opera, but that it is very much better. Let those who want soap operas
listen to them, but do not pretend to be improving their tastes just because you put the soap opera in a buckram binding. For the kind of thing it does, the soap opera is supreme; the book cannot and should not try to vie with it on its home grounds. It would do better frankly to admit that it serves another public.

The corollary of this conclusion is that our libraries then will be the haven of the few rather than of the many, and that we may be deliberately sending patrons elsewhere instead of trying to attract them to the library. But if you have admitted that book reading is not always the preferable activity in all cases, why should there be an objection to sending people to that agency which will serve their needs better? The library will just have to become reconciled to the hard fact that the services it offers, however excellent, are desired by an atypical minority.

To many this appears to be a kind of intellectual idealism, but actually it is less idealism than it is realism. The library, even now, is a minority institution. We do not serve the majority of our population anywhere; or if we do serve the majority in numbers (as we do on most college campuses) we serve them only because under the compulsion of class assignment they must come to us. That a majority would not do so voluntarily is attested by the fact that such a large proportion of them leave the library when they leave the school.

What about our goal of winning permanent users for the library? If we limit our patronage to the select few, do we not limit the possibilities for making lasting habits of library use among our potential clientele? Again it must be admitted that we are limiting our potential public, but the limitation is placed upon quantity, and our quantitative impact upon the community has never been our most notable contribution to society. Since we are already selective, would it harm us to be slightly more so?

For note: the selectivity is not imposed by the library, which is open to all. It is a process of self-selection which operates among the public themselves. The public library's clientele is top-heavy with the better educated, far out of proportion to their numbers in the population. The learned and the skilled professions use the library much more than their proportion of the population warrants. The community and opinion leaders are much more likely to be library users than are the people they lead. That being so, it would seem that the college library and college education have not failed as badly as we think; by and large, the better educated are the library users. If we have failed, our failure lies in ignoring our natural clientele in a vain attempt to pull into our libraries those who do not want what we are best equipped to give. For as we demonstrated earlier, for some people in some circumstances, the book is not the best and most useful medium. The book serves best only those who seriously seek the kind of knowledge, understanding and growth that it and it alone provides. The blame for our minority appeal, if it be blameworthy, belongs not to the library but to the very process of reading itself, for its appeal, naturally and inevitably, is limited to the few.

What of the influence of the library? Are we going to limit our impact upon society by serving the few instead of the many? Again we must recognize that even if the public library served every single person in the community who ever reads as much as a book a month, it would still reach only about 30 per cent of the adult population. The influence of the book, and of the library as the agency for distributing the book, has always been an
indirect one. The books that have changed our minds—the Darwins, the Freuds, the Marxes—have never reached the great majority directly, even though the lives of that majority have been colored and reshaped by them. It is always the leader, the teacher, the expert, who has acted as intermediary between the majority and the printed word. If we serve these real readers with the best, will we not, by training the natural leaders to be more enlightened leaders, be doing a greater indirect service to the majority than if we sacrificed the leadership in favor of the most backward in the parade? It seems to me that it cannot be denied that we will.

I should like to anticipate two objections which are usually raised when such suggestions as this are put forward. The first is that nobody really knows what the best and the good are; that excellence is judged solely on subjective standards and what is good for one is not for another. Granting that differences of opinion exist, and different purposes are served in different ways, still we do have standards upon which excellence can be judged. There are good books and poor ones; worthwhile and worthless ones—and we know it. The standards may require sharper definition and more precise delimitation, but standards have been devised, and librarians, even now, act upon some of them. That we cannot buy everything that is published means that we must be selective. A value judgment is exercised every time one book is purchased while another is not. But under our present system of book selection, we act on the premise that we should place our minimum level of merit as low as we possibly can, and I am advocating merely that we place it as high as we possibly can.

The second traditional objection is that the librarian does not have the right to dictate what other people shall and shall not read. I agree heartily with that statement, but I think that the librarian does have the right to decide what shall be placed on the library's shelves (which is an entirely different thing). It is the right of his office—the right that permits the conductor of the symphony to select Hindemith and eschew the Hit Parade—the right which allows the curator of the museum to accept Gaugin for exhibition and reject George Petty; the right of the corner drug store, indeed, to stock The Babe Ruth Story, but not the Bhagavad Gita. It is a right which even the objecting librarians themselves exercise every time they reject a pornographic title for library purchase. Again it is merely a matter of deciding whether the critical floor we establish shall be as low as we can possibly allow it to be—or as high.

The latter objective does not rule out fiction, humor or reading for pleasure. It does not rule out, for university libraries, the provision of many second-rate materials needed for research, analysis and comparison. It does rule out those titles which can be defended on no other grounds than that a popular and completely uncritical demand for them exists. It rules out—as patrons of the college library—those whose only reading interest is in the inferior and the unsound.

More books, more readers? Quite probably not. But better books and better readers, certainly.
Administrative Problems of Reference and Research Libraries

Mr. Rogers is librarian, The Grosvenor Library, Buffalo.

When I was invited to speak at this meeting, it was suggested that my topic be "Administrative Problems of Reference Service." I replied with the alternate suggestion that the topic be "Administrative Problems of Reference and Research Libraries." Except for a certain breadth of approach, these two subjects are not as divergent as they might appear because analysis of the big problems of reference service indicates that they are directly related to the big problems of reference and research libraries. Without disparaging the importance of routines, I take the position that we have already entered such a critical period in research library administration that either we shall meet the fundamental issues facing us, or routines will not matter.

I wish to express my appreciation to the dozen or more directors of research libraries who responded to my request for a current appraisal of their problems. Largely through their help, I am prepared to define our problems and to suggest some solutions and new perspectives.

Greatest Problems

What do we consider our greatest problems? First, there is lack of space, together with inefficient arrangement of collections dictated by buildings which we have outgrown or which have been expanded, not with reference to efficiency but to the emergency need for room. Second, we realize that the card catalog is costing us more and more and that, as subject approach to materials, it is becoming less and less satisfactory. Third, we continue to recognize that reference librarians are not being properly or adequately educated and our criticism is spreading to other members of the staff, particularly to catalogers. Fourth, we realize that there are startling gaps in our collective acquisition of foreign and domestic publications, despite historical assumptions to the contrary, and that we probably should be doing something about the tremendous publishing output in the world today. Finally, we are constantly aware of financial obstacles to the attainment of our objectives.

During the last 20 to 30 years we have dealt with many of these same old problems and have tried, pretty much in vacuo, a number of solutions. What we must now realize is that most of our problems and their solutions are inextricably interwoven and that we must approach them as a group, not individually.

Whether we subscribe to the Farmington idea or concede that there is some truth in Fremont Rider's concept of research library growth, we know our job is going to become increasingly difficult. Let us admit at the outset that we do not know the degree of difficulty because we have no accurate statistics in regard to the past, present or probable future volume of
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published works of all kinds. We know that from a national standpoint we are woefully weak in many subjects, for example, near eastern and Asiatic materials. Our holdings of world book production to date are estimated to be as low as 33 per cent and as high as 66 per cent. The Library of Congress, which is traditionally the most complete in Americana, is 88 per cent incomplete in some aspects of it. By such haphazardly statistical or completely unstatistical methods, it has become apparent that the job which lies ahead is going to be infinitely more difficult than imagined.

Let us now consider in some detail the means with which we have been experimenting to solve our problems. Almost every solution has involved some degree of cooperation. Cooperation is such a good American tradition that any plan which involves it has been, prima facie, a step in the right direction and anything done in its name has not been challenged. It is now becoming increasingly clear that we need to temper our enthusiasm for cooperation with some fundamental changes in methodology, and it is with this in mind that I approach past and present solutions.

First, we have the Farmington Plan based on the thesis that research libraries should join in collecting at least one copy of every printed book and pamphlet (and later public document, serial and newspaper) published anywhere in the world; that such material should be promptly cataloged, preferably centrally, and listed in the Union Catalog at the Library of Congress; and that participating libraries should share the expense and should specialize in certain subject fields for which they will assume complete responsibility. It is too soon to say how practicable this plan will be, how much it will ultimately cost or what the volume of material will be. It might prove too expensive—too huge to handle. That has yet to be proved. But it is subject to criticism on at least two grounds. First, does it make sense to acquire everything without regard to the inherent worth of the material? Pargellis calls this the "grab-all method" and insists that we must be selective in our acquisition. On the other hand Metcalf says that we cannot perceive the future values of a given piece of printed matter, and so the only sensible approach is mass acquisition. Furthermore, he insists that if a library attempts to be selective in a great many fields it cannot be outstanding in any.

Even stronger criticism is directed at the Farmington Plan on the grounds that library specialization on a national scale is a practical impossibility. Consider the overlapping in scientific fields such as biochemistry, physical chemistry, and astrophysics. Or, to take another example, suppose three libraries choose to specialize in segments of the field of history, e.g., British history, twentieth century history and German history. Which one should receive a history of World War I or II? I represent one of two libraries which are currently trying specialization on a much broader scale and I know how serious this criticism is. Furthermore, where university and not public libraries are concerned, this specialization has strong implications for the curriculum. Farmington Plan supporters will reply that each institution is free to continue to buy in any field, but with as many portals for a Division of Responsibility among American Libraries in the Acquisition and Recording of Library Materials. College and Research Libraries 5:105-09, March 1944.


Metcalf and Williams, op. cit.


as 6000 journals in some scientific fields, is there not a danger that all but the best financed libraries will eventually specialize in one field to the detriment or exclusion of all others? 9

Although acquisitions under the Farmington Plan are world-wide in coverage, the Plan is national from the standpoint of division of responsibility and use of materials. In order that Farmington materials, which are distributed throughout the United States, may be nationally available, it follows that we must have a central location record. This is being provided by listing each item in the Union Catalog at the Library of Congress, which brings us to a consideration of the union catalog as the second significant means with which we have experimented and are experimenting to solve our problems. I am sure that you are familiar with individual examples of union catalogs such as those in the Pacific Northwest, Denver, Cleveland and Philadelphia, and that I need not describe individual regional catalogs in detail.

Almost without exception regional union catalogs are author catalogs designed for one of two purposes. First, the static purpose is to determine whether a given book is available within the region covered by the catalog. Under this heading our main objective is to locate material desired for interlibrary loan. Second, the union catalog may reveal that two or more libraries in geographical proximity are duplicating publications unnecessarily and neglecting to acquire equally significant publications in the same field. Let us call this the dynamic purpose of a union catalog because if action results from this knowledge, member libraries change in character, even though slightly.

Downs says that it is fair to state "that most union catalog sponsors have not been particularly concerned with fitting their catalogs into any kind of national plan, and, consequently, some duplication of effort, questionable regional division, and other lack of integration are evident." 10

At the time Union Catalogs in the United States was published, it was recognized that there was a strong feeling that union catalogs were wasteful and not justified. 11 This criticism may be said to be valid for several reasons. Existing regional union catalogs were created for the most part with W.P.A. funds, but even in prewar dollars they were expensive and, in terms of library income, are still reasonably expensive to maintain. Not enough attention has been given to this latter aspect of the problem, although the Pacific Northwest Library Association has developed what appears to be a successful formula for financing that region's union catalog through contributions of participating libraries. 12 We have a substantial body of opinion to support the theory that a single national union catalog, properly completed, would make existing regional union catalogs unjustifiable in view of the services they can render over and above the Union Catalog, at the Library of Congress. It is hard to justify a regional union catalog as a location tool alone, except in special complicated situations such as Philadelphia, especially in view of modern means of communication and the establishment of air mail parcel post. Local union catalogs will be even harder to justify for location purposes if the national union catalog is expanded to show many locations for each entry. Can we then defend the regional union catalog as presently established on the dynamic basis
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alone, that we may thereby more intelli-
gently distribute acquisitions? It seems to
me that if the Farmington Plan in some form
is a success, part of this argument is elimi-
nated by virtue of agreed fields of specializa-
tion, and it appears further that unnecessary
duplication can be eliminated by some less
expensive means than the union catalog.

Union catalogs for the most part provide
no subject approach to materials. Few of
us will deny that we must have an
improved subject approach to present re-
sources. It follows with even greater
emphasis that we must have an improved
subject approach to vastly increased re-
sources, but I have already stated that the
adequacy and cost of cataloging are a grave
concern to almost every research library.
Therefore, should we not consider a sub-
stitute for the subject catalog before we
proceed much further with our plans to in-
crease our acquisitions?

Many a research library director is
alarmed that more and more highly trained
people work behind the scenes as catalogers
while insufficiently trained or untrained
people work with the public.13 It is much
easier to see a room full of uncataloged
books than it is to evaluate the harm done
to your service by lowering the quality of
people who wait on the public. This is a
nonmonetary cost of cataloging. As an
example of dollars and cents cost, Harvard
has had a dozen or more catalogs since
1764 because one generation of catalogers
has done over the work of its predecessor.14
No one has yet found a solution to the inde-
pendent cataloging which we all do on the
30 to 40 per cent of the books for which
we cannot buy L.C. Cards.

More serious than cost is the inadequacy
of the card catalog as a subject tool. The
head of a large research library writes me
that the "... card catalog is already too
unwieldy for untrained readers to use, and
by untrained readers I mean not only col-
lege students but graduate students and our
general public as well. ... An advanced
reader often finds our subject headings out-
moded. This situation grows worse each
year. We, and other libraries, are still
using headings drawn up 10 to 20 years ago."

We are indebted to Raymond Swank for
a penetrating analysis of the two common
ways of preparing a subject approach to
library materials.15 First is the traditional
book-to-subject method where we put a
book under a few established entries which
remain relatively unchanged from year to
year. The second is the subject-to-book
method, or subject bibliography method,
under which one picks a subject and tries
to get all the related material thereon in-
cluding related material from various fields.
Under this latter method, subjects are cur-
rent and dynamic, changing with require-
ments. The weakness of the first method
is that no cataloger can foresee all the im-
plications of any one book. Swank de-
scribes the card catalog as the "shotgun
method" of making materials available,
which method is based on the fallacious
assumption that readers' problems are
stereotyped and that a general purpose,
universal subject tool will satisfy all needs.
The scholar is not interested in one type
of material, such as books, or merely the
material in one library. He is interested
in all types of materials germane to his
subject irrespective of location. The sub-
ject catalog has had its day and the answer
to our problem is subject bibliography cre-
ated on a national or international scale.
We have not begun to explore the prob-
lems of adequate subject bibliography.

14 Ibid.
There is no doubt that satisfactory machinery may take years to create. Now is none too soon to undertake concerted action along these lines.

If we concede the inadequacy of the subject catalog, and I think research librarians must concede it, we are still faced with the need for and cost of author catalogs for our collections. Much has been done to improve and simplify cataloging. The stumbling block to cooperative cataloging is the refusal of the central publishing agency to accept, unedited, the copy submitted by cooperating libraries. L.C. cards are still slow in appearing, cover at the maximum only 60 to 70 per cent of our books and still require processing in the local library. The people who have written me in regard to this subject are still not convinced that cataloging centralized in the Library of Congress is the answer to our problems. To what extent this attitude may be motivated by regionalism, I am not prepared to say, but regional organizations are contemplating the possibility of their own centralized cataloging.

One of our other unsolved problems is how to store the rising influx of acquisitions. We are justified in trying to solve the problem on the assumption that we shall continue to deal with the book in its traditional form plus reasonable amounts of microphotographic material. The microcard has been discussed so thoroughly that I wish to add just one thought with respect to it. The system proposes to eliminate the cataloging problem by wrapping book and cataloging into one package. In view of the deficiencies of the card catalog, does anyone believe that the limited subject approach proposed for microcards will be anything but less satisfactory than the present subject catalog?

The most constructive step to the solution of our space problem is the cooperative deposit library, not merely because it costs an estimated 10 cents to store a book for one year in a deposit library vs. approximately $1.00 in our conventional buildings, but because this idea has implications for regional and national planning. We have heard a great deal in regard to the experience of the New England Deposit Library which is located near the participating libraries. We look forward with interest to the possible founding of a deposit library on a more ambitious scale in the Middle West because it would represent wider geographical coverage and give us added evidence with respect to the feasibility of this type of undertaking.

Pending the accumulation of this evidence, however, we should consider the implications that the cooperative deposit library may have for our other problems. First, we must prove that it is practicable to locate a deposit library a few hundred miles from some of the cooperating libraries. If this be true, we have established an extremely important point. Second, only if we amalgamate deposit library books from all cooperating libraries and eliminate most duplication will we realize the full potentialities of the deposit idea. Such elimination of duplication is the only intelligent manner I can see to reduce our bookstocks, for it is generally conceded that weeding on any other basis is an impossibility. If we proceed on any basis other than merging of deposit library collections and elimination of duplicate copies, each library might as well build its own warehouse and forget the problem of geographical location.

Conclusions

If we are going to meet the deficiency of the subject approach to materials, we must turn to pure subject bibliography on a national scale. The job is too large for any one region. It requires national plan-

16 Metcalf, "Division of Fields ...", op cit.
ning and national financial support. If we are going to acquire huge amounts of materials, we are obligated to make them useful to the scholar wherever he may be. How can the individual library interpret this mass of materials except by subject bibliographies rather than through a single subject or classified catalog in Washington, D.C.? Farmington planning at one point recognized that it would be difficult to specialize and that both for this reason and for economy in handling material it would be preferable to put one copy of everything in a super-library, i.e. the Library of Congress. An alternative to the single super-library idea was considered in order to reduce the dangers of the atomic age and the disadvantages created by the great distances which separate so many areas from Washington. This alternative was to establish three super-libraries, each of which would house duplicate copies of Farmington materials. It is easy to understand why it was not possible to proceed at once on such an ideal basis, but that is the ultimate key to the satisfactory solution of many of our problems. In addition to serving as regional super-libraries, these institutions could become the deposit warehouses for libraries in their respective regions. By this means we could create strong collections of older materials in the two super-libraries outside the Library of Congress, and even its collections could thus be made more complete as checking of the Philadelphia Union Catalog has demonstrated. Backed by these regional collections, each research library could tailor its acquisitions and services to its special needs. It seems unrealistic to expect a university or even a public research library to do otherwise.

Just one warning. When President Roosevelt proposed the production of 50,000 aircraft per year at the beginning of World War II, many people, including industrialists, said it was impossible. No one thought to ask who would service and fly the airplanes, and the Air Forces were hampered by trained personnel shortages throughout much of World War II. Impossible through it may now seem, some national approach to our problems can and must come as surely as our manufacturers turned out 50,000 airplanes a year. Cooperation and plans are not enough. We must meet the need for much better trained reference librarians, catalogers and bibliographers. Let us stop paying lip service to the idea that we are educators unless we get the educator’s training and point of view. Carman,19 McIntosh, Conant,20 Colwell,21 Hutchins22 and people in our own profession, such as Beals23 and Gitler,24 have emphasized the need of a general education. Shall we continue to compromise by moving any part of library training into the undergraduate school, thereby diluting its curriculum? The cry of research libraries from one end of the country to the other is for subject specialists. We need people with a sound general education, plus subject specialization and proper library training. Reference librarians and catalogers as presently trained—and I say this with some knowledge of the changed curricula of our library schools—are not being equipped to meet today's needs and will surely not be equipped to deal with tomorrow’s problems. We must produce cataloger-bibliographers with a scholar’s appreciation of research,

and reference librarians who know how to use the entire range of resources of great libraries, not merely 200 or 300 ready reference books. To command people of this quality, we must pay higher salaries. Those of us in the field owe it to our library schools to get the salaries which will justify the type of people we demand and need.

We must undertake integrated planning with respect to all our problems and critically examine both our methodology and our isolated experiments at solving our problems. What we need is a full scale planning organization composed of carefully selected research library directors with divergent points of view, not merely partisans who favor regionalism on the one hand or a completely national approach on the other. In addition, the planning organization should include expert catalogers, outstanding research librarians and subject bibliographers, the last group preferably from outside the profession. We should look to this organization to bring us an over-all plan which we will support both as it affects our libraries and as it has broader implications. We are going to need more than token federal financial assistance if we are to start a new era in librarianship. Our services and collections have proved indispensable to national defense and to education. Federal aid to libraries is every bit as important as federal aid to education. In fact, the one is incongruous without the other, and it is up to us to prove our case by concerted action and the assistance of those who need our services. Before this can be done, we need an intelligent plan with the wholehearted backing of our own profession.

Joint Committee on Library Education of C.N.L.A.

The second meeting of the Joint Committee on Library Education of the Council of National Library Associations was held in New York on May 27. Among topics discussed were the following: the urgent need of a public list of library schools accredited by the A.L.A. Board of Education for Librarianship, the question of establishing standard examinations which could be substituted for professional training, the possibility of a thorough study of the backgrounds of training needed for special librarianship, and the development of informational services by the joint committee. Maurice F. Tauber represents the Association of College and Reference Libraries on this committee.

1949-50 A.C.R.L. Officers

The following persons, elected by mail ballot, took office July 1, 1949. A complete list of A.C.R.L. officers, including section officers, will appear in the October issue.

PRESIDENT: Wyllis E. Wright, librarian, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

VICE PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENT-ELECT: Charles M. Adams, librarian, Woman’s College Library, University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

Graduate Studies in College and Research Librarianship

Among dissertations, theses, and projects completed at California, Chicago, Columbia, Denver, Illinois and Michigan during 1948, which may be of interest to college, university and research librarians, are the titles listed below. Starred items represent doctoral dissertations.

California
Lundy, Frank A. Faculty Rank for Professional Librarians.
Pedley, Katharine G. The Reading of Vocational Students at the Samuel Gompers Trades School. San Francisco, in the Spring of 1946.

Chicago
*Burke, Father Redmond Ambrose. The Control of Reading by the Catholic Church.
*Davies, David William. Social and Economic Background to the History of the Elzeviers.
Haselden, Clyde LeRoy. The Social Attitudes of Librarians and Selection of Books on Social Issues.
Kavanagh, Sister Clarence Marie. A Study of Noncurricular Reading of Students of Marian College.
Todd, Ann McKinney. Undergraduate Student Reading at the University of Missouri.

Columbia
Bogart, Ruth E. College Library Development in New York State during the Nineteenth Century.
Christ, Robert W. Acquisition Work in College Libraries.
Gordon, Edna C. Current Reading Material as a Factor in the Attitudes of College Students Concerning Certain Social Problems.
Thom, Ian W. The Divided Catalog in College and University Libraries. (Abstract in this issue of College and Research Libraries.)

Denver
Bustamante, María. American Sociology: An Introduction for Chilean College Students . . . Historical, Critical, and Bibliographical.
Fites, Gilbert Garver, Jr. A General Study of the University of Denver Business Administration Library.
Edwards, Zona Maxine. A Survey of the Biological Science Collection of the Mary Reed Library of the University of Denver.
Julian, Hilda May. Relations Between the College Library and the Social Science Department.
McLeod, Joyce Elva. A Study of the Methods for the Encouragement of Recreational Reading in the College Library.
Wells, Doris Jeanette. Book Guidance for the Young Adult.
of two hours per day to code the cards and file them; 15 hours every three months to arrange the cards by fund and rearrange them by author; one hour per month to follow up outstanding orders. A simple preliminary time study indicates a saving over a year's period of approximately 18 weeks or over 700 hours of a clerk's time. The saving in salary for a six-month period will pay for a two years' supply of these cards.

In this article I have made no attempt at a detailed explanation of punched cards as such. This question was thoroughly discussed by Katherine M. Stokes in the Library Journal in 1947 and does not need repeating.

In conclusion, the following advantages of this system have become apparent:

1. It furnishes considerable assistance in the bookkeeping operation and speeds up the processing of invoices.
2. It offers an efficient follow-up system.
3. After serving its primary function, the system is adaptable to various statistical studies. For example, at the end of the year for annual report purposes it will be possible to furnish statistics concerning the number of titles purchased in each subject field. Also, studies concerning the relative costs of books by subject will be possible. (It would be relatively simple to arrange the cards for all items purchased during the year by fund which is closely correlated with academic subjects, and using that figure with the amount of money spent on each fund, the average cost of books by subject could be obtained.)
4. Filing of cards in the orders and receipts file and in the dead file becomes almost mechanical and is much faster than hand filing.
5. By reading the slots on the cards, errors in filing and in punching show up readily.
6. The orders and receipts file may be weeded out at regular intervals.
7. One complete step in the processing of invoices for payment can be eliminated, thus speeding up the entire process.
8. It will no longer be necessary to type a copy of the purchase order to be filed by fund. This will save one sheet of paper for each purchase order typed. In addition, each page of the purchase order can be filled instead of having only two or three titles per page, as a separate purchase order for each fund will not be necessary.
Supply of Library of Congress Catalog Cards to Research Centers

[Note: On December 23, 1946 the Library announced (in Cataloging Service, no. 7, December 1946) that the Cumulative Catalog of Library of Congress Printed Cards would commence publication in January 1947 and that the depository sets of cards which had been maintained in a number of libraries throughout the country beginning in 1902 would consequently be unnecessary, and would be terminated. As a result of a significant demand, however, the Library has for some months engaged in discussions, with a committee of the Association of Research Libraries, whether it would be justified in supplying cards to research centers on a regional basis. The following announcement, the terms of which are acceptable to this committee, has resulted from these discussions.]

1. The Library of Congress has previously indicated its willingness to support regional union catalogs by providing its currently printed catalog cards for interfiling in them. Such a supply of cards constitutes a subsidy to the regional union catalogs which the Library of Congress considers to be justified by the services they render in lightening the load upon the National Union Catalog, in expanding the Nation's bibliographical resources, in facilitating interlibrary loans, and in providing a clearing-house service for bibliographic information.

2. The existing regional union catalogs do not, however, adequately serve all regions of the country. The Library of Congress is therefore willing to supply its currently printed cards to institutional catalogs performing in large measure the same service as regional union catalogs, to the extent necessary to provide a more nearly complete regional service. The following conditions would govern such a free supply of cards.

(a) The recipient library must be a center of research of recognized importance in a wide variety of fields. (In selecting institutions which meet this requirement the Library of Congress will consult particularly with library groups such as the A.L.A. Board of Resources of American Libraries and its subcommittee on Union Catalogs and Bibliographical Centers.)

(b) The recipient library must agree to file cards provided by the Library of Congress into the most complete catalog of its own holdings which is generally available to its users; or to make some other filing arrangement deemed by the Library of Congress to be a satisfactory substitute.

(c) The recipient library must agree to make the resulting catalog readily available for consultation by the general public, regardless of any restrictions on the public availability and its use of collections.

(d) The recipient library must agree not to render illegible the information on the Library of Congress cards, although it may add information to the cards, either with or without cancelling portions of the printed text by drawing a light line through them.

(e) Because the Library of Congress must retain title to the cards, the recipient library may not dispose of them without the concurrence of the Librarian of Congress.

(f) The Library of Congress cannot

undertake to supply cards printed prior to the date of the completion of the agreement with any given library. In cases in which an agreement is reached with a library which has purchased complete sets of printed cards in the period since the effective date of the cancellation of depository sets of cards, the Library of Congress is prepared to credit the recipient library with the cost of such cards. This last undertaking will lapse as of December 31, 1949.

(g) All agreements made under this announcement are subject to reexamination at 5-year intervals. In any case of cancellation by the Library of Congress, the recipient library will be given one year's notice.

3. The Library of Congress will welcome requests for cards for the purposes mentioned herein from the libraries which may be eligible and which are willing to accept the conditions named above. A period of six months from the date of this announcement will be allowed for the filing of applications before action is taken on any of them, in order that the Library of Congress may make the choices, where there are alternatives, best calculated to advance the national bibliographical interest.

Allocation of Book Budget

(Continued from page 218)

significant unknown factors that cannot, at least now, be resolved statistically are the present strength of any particular book collection, the cost of adequate or complete coverage of a field, etc. Gradually, notably through the Farmington experience, we will learn more about costs. If others will follow the lead of Coney and Ellsworth in searching the subject, we may solve other problems. But as one of these writers replied to the questionnaire, "It is not possible at the present time to arrive at an objective formula," but if the formula study is used "with discretion and common sense" it may have some usefulness.

Discretion and common sense, then, with an honest attempt at the kind of objectivity that prevents the budget from becoming a political plum, are probably more useful in balancing all obvious factors than any "scientific" procedure. In practice this approach is apparently the one used at many libraries, including U.C.L.A., at the present time. Wilson and Tauber seem to agree. 4

(9). Although one librarian reported that he purposely did not do so, it is common practice to make known to the faculty the size and use of allocations. Such practice seems only good public relations, although it can be argued that knowledge of an unusually solvent fund may encourage wasteful buying.

The library administration at U.C.L.A. has taken the open book as a first principle in its relations with the faculty, and the Library Committee has purposely published its decisions on budget matters in annual and special reports to the faculty.

As is common with questionnaires, most respondents to this one asked to be informed of results. The writer too, after his experience, feels most strongly that there is a great need for more study of this whole subject and for more information on current practice. If, for example, several librarians would regularly record the details of book fund allocations and expenditures in a series of annual reports, we would have on hand a body of information of potentially great value in any pragmatic or theoretical approach to the problem. But of course this shortage of knowledge is common in many library fields.

Consistent requests have been made to Unesco by libraries and research institutions in all fields of study, for help in obtaining copies of highly important out-of-print periodicals. The demand comes not only from war-damaged countries but from libraries in countries which were prevented from maintaining their subscriptions to foreign periodicals owing to the general rupture of communications, or for economic reasons. Also, there are many important institutions, newly established since the war, which cannot build up their research libraries because the publications they need are out-of-print.

It is recognized as an inevitable fact that the original publishers of periodicals cannot generally be interested in reprinting past issues. Their editorial and production staffs are properly concerned with the immediate task of producing current issues, but it is believed that most publishers will be willing to cooperate in making it possible for Unesco to organize the production of reproductions, and that many will also cooperate in the work of distribution.

A preliminary selection will be made from a small number of periodicals, all in the fields of higher studies and advanced technology, for past numbers of which a clear demand has been expressed and which, as far as is known to us at the present, are out-of-print. Consultation will take place with existing projects of a similar nature in various countries to avoid overlapping of efforts.

The procedure then is:

1. To ascertain from their publishers whether these periodicals are actually out-of-print, and if microfilm or offset copies have already been made.

2. If high quality copies have already been made but are not longer readily available, action will be taken to improve their availability as part of the Unesco program.

3. If no suitable reproductions have been made in the past, the publisher's cooperation will be enlisted in having new copies made; copyrights will be cleared and provisional arrangements made for distribution, preferably through the publisher's agencies.

4. Prices will be obtained from microfilm or offset reproduction firms for the production work. The reproductions will be made whenever possible in the country of original publication, if high quality work can be done at a sufficiently cheap price.

5. If the publisher requires the help of Unesco, the list of issues, with alternative prices for film or offset will be sent to all possible subscribers. However the publisher may know that his own needs, plus the Unesco backlog, will be sufficient for a definite quantity of copies.

6. According to the number of subscribers in each case, and the wishes of the publisher, it will be decided whether reproduction is to be in microfilm or in photo offset.

7. Orders will be placed with the reproducing firms for the quantities needed.

8. Arrangements will be made to distribute through the original publisher or other suitable distributor.

Address inquiries to Libraries Division, Unesco, 405 E. 42nd St., New York 17, N.Y.
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Meeting, Jan. 21, 1949

President Benjamin E. Powell explained that in addition to the members of the board, the A.C.R.L. representatives on the A.L.A. Council had been invited to attend the meeting in order that they might be instructed in the wishes of the membership.

Dr. Powell reported on the three mail votes which had been taken by the Board of Directors in the last six months: They had voted unanimously in favor of Mr. Howard's resolution concerning basic legislation to clarify the status of the Library of Congress; they voted in favor of establishing a subcommittee of the Policy Committee. The committee was appointed last October and met early in November with Mr. Shaw to discuss the proposals of the Fourth Activities Committee; they voted to continue the policy of publishing the salary and general statistics in College and Research Libraries rather than as a separate.

The first subject of discussion was the report of the Fourth Activities Committee. The recommendation in Part I that the executive secretaries of divisions receive secretarial help from a pool instead of each having a private secretary drew some discussion. The board took no action on this point but made a strong statement that they want the A.C.R.L. executive secretary to have whatever secretarial help he needs. Some of the objections to the idea of a secretarial pool were the undesirability of having the executive secretary of A.C.R.L. responsible to the A.C.R.L. board and his secretarial help responsible to the A.L.A., the matter of someone to handle details of his work when he is away from the office on field trips, and the fact that with help from a pool the intangible but important factor of personal loyalty does not exist.

The board then turned to discussion of Part II of the report of the Fourth Activities Committee. In regard to the provision for geographic organization of the A.L.A., the opinion was expressed that it is important not to disrupt local cooperation now existing, and that there is a basic weakness in the proposed method of setting up state chapters of A.L.A.—under this proposal the majority of the A.L.A. members in a state, although they may not be the majority of the members in the state association, may vote to form an A.L.A. chapter, which might wreck the state association. The board did not make a statement on this subject because they felt that such a statement might more appropriately come from the regional meetings to be held in the fall.

In discussing organization by type of work and by type of library some of the points brought out were:

1. The organization by type of library which provides that these "substantive" associations may not subdivide by type of work would eliminate the A.C.R.L. Reference Section.

2. The proposed affiliated associations would have no income except what A.L.A. gives them and they would not have the right to choose their own members.

3. The proposed reorganization would provide for sending College and Research Libraries to all A.C.R.L. members automatically and without payment other than their regular A.L.A. dues.

4. The question arose as to what provision would be made for funds for the sections.

5. There is need for one strong national organization but strength must grow out of a cooperative effort and not out of one which is imposed on the organization.

6. Specialized interests among librarians must be taken into account.

7. The goal is the construction of an organizational plan which will answer the now existing objections to a strong association.

8. It was suggested that ideas for the new structure of a central national organization might well emanate from the present major groups of A.L.A.
It was voted that the Policy Committee and the Board of Directors, jointly, should draft a statement embodying the views of A.C.R.L. regarding the reorganization of A.L.A. as a directive to the A.L.A. Council. The motion provided that the Policy Committee be authorized to consult with other groups in the matter and also included the provision that this drafted resolution be brought first before the A.C.R.L. Board of Directors and then to a business meeting of the association.

Ada J. English presented a report of the activities of the Committee on the Finances of College and Research Libraries. Her committee has materially increased the number of subscribers to the journal and has secured a large number of ads. She requested additional funds to carry on the work of the committee.

The board authorized an adjustment in the amount now paid to A.L.A. for keeping subscription records of College and Research Libraries so as to meet more nearly the present cost. (The amount paid A.L.A. for this service has not changed since it was originally established in 1939.)

The board approved President Powell's suggestion that the decision as to whether regional A.C.R.L. meetings should be held should be left to the regions and approved his plan to appoint in each region a committee composed of representatives of all the sections of A.C.R.L., one of whom would be designated the A.C.R.L. chairman for that region and authorized to contact the existing college and university chairman in that region and to arrange the program for the regional meeting with whatever advice may be wanted from A.C.R.L.'s official board.

Meeting, Jan. 23, 1949

Motions were passed as follows:

1. An additional $75 to the Committee on the Finances of College and Research Libraries.

2. An additional $50 to the Junior College Libraries Section for use in the completion of the directory which they are preparing.


4. A contribution of $100 for secretarial help to cut and run stencils in connection with the publication of the Library Score Card, which will probably be available late this summer.

5. Appointment of a committee to make an objective study of what is actually being spent when a library lends a book by mail. This committee could look into techniques and practices and perhaps suggest points at which a saving could be made in these practices.

6. To publish as a supplement to the July issue of College and Research Libraries the three papers on rare books in the university library which were given at the meeting of the University Libraries Section in Atlantic City. A few copies are to be bound in book form with a special title page.

President Powell was authorized to appoint a committee to investigate the desirability of making a comprehensive survey of faculty status for librarians.

The proposal that College and Research Libraries celebrate its tenth anniversary in October 1949 by having a special anniversary issue was discussed. It was suggested that a 10-year index would be a useful tool. Another suggestion was a special issue devoted to papers by A.C.R.L. members who have been making studies in foreign countries. The board passed a motion that College and Research Libraries have a special number approximately twice its normal size to contain a 10-year index and the articles on foreign libraries provided that the cost of such an issue can be met within the amount already allocated to the budget of College and Research Libraries.

There was some discussion of the advisability of sending a letter to colleges and universities which have recently hired a new librarian requesting information which might be of some aid to recruiting. It was suggested that perhaps personal contacts by the executive secretary would be more satisfactory than contacts by letter.

In discussing the library development program which Mr. Cory had proposed to the A.L.A. Council, the board felt that its present contribution is much in that direction.

N. Orwin Rush
A.C.R.L.
Executive Secretary
THE 32ND MEETING of the Association of Research Libraries, one of the most fully attended in its history, was held in the Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, on Jan. 20, 1949.

Newspapers on Microfilm

The executive secretary announced that the plan of the association to publish *Newspapers on Microfilm: A Union Check List*, compiled under the direction of George A. Schwegmann, Jr. and manufactured at the Library of Congress, had now been brought to completion. The executive secretary was authorized to sell the same at $2.00 per copy.

Indexing Service, United Nations Documents and Publications

Carl H. Milam, director of library services, United Nations, who was present as a guest, announced the publication, as an experimental venture, of the *Weekly Index to Documents and Publications of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies*, beginning with the year 1949. He distributed sample copies of the first number and asked that criticisms and suggestions be sent to him promptly. He said that the *Weekly Index* had not yet been established on a permanent basis. Whether it would be continued would depend in part upon the extent to which it appeared to meet the needs of those who use the documents and publications in question. If continued he thought the subscription price would probably be $20 for 52 issues, approximately the actual cost of printing.

Mr. Milam spoke also of plans to produce an index and check list of United Nations documents, each volume to be devoted to one or more sessions of each organization, and an index in mimeographed form showing the disposition of agenda items.

On motion it was voted that the association endorse the project to print United Nations indexes as very desirable.

United States Book Exchange

Alice Dulany Ball, executive director of U.S.B.E., was present as a guest and made a short statement. She said the exchange had gone into full scale operation as of Jan. 1, 1949 with the support of a three-year grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. She said it would collect duplicates from American libraries, list them, and supply lists to libraries abroad to make selections. It would also collect duplicates from libraries abroad and distribute them to American libraries. Since its interest centers in research materials and it will distribute them at low cost, Miss Ball anticipated that it would be able to render a very real service to American research libraries.

Miss Ball expressed the hope that the information which the exchange would be able to assemble would prove very helpful from a bibliographical standpoint. In addition to bibliographical service, it is hoped that eventually the exchange might be able to offer participating libraries a procurement service. As a means of keeping participating libraries informed of progress, it was proposed to issue a monthly newsletter, the first issue to appear February 1.

Farmington Plan

Consideration of the Farmington Plan was introduced with a report by Paul North Rice reviewing the first year of operation as seen from the vantage point of the New York Public Library, which had acted as the control office to which all Farmington receipts had been sent for classification and reshipment to the recipient libraries.

Mr. Rice gave statistics of the first year's receipts as follows: Books received from France, 2634; Switzerland, 558; and Sweden, 356 making a total of 3548. The cost of handling them was $1029.37. They had been assigned and shipped to 46 of the 54 libraries which are participating in the plan. Assignments to a particular institution had ranged
from a single item to as many as 729 items. No volumes had been received at New York Public Library before April, and it was very clear that a good many 1948 imprints would be received in 1949.

Mr. Rice felt that, as an initial operation, the plan had achieved a considerable measure of success. There had, however, been difficulties. There had been disappointing delays on the part of agents in sending the books, and there had been unavoidable delays in handling the books after their arrival in this country. There had been complaints from some libraries that they had received duplicates of their own purchases or of previous Farmington receipts. Agents abroad had found difficulty in eliminating parts of continuations and series and publications on the list of items they were not to send, though this difficulty was diminishing as agents grew in understanding of what was wanted. A difficulty which threatens to persist has been that participating libraries have no easy way to determine in advance whether or not a particular book will come to them under the Plan.

At Mr. Metcalf's suggestion, John Fall of the New York Public Library, who had had charge of the Farmington Plan office, was called on to make a brief report of the trip which he had made to Europe in the autumn to establish direct contact with our Farmington dealers in France, Switzerland and Sweden, and to prepare the way for an extension of the plan to other countries. Mr. Fall spoke briefly of his trip. He expressed appreciation of the preliminary work which Mr. Nyholm had done last summer. He listed the Farmington dealers in France, Switzerland and Sweden whom he had visited and to whom he had explained the new procedures which it was proposed to follow this year. He had also visited dealers in Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium and Italy whom he recommended that we make our agents as the Farmington Plan is extended to those countries.

Mr. Metcalf then spoke of our experiences with the Farmington Plan as he saw them. He fully recognized the difficulties, and to those which had already been mentioned he added others, namely, books sometimes cost us more than they would have cost if bought through certain New York agents; our Farmington dealers have been too selective; there have been disagreements about classification, etc. But he said that the main questions were: "Will the Farmington Plan in the long run give us better coverage of foreign publications than any other plan which we can devise and will it do this without involving us in too many disadvantages; will it perhaps have other advantages such as saving us money through making it possible and desirable for many of us to be more selective than we have been in the past in our foreign acquisitions in fields for which we do not accept a major responsibility?" To these questions he felt that an affirmative answer would ultimately be given. On the subject of costs he emphasized that we have been pressing our agents not for discounts but for service. He felt that this was sound policy since if we pressed for discounts, we would "undoubtedly lose out on many hard-to-get books on which the agents would lose money if considered by themselves alone."

Mr. Metcalf then proposed that we ask our agents abroad, as of 1949, to classify Farmington books for us with the guidance of index cards which have been prepared by the New York Public Library, and to send them directly to the cooperating libraries. In the comparatively few cases in which they would find it difficult to classify books on which the agents would lose money if considered by themselves alone." On motion it was voted that the proposal for classification abroad and direct shipment to cooperating libraries be approved.

On further motion the addition as of Jan. 1, 1949 of five countries to the Farmington Plan, namely Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Italy, was approved.

On further motion, after discussion, it was voted that existing subject commitments be continued in 1949 not only with respect to the Farmington Plan countries of 1948 but with respect to the five new ones now added.

In reply to a question Mr. Metcalf stated that participating libraries, not members of A.R.L., would be informed promptly of the foregoing decisions.

Mr. Metcalf reported that Lewis Hanke, Library of Congress, had undertaken while
in Mexico to investigate dealers and try to select one who might serve as our Farmington agent for that country.

Upon motion Mr. Metcalf was authorized, upon receipt of Mr. Hanke's recommendation, to proceed with negotiations looking to the inclusion of Mexico in the Farmington Plan at once.

Mr. Metcalf stated that in the operation of the Farmington Plan, new monograph series and new periodicals would be sent directly to the New York Public Library for examination and would then be assigned to participating libraries.

Mr. Metcalf stated that with a view to improving communication between Farmington dealers and participating libraries, and hence the functioning of the plan, a mimeographed publication would be issued from time to time by the Farmington Office and sent to dealers and libraries. He urged as a means of avoiding "dealer trouble" that libraries do their utmost to pay Farmington bills promptly.

Mr. Metcalf requested that members come to the next meeting prepared to discuss a further extension of the Farmington Plan. As possible additions, Austria, Germany, Spain, Portugal, certain Latin American countries, Australia and New Zealand were mentioned. A question arose on the inclusion of Russia, but the prevailing opinion appeared to be that while present conditions continued, Russia had better not be attempted.

Committee on Research Libraries and the Library of Congress

Mr. David, chairman, made a progress report dealing with the several problems which have been placed before the committee.

With respect to the first problem, namely the bases on which the Library of Congress would find it possible to make full sets of its printed cards available without charge to United States libraries, he was able to report a definite achievement. After the problem had been studied for the committee by Robert A. Miller of the University of Indiana Library, and after extended discussions with the Librarian of Congress in Atlantic City and Chicago, a formula had been arrived at which was acceptable to the Library of Congress. (With minor verbal modifications it has since been published in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin, Feb. 8-14, 1949, Appendix.) In essence it provides, on the analogy of the existing Library of Congress practice of providing cards without charge to regional union catalogs, that the Library of Congress may supply cards to institutional catalogs performing in large measures the same service as regional union catalogs.

With respect to the problem of federal subsidy to libraries giving extensive service to federal field offices (and the allied problem of regional federal libraries), he was able to report almost no progress. Though the committee has held prolonged discussions, the obstacles had appeared almost insuperable. Nevertheless there was strong opinion in the committee that there must in due course be a network of great regional libraries established in this country which can hardly be created and maintained without federal subsidy. The committee was unwilling to acknowledge defeat and was determined to continue its discussions, Mr. Coney taking the lead.

With respect to the problem of cooperative cataloging arrangements, the committee had sought the help of Andrew D. Osborn, Harvard Library, who had gone to Washington last spring and spent several days in a study of it. Mr. Osborn's report expounds and then sets forth seriatim a considerable number of recommendations, the first of which have to do with a simplification and reduction of cost of entries and the rest of which have to do with the setting up of a standing advisory committee of the Library of Congress and the cooperating libraries to revise and promulgate cataloging rules and deal with subject cataloging. The committee had had inadequate opportunity to study this report and requested that it be reproduced as an appendix to the minutes of the present meeting in order that the whole membership should be able to study it. Members were invited to send their comments to the committee which undertook to continue its consideration of the problem.

With respect to the problem of including the catalog cards of other libraries, other than the Library of Congress printed cards, in the Cumulative Catalog, the committee had sought the help of LeRoy C. Merritt, University of California. Mr. Merritt had investigated the problem, particularly by the method of questionnaires submitted to subscribers to the Cumulative Catalog and had
concluded that "the demand is for an expanded Cumulative Catalog containing as complete a record as possible in one alphabet, but that the cost would be so great that this is impractical." However, he had made a reference to the Ellsworth Report (Library of Congress Information Bulletin, Nov. 16-22, 1948) and had suggested that a sound practical way out of the dilemma might still be found through some combination of the two approaches to the problem. The committee undertook to continue its study of the problem and it was directed that the Merritt and Ellsworth reports be reproduced together as appendixes to the minutes of the meeting.

With respect to the problem of an interchange of personnel on a swapping basis between the Library of Congress and other libraries, the committee had sought the assistance of Herman H. Henkle who had addressed a questionnaire to A.R.L. members. The answers were far from unanimous though it was clear that, in spite of difficulties, there existed a very real interest in the subject. The committee undertook to continue its consideration of the problem and to bring in a more definite report.

The last problem before the committee, namely that of the role of the Library of Congress as an informational clearing house in relation to subjects not now covered, had been referred to Herman H. Fussler. His thoughtful report on the subject had not yet had from the committee the attention which it deserved. It was therefore ordered to be reproduced as an appendix to the minutes and the committee undertook to bring in a further report at the spring meeting.

Committee on Library Statistics

Mr. Lyle, chairman, presented a report (to be reproduced as an appendix to the minutes) and sought the discharge of his committee, it being his conviction that, whether an acceptable decision could be reached or not, further discussions in committee would be of little use. However, it was pointed out that so important a report deserved more careful consideration than could be given it at the moment. He was therefore urged, and he agreed, to allow his committee to remain in being at least until the next meeting when it was hoped that important decisions could be made. The principal point at issue was whether library holdings should be counted and reported by volume or by bibliographical unit.

Committee on Microfilming Cooperation

Mr. Tate, chairman, reported that an information center on long-run microfilm projects had been established at the Library of Congress (and he urged publicity); that Newspapers on Microfilm, A Union Check-List, compiled by George A. Schwegmann, Jr., had been published and was for sale through the office of the executive secretary; and that a preliminary draft of "Standards for the Microphotographic Reproduction of Newspapers" was undergoing final revision and would be published in a forthcoming issue of American Documentation, a new periodical just announced by the American Documentation Institute. He said that his committee had also given considerable attention to the problem of pricing policy in the production and sale of microfilms and to the problem of loaning positive copies of microfilms of newspapers and similar materials. In both these cases further study was felt to be necessary before positive recommendations could be made.

There were two other large problems which required attention. The first, namely the evaluation of existing files of newspapers and similar materials on microfilm, Mr. Tate said might be dealt with in the newly established Center for Scientific Aids to Learning at M.I.T.; the second, that of what newspapers should be microfilmed in order to ensure good nationwide coverage of the principal sources, he felt should be referred to a different committee "whose interests lie in the field of resources planning rather than in technical realization." He therefore expressed the hope that his committee could soon complete its assignment and ask to be discharged.

Committee on the Reproduction of Wartime Serials

Charles H. Brown, chairman, reporting on an inquiry which he had made among member libraries, recommended that action be taken to extend the distribution of duplicates of wartime serials (hitherto confined to German serials) to include those of France, Italy and Japan. On motion it was so voted.

Then turning to the reproduction program,
Mr. Brown reported that Edwards Brothers would complete within the next two years the reproduction of wartime issues of 100 serials of which some volumes had already been reproduced; he expected that 65 would be completed in 1949. In addition to the 100 mentioned, Mr. Edwards expects this year to start the reproduction of 32 serials not on the original list. These reproductions will be on the basis of four pages on one.

Mr. Brown distributed samples of four pages on one reproduction and also of reproduction by means of photostats. Members present agreed unanimously that they would prefer the four to one reproductions to photostats, even if the price were double that of photostats.

Edwards Brothers have listed the four following periodicals the reproduction of which will start as soon as sufficient orders are received: Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie; Deutsche Math. Vereinigung. Jahresbericht; Natur und Volk; Physikalische Berichte. Members desiring them were urged to place orders at once.

The thanks of the association were voted to the University of Minnesota Library and to Raymond H. Shove for their effective efforts in locating for the committee single issues of wartime serials.

Committee on Indexing and Abstracting

In the absence of Mr. Ellsworth, chairman, the executive secretary presented a brief report on his behalf. Mr. Ellsworth and the members of his committee have studied their problem very largely through conversations with the members of their faculties with a view to finding out what the scholars want. Their findings have been that scholars disagree among themselves on many fundamental questions bearing on this subject. Therefore the committee has reluctantly reached the conclusion that while much can and should be done, A.R.L. should do nothing on its own responsibility at this time. Meanwhile efforts of some promise are being made to find out how the scientist works and what his needs are. The results of these efforts should be awaited.

With respect to the more specific problem of American representation at the projected conference on scientific abstracting which is to be held at UNESCO headquarters in Paris this coming June, Mr. Ellsworth urged that steps be taken to bring it about that at least one librarian be placed on the American delegation. That problem he had referred to the executive secretary who in turn had taken it up with Mr. Clapp of the Library of Congress. Mr. Clapp's soundings at the Department of State had been encouraging with respect to this matter. Mr. Clapp also reported on the cooperation between the Library of Congress and UNESCO in the field of bibliography which was still in its early stages.

Royal Society Conference

Mr. Shaw drew attention to the publication of the Proceedings of the Royal Society's Scientific Information Conference, June 1948, which may be purchased directly from the society.

Supplement to the DeRicci Census

At the request of Professor C. U. Faye, University of Illinois, the executive secretary distributed copies of a circular announcing plans for a supplement to the DeRicci Census of Mediaeval and Renaissance Manuscripts.

Place and Date of the Next Meeting

It was decided to accept the invitation of the director of the Harvard Library to hold the next meeting in the Lamont Library, Harvard University, on the afternoon and evening of March 31, in connection with the Harvard Conference on The Place of the Library in a University. —Charles W. David, Executive Secretary.
Personnel

In March of this year Robert H. Muller became director of libraries at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. From September 1946 to February 1949 he was librarian at Bradley University, Peoria, Ill.; before that time he was chief of the acquisitions section, Office of Technical Services, U.S. Department of Commerce. He received his doctor's degree from the Graduate Library School in 1942. Immediately thereafter, he organized the meteorological research library for the Army Air Forces Headquarters in Washington and subsequently served in the Army for two years. His earlier professional experience included assistantships at the San Francisco Public Library and at Temple University Library. He received his basic library training at the University of California School of Librarianship, after graduating from Stanford University, California.

Dr. Muller brings to S.I.U. a broad professional competency with especial promise and achievement in two important areas—library buildings and the teaching role of libraries. At Bradley he played a dominant role in the thinking, planning and construction of a new $600,000 library building. Using modular construction, he evolved a structure which skillfully combined functional utility with aesthetic grace—and that on an urban campus. The Bradley University Library building and the new Washington State College Library building are likely to be pace-setters for the college library buildings of the future. At Carbondale, Dr. Muller has an even greater challenge; it will be his task to direct the planning of a proposed new library building that is expected to cost in the neighborhood of $5,000,000.

After the construction of a new building, the problem of effectively implementing the teaching role of the library is still to be solved. To this problem, too, Dr. Muller brings appropriate qualifications. His major interest during his graduate work was in the field of communications and at Bradley he introduced and taught a course on mass communications and public opinion. He inaugurated a library sponsored book discussion program at Bradley and has investigated the newspaper reading preferences of university students. All who know or have worked with Dr. Muller are aware of his ability, insight and vision. We can expect to see interesting developments in library service at Southern Illinois University in the years ahead.—Herbert Goldhor.

Appointments

Arthur M. McAnally, who recently reorganized the library system at the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru, has resigned his position as librarian of the University of New Mexico to become assistant director of the University of Illinois Library in charge of public service departments and associate professor of library science.

Harriet D. MacPherson, professor of library science at Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, since last June, has succeeded Dr. Marie Hamilton Law as dean of the Graduate School of Library Science in September. Dr. MacPherson was librarian of Smith College from 1943 until going to Drexel.

Wilmer H. Baatz, assistant chief of the library division of the Veterans Administration, became assistant librarian of the University of Rochester on April 18.

Dr. Leslie W. Dunlap, assistant chief of the Division of Manuscripts at the Library of Congress, has been appointed librarian of the University of British Columbia at Vancouver.

Kenneth Brough has recently been appointed librarian and professor of bibliography at San Francisco State College.

Frank N. Jones, on the Harvard College Library staff since 1946, left to become head librarian of the Ohio University Library, Athens, on July 1.

Hobart F. Berolzheimer, formerly first assistant in book selection for the Chicago Public Library, is now acquisitions librarian, University of California, Santa Barbara College Library.
Donald B. Engley, formerly librarian of Norwich University, Northfield, Vermont, has accepted the post of assistant librarian of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

William A. Kozumplik, who has been assistant librarian of Notre Dame University since 1947, is going to Oregon State College at Corvallis as assistant librarian with the rank of associate professor.

Thomas S. Shaw, assistant in charge of public reference, Main Reading Room, Library of Congress, and lecturer in reference and bibliography at the Catholic University of America, has been appointed to a lectureship in reference and bibliography at the School of Librarianship of the University of California for 1949-50.

Louise M. Stubblefield, reference-circulation librarian at the University of Illinois at Galesburg since 1946, became circulation librarian of the Columbia University Libraries on July 1.

John E. Smith, librarian of the Institute of Industrial Relations of the University of California at Los Angeles, has been appointed head of the acquisitions department of the library, succeeding Helen F. Shumacher, who resigned to be married. Mr. Smith is succeeded in his previous post by Robert E. Thomason.

Filomena Martemucci, head cataloger of Hunter College, New York City, has been appointed assistant librarian in charge of technical processes for the New York State Maritime Academy. Frederic O'Hara, library assistant, College of the City of New York, has been named assistant librarian in charge of readers services.

Jorge Rivera-Ruiz began work on January 1 as assistant to the director of the Hispanic-American Institute and assistant acquisition librarian at the University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.

Nina McIntosh has succeeded Ruth Lowenthal as head cataloger at State College Library, Fort Hays, Kan.

Bernice Hetzner has been appointed librarian of the College of Medicine of the University of Nebraska Library, Lincoln. Mr. Joy Blanchard, department head of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Library, has been named librarian of the College of Agriculture.

Robert E. Booth, formerly head of the reference department at the Peabody Institute Library, Baltimore, is now associate librarian at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mrs. E. Grimes Witcher has been appointed head of the periodical department of the University of Oklahoma Library, Norman.

Francis S. Allen, Oregon State Library, is now senior librarian in charge of government documents, California State Polytechnic Library, San Luis Obispo.

Mollie H. Hollreigh, University of California Library at Los Angeles, has succeeded Loeta Johns as director of the Pacific Northwest Bibliographical Center.

Martha Thurlow, formerly head of the chemistry library at the University of Texas, Austin, joined the staff of the Columbia University Libraries as assistant librarian in the Natural Science Library in charge of zoology.

Necrology

Raymond W. Holbrook, librarian of the Russell Sage Foundation since 1946, died in New York City on May 2. A graduate of Dartmouth and the library schools of Columbia and Michigan, Mr. Holbrook was on the staff of the library of the College of the City of New York from 1931 to 1943. He left his position as supervisor of cataloging and classification to head a recataloging and reclassification project at the University of Georgia, where he advanced to the post of associate director in charge of technical processes.

Charles Edwin Janvrin, natural history librarian emeritus at the University of Illinois, died in Urbana on March 19 after a prolonged illness. After teaching from 1894 until 1901 in the Pennsylvania Institute for the Blind, he was appointed librarian of the Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia. Following his graduation from the New York State Library School in 1911, he came to Urbana as lecturer on departmental problems in the Library School and natural history librarian at the University of Illinois. During his tenure he saw the departmental collection grow from a few shelves of books to a research library of 35,000 volumes.
News from the Field

The private library of Acquisitions, Gifts, Dr. George Petrie, former professor and dean of the Graduate School at the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, was presented to A.P.I. last year by Kate Lane, his sister-in-law. The collection contains some 12,000 volumes and exhibits the varied interests of Dr. Petrie. It is particularly strong in the fields of Alabama and southern history, modern European history, languages and literature, and contemporary American literature.

A collection of approximately 8000 photographic negatives, depicting early western scenes, has been acquired by Special Collections of the University of Oregon Library. Known as the Lee Morehouse collection, the negatives include scenes of Indian life, agriculture, urban and rural studies, Columbia River life, rodeo personalities and other illustrations of the culture of eastern Oregon dating from 1890 to 1920.

The Chicago Undergraduate Library of the University of Illinois, David K. Maxfield, librarian, has received a gift of architectural books and portfolios. Formerly comprising part of the special library of the Chicago architectural firm of Holabird and Root, the collection was recently appraised at approximately $10,000. It will be used as a nucleus for the special departmental reading room for art and architecture which the Chicago Undergraduate Library plans to put into operation next fall.

The excellently written "Acquisitive Notes," edited by Robert Vosper, assistant librarian of the University of California, Los Angeles, announced in April that the library had purchased 50 Italian opera books. These books contain not only the dialogue of operas, but also the casts and plots of ballets performed between the acts. Many of the ballet plots are based on mythology and some have exotic settings—their scenes being laid in China, Persia, Turkey or India. They recount historical tales of love, jealousy, treachery and violence among the nobility, and romantic tragedies borrowed from English history. On the lighter side some of the ballet themes concern themselves with magic and fantasy; others provide examples of straight farce, such as The Conscript (1839).

These libretti purchased for U.C.L.A. range in date from 1777 to 1853. Works by Mozart, Rossini, Donizetti, Meyerbeer, Pacini, Mayr, Mercadante, Nicolai, Fioravanti and many others are represented.

Library News, published by the Mississippi State Library, announced in February that a grant had recently been provided for the library through the generosity of the General Education Board. This grant will be in force for the next three years and will be matched with college funds. The money will be used to purchase books, new sets of periodicals and volumes to fill in sets now in the library.

Northwestern Library recently added to its collection of Kantiana by acquiring nine new items. Among the new acquisitions was a first edition of Kant's, Kritik der reinen Vernunft (Riga, 1781), the Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht (Konigsberg, 1798), Kleine Schriften (Neuwied, 1793), Welches sind die wirklichen Fortschritte, die Metaphysik seit Leibniz' und Wolff's zeiten gemacht hat? (Konigsberg, 1804). The remainder of the newly acquired Kantiana consists of contemporary works about Kant's philosophy.

Two important contributions to the Stanford University music library have been made by Colonel Tod Bates and Flodden W. Heron, both of San Francisco. First editions of 15 comparatively unknown Strauss waltzes—two by Eduard, seven by Johann, and six by Joseph—are included in the Bates gift of 28 pieces of rare sheet music. Colonel Bates is the owner of one of the most important private collections of sheet music in the United States. Mr. Heron gave the university's music library two volumes of Original Scottish Airs for the Voice with Accompaniments for the Piano, Violin, and Violoncello, many of them by the immortal Robert Burns. The airs were edited by G. Thomson of Edinburgh in 1805, and each of the volumes bears his signature. Arrangements for the gifts were made by Dr. Nathan van Patten, Stanford professor of bibliography.
Alexander O. Vietor, curator of the Yale Map Collection, announced earlier this year that the Yale University Library had acquired the earliest pair of dated globes made in America. The pair includes a terrestrial globe, made in 1811, and a celestial globe made the following year. Both were handmade by James Wilson of Bradford, Vt., who later established the first globe manufactory in this country. The globes are examples of the first engraving on a globular surface done in America. They were obtained for Yale through gifts from the Yale Library Associates, Horace Brown, Class of 1900, and Arthur W. Butler. The maker of the globes was a Vermont farmer who began the task at the age of 33 after having seen a British made globe at Dartmouth College. At the time he had only a meager knowledge of geography and astronomy and none of engraving. He acquired the necessary background in astronomy and geography and managed, by great sacrifice, to buy a third edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. He walked from his Vermont farm to New Haven, Conn., to see Amos Doolittle (1754-1832), who had engraved two maps in Jedediah Morse’s Geography Made Easy. Picking up a basic knowledge of copper engraving from Doolittle, Wilson trudged back to Vermont. Being a farmer, he was an experienced blacksmith. He made all of his own tools, including his lathes and presses. He did his own printing and even made his own ink and varnish. Wilson spent 300 days making his first copper plate for a globe. However he ran into difficulty trying to get the true proportions of the meridians on a globular surface and was forced to begin his work all over again. In 1810 he completed and sold his first globe. Wilson was now 53 years of age. Eight years later he helped establish a globe manufactory in Albany, the first of its type in America. Within a few years British globes, which had monopolized the American market, had all but disappeared.

The State College Library, Fort Hays, Kan., is the recipient of the library collected by Dr. I. H. Betz of York, Pa. The library is the gift of Dr. Betz’s niece, Mrs. Ross L. Miller, Cimarron, Kan., and consists of 2000 volumes of history, literature and science.

Duke University Library has obtained a complete collection of Ralph Waldo Emerson’s works and other papers. Dr. Clarence Gohdes, Duke professor of American literature, has described the new material as containing “a complete set of first editions of all the books by Emerson, plus the English editions . . . as well as a goodly supply of the separates of individual orations or essays.” A showpiece in the collection is a copy of The Conduct of Life (1860) with the words “Nathaniel Hawthorne, from the Author, November 6, 1860.”

Dr. Carl M. White announced in March a gift to the Columbia University Libraries of 1500 volumes of Greek classics in English and modern Greek translation. The books were contributed by an organization comprised of Greek ship operators. According to Manuel Kulukundis, president of the group, the collection includes the works of outstanding contemporary Greek authors. The gift will augment the modern Greek collection which was presented to the Columbia Libraries in 1936 by the University of Athens, the late King George II, and the Greek ministry of Education.

Stanford University has acquired the professional library of Professor Takeo Kaneski, noted Japanese anthropologist. The collection offers a wide range of material on eastern Asia previously unavailable to western scholars. It numbers some 800 separate items, including many complete series of journals. The collection contains contributions of Japanese scholars to the fields of prehistory, cultural anthropology and folklore. Also included are archeological surveys, plates from government museums, monographs and Japanese professional journals.

Fire completely destroyed the agricultural library of Pakistan some months ago and the government immediately issued a plea for assistance. In April, Dr. Sidney B. Smith, director of libraries at Vermont, announced that more than six tons of agricultural literature, including reports, pamphlets and books from state and national agricultural departments had been shipped to Pakistan by the University of Vermont. The collection is composed of duplicate publications now on file at the University.

Buildings

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education has awarded contracts for the construction of
a modular type addition to the University of Oregon Library, with completion tentatively scheduled for midyear 1950. The four level addition will provide about 40,000 square feet of floor space (exclusive of ramps and stairways) at a building cost of $631,608 for the 90 full size (18' × 22.5') bays and 12 smaller bays (9' × 18'). The modular type addition is designed to permit unlimited horizontal expansion in three directions, and to allow maximum flexibility in interior arrangements. The stack, reading and office areas will be interchangeable. Movement between the addition and the present fixed stacks will be facilitated by ramps, as well as by stairways and elevators in each part of the enlarged building.

The addition will seat 570 readers and have stack space for about 135,000 volumes. Besides furnishing custombuilt quarters for the library's audio-visual department, the addition will allow reorganization of facilities and expansion of services on a modified divisional plan. Access to the stacks will be unrestricted, and reading areas will be distributed throughout the stack areas rather than concentrated into conventional large reading rooms. Each level of the addition will also have conference and typing rooms as well as group study areas, carrells and faculty studies.

A new four-story library building is being constructed for Mississippi State College, Jackson. It will have 42 faculty studies and 35 student carrells, and a capacity of 450,000 volumes distributed throughout seven tiers of stacks. It will also contain a separate room for Mississippi books, two music rooms and a record library, an auditorium seating 122 persons, a browsing room and a microfilm laboratory. The building will be constructed of reinforced concrete, brick and hollow tile with Indiana limestone trimmings. The building is scheduled for completion early next spring.

Dr. Carl M. White, Columbia University, announced a bequest of $300,000 from the will of the late William Nelson Cromwell, noted lawyer who graduated from the Columbia Law School in 1876. The gift will be used to finance a major book stack construction project which will provide new shelving for 100,000 volumes in the Law Library. The stacks will be built three tiers high, with a workroom for processing operations on the top level. Rare and irreplaceable materials will be shelved in a special section of the new stacks. The entire stack area will be moisture-proofed and air conditioned. Study desks will be provided for the convenience of students using material in the stacks.

The spring meeting of the Conference of College and University Librarians of Southern California met May 14 in the recently completed $500,000 Immaculate Heart College Library. Equipment was the theme of a panel discussion. Everett Moore of U.C.L.A. acted as chairman. Sister Mary Regis, I.H.M. of Immaculate Heart College, Deborah King of U.C.L.A. and Herman Smith of Pasadena City College told of planning and equipping their respective libraries. Close inspection was made of the Immaculate Heart 150,000 volume library, unique for its stack tower, providing a vertical expansion with five tiers.

Curricula. In answer to the many requests for information about degrees at the University of Denver School of Librarianship, from those who already have a graduate or undergraduate year of library science, the following information has been prepared. These students may carry a minor of 15 quarter hours (10 semester hours), of advanced library courses in the School of Librarianship, together with 30 quarter hours in a subject field, and receive the M.A. with a major in the subject field. The program requires three quarters in residence and is available during the summers, as well as the regular year. Application should be made to the dean, Graduate College, University of Denver, University Park Campus, Denver 10, Colo. This program is in addition to the regular curriculum of the school which leads to the Master's degree with a major in librarianship.

The fifth summer training course in the preservation and administration of archives, for custodians of public, institutional and business records, will be offered July 25-Aug. 20, 1949 by the American University, Washington, D.C., with the cooperation of the National Archives, the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress and the Maryland Hall of Records. The program will consist of lectures on the most important
phases of work with records and manuscripts, demonstrations and group conferences, in such fields as arrangement and description of record and manuscript material, repair and preservation, and cataloging. It will also include laboratory work in the National Archives and in the Maryland Hall of Records, which institutions will grant to the students the privileges of interns for the duration of the course. For those especially interested in the care of historical manuscripts, internships will be available in the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress, and special lectures and laboratory experience will be provided for students whose work calls for emphasis on the basic problems of the administration of current records. The fee for the entire course, in which veterans may enrol under Public Laws 16 and 346, will be $40.00. Detailed information may be obtained by writing to Ernst Posner, School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs, The American University, 1901 F Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

The Medical Library Association is sponsoring two scholarships of $150 each for students taking the medical library course at the Columbia University School of Library Service during the summer quarter of 1949. Funds for this purpose have come from a gift made by the Lilly Research Laboratories.

Preference will be given to students giving evidence of an intention to stay in medical library work and who seem to have possibilities of making a real contribution to it through their work. It is expected that the individual either has or will have a library school degree at the end of the course.

Application should be made to the Columbia University School of Library Service, New York 27, N.Y.

The New York State College for Teachers, Department of Librarianship, will hold its Second Annual Workshop for Children's and Young People's Librarians August 1-12. Laura K. Martin, associate professor of library science, University of Kentucky, will direct the program. The theme of the two week session will be "Periodicals and Pamphlets for Today's Problems." Two hours graduate credit will be granted participants and the course is open to students who have completed a one year course in library science. Arrangements may be made for room and board. The cost of the course is $14 for New York residents and $20 for nonresidents.

At the request of A.C.R.L., Publications Humphry G. Bousfield, librarian, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N.Y., is preparing a revision of the pamphlet on Friends of Library Groups. It will be appreciated if librarians of colleges and universities who have such groups will submit information about them by means of a questionnaire which will be sent on request.

Instead of a single comprehensive student handbook, the University of California Library, Berkeley, is publishing a series of Orientation Leaflets to introduce the library and its services to new students. Leaflets published so far are The University of California Library (No. 1); How to Use the Catalog (No. 2); Magazine Indexes (No. 3); How to Find Book Reviews (No. 4). They are uniform in size and punched to fit two standard sizes of looseleaf binders.

The leaflet form, rather than the handbook, was chosen for several advantages it offers in a large and complex library. It allows more thorough treatment of library matters when that seems desirable; it permits variations in style and content between leaflets addressed to graduates and undergraduates; and it permits variation in color of ink and paper and style of typography and illustration. The more popular leaflets are quickly reprinted, and revised editions keep the leaflets up to date. As a rule, the leaflets are tried out first in mimeographed editions and then revised and printed. This year the leaflets have been distributed in English and Speech classes.

Results and recommendations of a two year survey of how well public libraries are serving American communities will be made public in the fall. The Public Library Inquiry, under the direction of Dr. Robert D. Leigh, has been a project of the Social Science Research Council financed by a $200,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation. The findings of Dr. Leigh's staff of experts will be published in seven volumes by Columbia University Press.

The Florida Library Association has published Libraries in Florida. This survey may be obtained for $1.00 per copy from the
School of Library Training and Service, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Harry C. Bauer, director, University of Washington Library, Seattle, is the author of "Books at the University of Washington," in The Pacific Spectator, vol. III, No. 1, Winter 1949. The article has also been reprinted as a pamphlet.

The Association of Research Libraries has sponsored the publication, Newspapers on Microfilm: a Union Check List, issued from the office of the executive secretary, University of Pennsylvania Library. The list was compiled under the direction of George A. Schweigmann, Jr., and includes all entries of newspapers on microfilm which were reported to the National Union Catalog by libraries and other producers of microfilm. The arrangement is by country (United States first), and then by place and title. Locations of copies are indicated and prices are given when known.

Sir Ernest Gowers is the author of Plain Words: A Guide to the Use of English, issued by the British Information Services, New York. Librarians will be interested in this monograph which discusses style for officials and librarians who are interested in public writing. Price, $1.15.

The Public Administration Service, Chicago, has issued two publications of interest to librarians: Public Administration Libraries: A Manual of Practice (Publication No. 102, price $2.50), and Source Materials in Public Administration (Publication No. 102A, price $1.00). The first of these is a reprint of the edition in the lists of materials of 1941, with changes in the lists of materials in Chapter II, "Materials and Their Acquisition."

The Collection of Regional History of Cornell University, has issued its Third and Fourth Annual Reports of the Curator, 1946-1948. The report by Edith M. Fox, curator, describes and analyzes the manuscripts, papers and other materials acquired by the collection during the period cited. It provides a body of useful information to research workers and librarians who are interested in knowing the nature of the materials acquired. Special lists for newspapers and periodicals and broadsides, as well a detailed index, are included.

The January 1949 Library Notes, a bulletin issued by the Friends of the Duke University Library, contains an article on "The Music Collection of Duke University Library," by Dr. Kathi Meyer-Baer. A. S. Limouze writes about "Early English Periodicals in the University Library," and Clarence Gohdes reports on the Emerson collection, gathered together by the bibliophile Carroll A. Wilson, which has come to Duke.

Sister Mary Luella has edited The Catholic Booklist, 1949 for the Catholic Library Association. Copies are available, at 65¢ each, from the Department of Library Science, Rosary College, River Forest, Ill.

The October 1948 Arkansas Libraries is entitled the "College Library Edition." The issue contains a number of articles on college and university library problems, including both the technical and the readers' services.


Other Library of Congress publications include: Classification, Class K: Law, prepared by Elizabeth V. Benyon, senior assistant in charge of preparations, the Law Library, University of Chicago. This classification, which makes use of Library of Congress notation, which has been reserved for law, is printed as manuscript for comment and suggestions by librarians and others. The Library of Congress eventually plans to prepare and publish a classification of law "adequate to its needs and in conformity with its system of classification."

Representative Positions in the Library of Congress (Government Printing Office, 1948), is a 576-page lithoprinted publication containing a wealth of information about many of the positions in the national library. The publication is intended to provide a means for members of the L.C. staff to relate their duties to the total organization and broad objectives of the Library. It is also designed to aid the administrative members of the staff in planning and improving techniques of organization and classification. The library profession as a whole can use the information in this volume to answer many questions about the organization of L.C. and
the various types of positions which have been established. The publication was prepared under the general supervision of George A. Pughe, director of personnel.

Walter Hausdorfer, librarian, Temple University, in his Annual Report, 1947-1948 has provided a thorough analysis of the problems and shortcomings of the Temple libraries. The report is actually a plan for development in the future.

The library of the University of California at Los Angeles, Lawrence C. Powell, librarian, has issued an attractive Handlist of an Exhibition of Great American Historical Documents, Manuscripts and Books. The materials used in the exhibition, which was held Feb. 23-Mar. 13, 1949, were loaned by The Rosenbach Company.


The Junior College Journal, March 1949, contains Crawford Beecher Thayer's "A New Role of the Junior-College Library." A. D. Roberts, United Nations Library, has written an Introduction to Reference Books. The book is based on lectures given by the author during the 1945-46 and 1946-47 sessions of the School of Librarianship of University College, London. It is a practical explanation of various types of reference books and is aimed at the young library school student and library assistant. It is published by The Library Association, Chaucer House, Malet Place, London, W.C.1 (1948, price, 12s.).

The Harvard University Press has published Organization and Management: Selected Papers, by Chester I. Barnard (1948, price $4.00). Librarians interested in personnel relations will find much of value in this volume. Chapter V is concerned with "Concepts of Organization," and Chapter VIII is devoted to a consideration of "Education for Executives."

Professor Weldon A. Brown, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, is the author of The Common Cause, Collectivism: Menace or Challenge, 1949. The volume is published by the North River Press, Box 821, Blacksburg, Va. The author presents the case of democracy against the development of collectivism.

Two recent books published by Henry Schuman which are of considerable interest to librarians are Scientists and Amateurs: A History of the Royal Society, by Dorothy Stimson, chairman of the Department of History at Goucher College, and Sons of Science: The Story of the Smithsonian and Its Leaders, by Paul H. Oehser, who has been affiliated with the Smithsonian since 1931. The authors include materials relating to the collections and libraries of the institutions. Both of these volumes, priced at $4.00 each, are in The Life of Science Library series.

The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, which began publication in January, 1949, makes it easier for scholars and journalists to obtain current material regarding the Soviet Union. In addition to providing complete translations of the more important items in Pravda and Izvestia, and summaries of less important ones, the Current Digest contains selections from approximately 40 other Soviet newspapers and magazines. The Joint Committee on Slavic Studies, appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, publishes Current Digest. The subscription rate, including the quarterly index, is $150 per year; single copies, $3.00. Universities, colleges, libraries and other education and research bodies subscribing may obtain additional copies at a special rate of $25 per year. All communications should be addressed to the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, 1219 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Opportunities in College and University Librarianship has been published by the Conference of College and University Librarians of Southern California, for distribution to vocational counselors and interested college and junior college students. Additional copies are available at three cents each on application to Everett Moore, University of California Library, Los Angeles 24.
Review Articles

Documentation


More than half a century after La Fontaine and Otlet began their work in developing improved techniques for the bibliographical analysis of printed and nonprinted documents, the English speaking world has remained without a basic treatise on the principles of documentation. The absence of such a work may in large measure explain the failure of American librarianship to keep pace with such developments in France and other European countries. The publications of the International Federation of Documentation, and scattered contributions widely dispersed throughout a miscellaneous variety of journals, have but imperfectly interpreted the meaning of documentation to those on this side of the Atlantic who should be most interested in the field. The late Mr. Bradford's little volume, then, is an attempt to bring together for the first time, in a systematic treatment, the basic principles and problems of documentation in a manner which will make them most useful to those on this side of the Atlantic who should be most interested in the field. The late Mr. Bradford's little volume, then, is an attempt to bring together for the first time, in a systematic treatment, the basic principles and problems of documentation in a manner which will make them most useful to the English speaking world. In effect the volume is an addition to our shelves rather than to the literature of documentation, since it is largely an assembly of previously published articles; a method of compilation which almost inevitably results in a sacrifice of cohesiveness. For all that, it remains a useful volume and librarians generally can read it with profit and be grateful for it.

Quite properly the book opens with a consideration of the nature, origin, and purpose of documentation, an approach particularly appropriate for American readers to whom the concept of documentation is still generally unfamiliar. After a provocative consideration of the problems inherent in alphabetical subject indexing the author begins his vigorous defense of the Universal Decimal Classification, a theme to which he reverts all too frequently throughout the entire book. The remainder of the volume is largely concerned with the documentary chaos which the author finds at present characteristic of the work now being carried on by the variety of English organizations working in the field, and his own rational plan for more adequate bibliographic coverage of scientific literature—a constructive program that is somewhat less convincing than his criticisms of the existing situation.

The author's treatment of the semantic problems inherent in alphabetic subject indexing, and his contention that such subject headings are themselves a concealed classification, are both admirable, but he seems to be unaware that these same weaknesses are also implicit in all of our existing systems of book classification, and that because of the physical form of the book itself and the multiplicity of concepts which a single volume may contain, no schematism can assemble in one place even a substantial proportion of the total library resources on a given subject. Admittedly Mr. Bradford is primarily concerned with a classification of the literature, rather than a shelf arrangement of books which of necessity is largely predetermined by their physical format. This freedom from the restriction of the codex form does not solve the problem of classification if the terminology of the discipline is not precisely defined or the relationships among its subordinate disciplines but imperfectly understood.

It is Mr. Bradford's excessive enthusiasm for the Universal Decimal Classification which will probably arouse the greatest criticism in this country. Though the U.D.C. is based upon the scheme devised by Melvil Dewey, the length of its notation, the intricacy of its details and the complexities attending its application have made it so extremely unpopular with American librarians that it has been almost completely neglected in the United States. One wishes that this book had been less a tract for the U.D.C. and more of a general consideration of the problems of classification as applied to bibliographic organization.

More constructively important is the author's proposal for an integrated system of special libraries under the leadership of a central library of science and technology. Such a system would promote an expansion of the librarian's activities to include more
effective organization of bibliographical operations and the more adequate indexing and abstracting of scientific and technical literature. His central library would coordinate the acquisition program of the system, function as a clearing house for all phases of interlibrary cooperation and promote centralized cataloging and indexing. This appeal for the expansion of traditional library functions and the greater concern on the part of librarians with the bibliographic organization of their resources may well be considered with profit by American librarians, who have all too long been indifferent to an area in which they should be assuming the initiative.

Confronted by this chaotic state of British documentation, and urging a coordinated system of special libraries in science and technology, Mr. Bradford reaches the climax of his argument in his proposals for a plan for complete scientific documentation throughout the scholarly world. This program urges the development of an international network of existing agencies concerned with indexing and abstracting of scientific literature, each agency operating in its own clearly defined area and transferring to the others all materials relevant to their particular fields. Though it would rely solely upon voluntary cooperation for the control of its constituent parts, the failure of any one of which might seriously endanger the success of the whole, the author believes that the results of such effort would bring to the bibliographic organization of scientific literature a thoroughness of coverage and a directed effort that are now conspicuously lacking. The objective is certainly meritorious, but voluntary cooperation on an international level is at best an uncertain foundation stone upon which to rest so important an undertaking. One can hope that Mr. Bradford is right, but past experience and present realities engender skepticism.

Perhaps enough has been said to indicate that the constructive proposals of this book are less successful than the picture it presents of the present state of documentation and its criticisms of the existing situation. The chaos of documentation, especially in the field of the social sciences, in this country is even greater than that found by Mr. Bradford in his native England. If the book will serve no other purpose, at least it should focus the attention of American librarians upon the importance of the problems which it raises, the need for much greater attention to the promotion of more adequate bibliographical controls, and the desirability of effective exploration and original investigation in the field. It is to be hoped that the newly revived American Documentation Institute may eventually achieve at least some of Mr. Bradford’s desired goals. Already there is considerable evidence that workers in medicine, pure science, and technology are growing increasingly concerned over the inadequacy of their bibliographical services and classification systems, and even the social scientists are beginning to think seriously about an effective abstracting medium to fill the need left by the demise of Social Science Abstracts. To such activity librarians can ill afford to be indifferent, and if Mr. Bradford’s book should arouse some stirring in the library world, its results may well be the author’s best memorial.—Jesse H. Shera, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago.

Literature of Mathematics and Physics


Here is a welcome companion piece to those subject guides which already exist in chemistry and engineering. As the first of its kind in this specific field, this book is “intended to be of most help to those who do not necessarily have a detailed knowledge of mathematics and physics.” It provides the reader—be he scientist, student or librarian—with a general orientation in the literature available and indicates landmark books as well as further sources of information.

The author has divided his presentation into two parts of somewhat varying quality. The first part is concerned chiefly with general information on methods of study and reading, the use of the library and the technique of the literature search. One cannot help but feel
that such information could probably have been very well omitted, due to its availability elsewhere. Interwoven throughout this discussion, however, are references to certain basic tools and publications of particular relevance to the area of mathematics and physics. It is precisely this portion of the presentation which, though probably adequate, could have been profitably expanded in view of the previously uncharted nature of the field. The section on periodicals is notably and lamentably brief.

The second and more valuable part of this guide consists of a bibliography of more than 2000 titles, including books and some periodical articles. The latter consist mainly of references to *Reviews of Modern Physics*, of which the first 17 articles are said to be indexed here. The content of the bibliography falls predominantly within the area indicated by the title of the volume, with emphasis on basic and fundamental—though by no means elementary—publications, which can serve as starting points for further reading. Related engineering and general scientific literature is well represented, though with an occasional unevenness and incompleteness due probably to limitations of space and time. The material is arranged under 150 carefully chosen and specific subject headings, most of which are described or defined briefly with an occasional indication of the kind of literature available in the specific area. Unfortunately there are only a few brief annotations of individual titles and even these are sometimes as short as three or four words. The annotations given are surprisingly helpful and meaningful despite their brevity. The usefulness of the bibliography is increased by the inclusion of a good author index, but is decreased by the lack of a sufficiently detailed index.

Reference librarians will find the bibliography of particular value as it affords a more direct and convenient approach to some of the material than does the library catalog. Some use could also be made of this volume in the building up of a basic collection in the areas covered, though prices are not given and many of the books listed are not readily available. It should always be remembered that the value of a subject guide is limited somewhat due to the rapidly changing nature of the field, and hence continuous supplementary use must be made of current periodical literature. As a guide to important material which exists today, this is a valuable and helpful work.—Robert E. Maizell, New York Public Library.

**Engineering Information**


This is an excellent beginning for a much-needed work in engineering and technology. It is a manual on the reference sources of the field; a field whose wealth of material bewilders even the experienced. It is also a pioneer work in that it is virtually the first of its kind to cover technology and engineering from the American point of view. It leaves much to be desired, but the author is to be congratulated on her enterprise and courage in undertaking this formidable project.

In the preface, the author refers briefly to two works: A. D. Robert's *Guide to Technical Literature* (1939) and Dr. J. Edwin Holmstrom's *Records and Research in Engineering and Industrial Science* (1940). Neither of these is competitive. The former is better organized and written but emphasizes European material. The latter is a work of description and constructive discussion written by a scientist and engineer in his own right. In content and literary merit, it will delight and fascinate both the practical technologist and engineer as well as the most erudite scholar. It is not, however, a reference manual in the sense that Mrs. Dalton's book is.

*Sources of Engineering Information* is a classified guide to titles accompanied usually by a one-line annotation. Unquestionably the best section in the entire work is number II on "Abstracts," p. 4-15. To begin with

1 The second edition, revised and enlarged, came out in 1947.

2 For a fine survey and review on this subject, see
are the more general; then follow the special arranged by subject. It should be pointed out that the former “Current Metallurgical Abstracts” of Metals and Alloys has two cumulative indices covering 1929-34 and after that annual indices through 1942, with which this fine abstracting service goes into oblivion.

Section I on “Indexes to Periodical and Serial Literature” is considered second best. To this should be added Donald C. Haskell’s A Check List of Cumulative Indexes to Individual Periodicals.

Section III on “Location of Articles; Identification of Periodicals” is reasonably extensive and no doubt quite adequate for the purposes of this bibliography. Since, however, the Bibliography of Scientific and Industrial Reports is listed (p.23), it would not have been out of order to have listed Grace Swift’s Government Document Series Analyzed by the Office of Technical Services (1947), which lists the serials abstracted in that work. Also it is to be regretted that the third edition of Union List of Technical Periodicals (1947) is not included. There are, to our knowledge, over 600 references in this field alone, and the most extreme selectivity can be exercised.

Sections IV and V, “Bibliography” and “Reference Books” respectively, might well have been grouped, as both cover about the same ground. A grave omission from the former is the Bibliographic Index, which lists a number of bibliographies in the sciences and in technology. Under “Metals” is listed John L. Haughton’s Bibliography of the Literature Relating to the Constitutional Diagrams of Alloys (1942); this should have been listed under “Alloys,” as such diagrams in metallurgy deal only with alloys. Max Hansen’s Der Aufbau der Zweistofflegierungen (1936, Edwards Bros., 1943) and Ernst Jänecke’s Kurzgefasstes Handbuch Aller Legierungen (1937, Edwards Bros., 1943), both on constitutional diagrams of alloys, should have been listed under “Alloys” in one or the other of these two sections. In addition, reference could also have been made to the extensive sections on this subject both in the International Critical Tables (p.92) and in Landolt-Börnstein Physikalisch-chemische Tabellen (p.92).

Section VI, the “Trade Catalog Collection,” is limited to one page.

Section VII, on “Standards and Specifications,” is an excellent listing of institutions and offices relating to these topics.

Patent literature is conspicuous by its absence. Since patent literature in technology and the sciences precedes periodical literature by two or three years and since there were approximately 200,000 patents issued annually before the war, this becomes a vital source, and often the only source, of technological information. It should not be ignored.

Throughout the work only monographs and sets are listed. Periodical articles, regardless of their contents or merits, are not included. There are no indices of any sort. At times titles are inconsistently repeated under different subjects. The latter is especially true for Sections IV (Bibliography) and V (Reference Books).

The classification is based on form rather than subject. As a consequence anyone making the subject approach must use his ingenuity, as he may find his references scattered throughout several sections of the book as well as under different subheadings of the same section.

Engineering librarians, engineers and technologists will welcome this work both as a survey of the field and as a guide in searching the literature. May we lend every encouragement to the author to continue. Future editions should double or even treble the size of the present volume. Also we would like to see them classified by subject rather than form, with more complete titles and bibliographical data, fuller annotations, and author and subject indices.—Emory C. Skarshaug, Federal-Mogul Research & Development, Ann Arbor.

The Vatican Cataloging Rules


Eighteen years have gone by since the first edition of the Vatican Library's Norme reached these shores and received an enthusiastic welcome: "Perhaps the best of modern cataloging codes" (W. W. Bishop); "The world's best code of rules" (C. J. Farrell); "When this code is translated into English it will no doubt be very much used in American libraries" (H. D. MacPherson) were among the printed encomiums. Now at long last here is the eagerly awaited translation. What does it look like? How does it work of the Vatican rules to American practice than any of our own books available at that time, one would have thought the much needed translation would have appeared at once. In the editor's "Foreword" it is thus explained:

"After some years of discussion and postponement a translation representing the joint work of the Very Rev. Thomas J. Shanahan, Mr. Victor A. Schaefer, and Mr. Constantin T. Vesselowsky was accepted for publication by the American Library Association. The Editor was requested to review these three parts, and to harmonize the methods followed in preparing them. A survey of the work done disclosed that it had been in part an adaptation of the Vatican rules to American usage. It was agreed that a literal translation was more advisable, since the early publication of the revised Anglo-American rules, which would cover the same ground with equal thoroughness, was expected. No sooner was the revision along these lines begun than the second edition of the Vatican rules appeared (1939), and the entire translation was reworked to conform to the new edition. Although the translation was completed in 1940, publication at that time proved impossible because of the war."

But here it is—a large but manageable volume, handsomely and strongly bound in gold-lettered red buckram. Produced by offset, a method of reproduction that often results in letters too small for eye comfort and in page layout too compressed for clarity, neither fault is here found. In fact, quite the contrary. Neatly set forth in pica size type the page is as well spaced and attractive as the usual typeset book. Insofar as a reproduction from typewritten copy can be made into a luxurious appearing volume, this one is. Unfortunately inking is uneven (at least in the reviewer's copy) with some pages very black and others so lightly impressed that occasionally letters do not appear at all. On the whole, however, it is an excellent piece of bookmaking.

The translation itself is accurate and so smoothly and tersely expressed that sometimes the wording is clearer and more concise than in comparable rules of the A.L.A. code. There are a few trifling inconsistencies, such as inability to distinguish always between an original footnote and an editorial one. A little more annoying is the failure in some cases to translate examples. While the reader is told that "2.ed.di" means "2.ed. of" he is left to wonder as to the meaning of such expressions as, "Titolo dell'occhietto." These are minor defects. In general the text reads so smoothly that one is scarcely aware of its being a translation. It might well be an original English work but for the preponderance of examples in Italian.

The Rules are divided into four main sections: "Entry Word" (mainly translated by Father Shanahan); "Description of the Book" (translated by Mr. Schaefer); "Subject Entry" (Mr. Vesselowsky's contribution); "Filing" (also by Father Shanahan). Translation of definitions and material in the various appendices was the work of the editor and Father Shanahan.

In 1931, when the first edition of the Norme appeared, about the only American publication to which it could be compared was our Rules of 1908. Nor had this situation changed eight years later when the Vatican Library issued its second edition. Therefore reviewers of the two original editions...
were concerned mainly with comparing their rules of entry with those in the 1908 code, not only to point out the expansion and clarification of types of entries included in the Vatican code but also to list a long line of subjects fully treated therein and not even mentioned in our own. No wonder we felt bound to attempt to master the Italian language! American catalogers have not stood still during this long period and now there is an imposing array of publications against which the Vatican Rules can be measured and evaluated. At the head of the list both in time and importance stands the second edition of the A.L.A. Catalog Rules (preliminary ed., 1941; final edition, 1949). So detailed and comprehensive is it that even in one of the fields in which the Vatican Rules is fullest the American code can hold its own. Father Farrell, writing in the Catholic Library World (February 1942) comments: "Offhand, it appears to the reviewer that the revised A.L.A. rules now offer greater assistance in the cataloging of Catholic materials than do the Vatican rules." Thus have the tables been turned. One might also compare the seven pages devoted to music in the new A.L.A. code with the scant single page in the Vatican; or the few lines devoted to maps and atlases in the latter to the two and one-half pages of the other; or even to the American treatment of manuscripts—five and one-half pages against the Vatican's two. On the other hand, the Vatican Rules offers such aids as a long list of religious orders and congregations, together with their English equivalents and the key to the abbreviations by which they are so frequently cited. Helpful, too, is the list of apocryphal books of the Bible. But this is not the place for a rule-by-rule comparison. Nor does it seem necessary to more than mention that parts two and four of the Vatican Rules are now paralleled in American publications by the Library of Congress Rules for Descriptive Cataloging and the A.L.A. Rules for Filing Catalog Cards.

When we come to part III, "Subject Entry," the situation is quite different. Not since the days of Cutter's Rules (4th ed., 1904) has there been any attempt to codify this important and difficult part of cataloging. Valuable as is Cutter's code, especially in his careful explanations, much of his reasoning harks back to practices followed in the classified catalog. Many of the principles he enunciated, with the Cutter charm and clarity, have long been abandoned in our huge dictionary catalogs. It is astonishing to find codified and systematized by European scholars much of the theory, up to now largely unexpressed, which lies behind the choice of terms made in the subject cataloging department of the Library of Congress and followed by catalogers across the land. Father Shanahan, in reviewing this section of the original editions, thus summarized it: "A reasoned outline, with many well-chosen examples of subject heading procedure which is familiar to us through long association, but which we might have difficulty in describing briefly to inquirers." (Catholic Library World, February 1940.) All of us who teach, be it in formal classes or as part of cataloging department procedure, know too well how great the difficulty is.

That catalogers had recognized the value of this section from the very beginning is evidenced by the number of persons who had been working on it. The editor tells us that in addition to Mr. Vesselovsky's translation, use was made of a partial restatement of the rules for English usage by John Ansteinson, the original author of this section and once a student at the library school in Albany. Also utilized was a translation prepared by Katharine Adams, formerly of the Baker Library, Harvard School of Business Administration, and an adaptation to Library of Congress practice prepared by Lawrence H. Bloedel while a student at the School of Library Service, Columbia University.

In order to make this section as useful as possible a different policy from that followed in the remainder of the volume was adopted. For these chapters both a translation and an adaptation are included, chiefly by supplying headings used by the Library of Congress, listed in parallel column to the Italian headings. When possible the English heading is merely a translation of the Italian. Otherwise an English term which illustrates the rule is used. In some cases, to avoid listing a long column of equivalent English expressions, reference is made to special lists issued by L.C.—for example, the subdivisions used under names of languages, general form divisions, etc.

The section on subject headings covers about 70 pages, divided into ten chapters: "Subject cards." Definitions, general directions; "Form of the heading." Singular vs.
plural, phrase headings, etc.; "Relations between subjects." Subject subdivision, compound headings, etc.; "Bibliographical and critical material." Includes relations between sovereigns and countries, between persons and events; "Corporate bodies." Includes treatment of their publications as well as material about them; "Geographical subjects;" "Historical periods and events;" "Language and Literature;" "Form headings;" "References for subject headings."

Systematically organized, clearly and concisely enunciated, copiously illustrated with helpful examples—need we ask that a code do any more. Probably it should not but the fact remains that we do need more. The very conciseness of the wording of the rules precludes much explanation and practically no reasons for the choice of terms, the part of Cutter's code which is the most valuable. It is fortunate for the beginner that many questions are answered by Julia Pettee's Subject Headings (N.Y., H. W. Wilson, 1946), the only book in English devoted entirely to this topic. By means of Part I of this book the beginner can be reasonably, interestingly and painlessly guided from his known world of encyclopedias to the terra incognita of subject headings. Likewise he will read of the evolution of the dictionary catalog, an account which gives meaning and reason to current practices not otherwise understandable.

After studying the "Vatican Code," full of questions as to reasons why, the student can again find help by using Part II of Miss Pettee's book—"Principles and Practice." For example, the code states: "Works are recorded under their specific subjects, and not under the names and designations of the classes and disciplines to which they belong" (Rule 374a). Miss Pettee explains under what types of headings and in what types of libraries this rule should be followed or modified. She also discusses "How specific must the specific topic be?" Going far beyond the scope of any code for subject headings Miss Pettee covers questions which are an essential part of the subject heading process. She considers subject headings both as a feature of the whole dictionary catalog and also in their relation to classification and the shelflist. Likewise she examines the nature of words as well as the nature of the clientele of the library.

The tools for the subject cataloger have been enormously benefited by the addition of these two publications, each one serving to supplement the other. The high price of the Vatican Rules is indeed unfortunate. In the opinion of the reviewer it would be eminently worthwhile to issue separately, at a reasonable price, these valuable and unique ten chapters on subject headings.—Bertha M. Frick, School of Library Service, Columbia University.

Red Dog and Podunk

Bibliography of Place Name Literature, United States, Canada, Alaska and New­foundland. By Richard B. Seelock and Pauline A. Seely. Chicago, American Library Association, 1948, [10], 331p. $4.50.

The poetical and historical charm of our American place names was first brought home to me many years ago as I sat in the Minnesota Senate gallery in Saint Paul and heard the Speaker recognize the various senators as they arose to address the chair. He would say: "I recognize the gentleman from Lac Qui Parle County," or "the gentleman from Ottertail County" and I remembered that this was the country of the voyageur, of the trappers who mingled their quaint names with those left on the lakes and rivers by the Sioux and the Chippewas, the country of the old fur brigades, sweeping down the Great Lakes toward Quebec with their winter's catch of pelts, dipping their paddles to the rhythm of "A la Clair Fontaine."

Each racial element has left its distinctive, poetical or whimsical mark on the place names of our frontiers even down to our own time, when we find such geographical monikers as Gene Autry, and New Deal, or mountains named for Churchill, Eisenhower and Stalin. Some of the queer people who lived on the edge of the wilderness are remembered in Big John's Spring, Crazy Woman, Mike Mountain Horse, Red Dog and White Woman Creek. Certain characteristics of the local citizens are perpetuated in the names they gave their settlements, such as Fairplay, Frugality, Hangtown, Hairy
Hill, Odd, Robbers Roost Creek and Tarry-all. Famous early cooks are remembered in Ginger Cake Mountain and Pie Woman's Lane, while a literary flavor is evident in Author, Ind., and in the classical names which infest central New York. Lulbegrud Creek was named by a Kentuckian with a taste for Gulliver's Travels. If you like just plain queer names, here are a few: Dogtown, Flag Station, Hell on Wheels, Hogswallow, Hokus, Mail Box, Podunk, Punk's Hole, Shake-Rag-Under-the-Hill, Shirt Tail Gulch, Tessertown, Uz and Zipp. Among the thousands of Indian names, we have that for Niagara Falls which meant: "The waterfall-that-causes-women-to-exclaim-Gosh!" and the Massachusetts lake which was a boundary between two tribes and which is probably the longest geographical name in North America. Take a long breath before pronouncing it: Chargoggagoggmanchauggagoggchaubunagamaug. It means: "You fish in your end of the lake, we fish in our end of the lake, nobody fish in the middle."

All of these delightful geographical names and many more are to be found in the index of this excellent bibliography of North American place name literature. Since there is no adequate dictionary of place names in the United States and Canada, it is necessary to search the separately published gazetteers, manuals and articles, over 2000 of which are assembled here for the first time. Certain important manuscript sources are also indicated, but county and town histories have not been included since they are such obvious sources for those interested in a restricted area that their inclusion did not seem necessary.

In addition to separate chapters on each of the states, provinces and the District of Columbia, there are three on the United States as a whole and one each on the Mississippi Valley and New England. By the addition of a detailed 68-page name and subject index, the compilers have not only given us the individual authors and place names but a most interesting group of subject entries which is so suggestive of further study that we have yielded to the temptation of copying some of them:

Animals, artificial names, battlefields, bayous, Bible names, birds, border towns, camps, cantons, capes, Celtic names, Chinese, classical and corrupted names, dams, desert, Dutch, English, Eskimo and European names, explorers, forts, freak and French names, furnaces, German names, ghost towns, gold camps, historical, Icelandic and Indian names, the latter subdivided by tribe, islands, Italian and Japanese names, lakes, literary names, military posts, mills, mines, mining towns, missions, mountains, nicknames, Norse names, parks, patriotic and personal names, plains, plantations, plants, post offices, religious names, rivers, Russian names, saints, Spanish names, states (nicknames), statesmen, streets, Swedish names, synthetic names, topographic features, underworld names and water holes.

This extremely valuable compilation, published in photo-offset from a typed text, gives full title and brief collation for first editions of separate works, with indications of later editions and an exact reference for each periodical analytical. Brief but adequate notes are added when the nature of the contents does not appear from the title. A casual examination of this painstaking work gives no idea of the immense labor involved. It is a must purchase for all reference libraries, geographers and historians.—R. W. G. Vail, The New York Historical Society.

**Louisiana Author Headings**

*Author Headings for the Official Publications of the State of Louisiana.* By Lucy B. Foote. Chicago, American Library Association, 1948, x, 125p. $4.50.

Lucy B. Foote, chief catalog librarian, Louisiana State University Library, seems to have been destined to become the compiler of the second in the series of state author headings lists to be published by the American Library Association. In 1935 she completed *Official Publications of the State of Louisiana* as her Master's thesis at the University of Illinois, and in 1942 her *Bibliography of the Official Publications of Louisiana, 1803-1934*, *See review by Lucile M. Morsch of Author Headings for the Official Publications of the State of Alabama, by Anne Ethelyn Markley, in College and Research Libraries 10:70-73, January 1949. Many of Miss Morsch's general remarks apply also to the Foote list.*
was issued. Without a doubt, she realized the difficulties and problems involved in attempting to compile an orderly and acceptable list of the official agencies of the state of Louisiana and of its predecessor, the Territory of Orleans. The reorganizations effected by 10 constitutions and the reorganization acts of 1940, which in turn have been attacked as unconstitutional and have had many of their provisions set aside in succeeding appropriation acts, multiply the traps for the researcher. Miss Foote was indeed courageous to accept the challenge to list all official agencies found in the law from 1803 through 1947. The cataloging profession should be forever grateful.

Miss Foote has included in the alphabetical list official departments, bureaus, committees, etc.; state supported institutions, parks and preserves; legislative bodies and committees, if created by law or whose reports are published. Also included are many semiofficial agencies supported in whole or in part by state funds, and some private corporations who report to the state or whose reports are published as state documents. Examples of this latter group are the several railroad companies and state fair associations. By means of arbitrary headings such as “Louisiana. Levee Boards,” “Louisiana. Railroads” and “Louisiana State Parks,” Miss Foote has managed a subject grouping of similar agencies, in addition to their listing in alphabetical order. With a similar method she has indicated the many legislative committees working in the same fields.

The majority of the headings are accompanied by brief histories and references to the specific acts creating or abolishing the agencies. However many, especially the numerous legislative committees, give no information in regard to authorization or source of the entry. Miss Foote says in her introduction that the list is based primarily upon the entries found in the laws and constitutions, several library catalogs, and two published bibliographies (see above). This list of headings would be considered even more valuable if, lacking the specific enabling act to cite, Miss Foote had given some source for each entry. This might have consisted of the name of the institution in whose catalog it was found, the title or author and title of the publication with which the agency was connected, the activity in which it was engaged or the approximate dates of its existence. With so many committees, commissions, etc. having similar names it is difficult to see how one can be sure whether Miss Foote has used a varying form of entry or that the agency given on a particular publication is not in her list at all.

One instance in the use of the Foote list may underscore the value of citations or sources and the weakness of the list where they are lacking. A publication of the Louisiana Legislative Committee on Educational Survey has been issued under this form of its name. Consulting the list no such entry was found. However, the publication carries the information that the Committee was authorized by Act 38, 1946. By reading through the list of legislative committees Miss Foote's heading was located as “LOUISIANA LEGISLATURE. SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEE,” but only because in this case she has given a reference to the same Act 38, 1946. The lack of cross references is understandable since this might well have been an entry taken directly from the laws. But the many headings with no identifying information may not offer the assistance one might wish for in establishing entries for one's own library catalog.

Comparing the list with the catalog of the Library of Congress it was found that of approximately 820 headings included in the Foote list the Library of Congress has entries for only 222. The Library of Congress has entries for 19 agencies not in the printed list, but only three of these are for separate bodies, the others being for additional subheadings of agencies included by Miss Foote. As to agreement in form of entry, the Library of Congress and Miss Foote agree for 154 entries, differ for 68. The most consistent variations among these 68 entries are the inclusion of “State” in the name of a board or department and the preference of the Library of Congress for the entry of a bureau or office directly under its own name rather than as a subheading under the name of the executive department of which it may be a part.

The discrepancies regarding the use of “State” in the name may be due to the use of an earlier form by the Library of Congress and the lack of more recent material in its Louisiana collections. The discrepancy in the use of direct or indirect entry for bureaus, etc., brings up a more important question regarding the forms of entry used.
by Miss Foote. This reviewer believes that
a list of state headings as inclusive as this
one and so long awaited by the profession
should have more closely followed the A.L.A.
Catalog Rules for entries of government and
corporate bodies. Her entries for the state
institutions have generally ignored the rule
to enter the institution under the name of the
state, the name of the state to be followed by
a period. She has preferred forms like
"LOUISIANA POLYTECHNIC INSTI-
TUTE, RUSTON," omitting the period in
the heading. The entry of all of the state
controlled trade schools directly under their
names is another case in point. Bureaus and
other subdivisions of executive departments
created by law have been entered as sub-
headings, no matter how distinctive their
names.

Miss Foote's policy regarding change of
names seems to be the use of the latest form.
However, both "LOUISIANA. BOARD OF
STATE AFFAIRS" and "LOUISIANA.
TAX COMMISSION" are used, though ac-
cording to information given in the list the
Constitution of 1921 changed the name of the
board to the Tax Commission. Also, one
wonders why "LOUISIANA. UNIVER-
SITY OF LOUISIANA, NEW OR-
LEANS" has been used for the heading of an
institution which in 1884 was renamed Tu-
lane University of Louisiana.

The use of dates to distinguish different
agencies having the same name is an accepted
library practice. The policy is not clearly
shown in the Foote list. We find "LOUISI-
ANA. BOARD OF STATE ENGI-
NEERS (1871-1942)" and LOUISIANA.
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (1940/41)
where there is only one entry for agen-
cies of those names. There are "LOUISI-
ANA. DEPARTMENT OF CONSER-
VATION" (with no dates), "LOUISIANA.
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION
(1940/41)" and LOUISIANA. DEPART-
MENT OF CONSERVATION (1944-
)." Also, "LOUISIANA. TAX COM-
MISSION, 1906" and "LOUISIANA. TAX
COMMISSION," listed in that order.
Should not each one in a series of conflicting
names carry identifying dates?

Further editing of the very numerous cross
references would have eliminated many dis-
crepancies which occur between the form of
entry as given in the reference and as a head-
ing in the list. Place names are given in the
references from several institutions but do not
appear in the headings. The list gives refer-
ces "Louisiana. Board of Highways. See
LOUISIANA. DEPARTMENT OF
HIGHWAYS" and "Louisiana. Highways.
Board of. See LOUISIANA. DEPART-
MENT OF HIGHWAYS. BOARD OF
HIGHWAYS." The entry is "LOUISI-
ANA. DEPARTMENT OF HIGH-
WAYS (1942- ) BOARD OF HIGH-
WAYS." The entry "Audubon Sugar
School, New Orleans" refers to "LOUISI-
ANA. SUGAR EXPERIMENT STA-
TION, AUDUBON PARK, NEW OR-
LEANS" and also to "LOUISIANA
STATE UNIVERSITY AND AGRICUL-
TURAL AND MECHANICAL COL-
LEGE." Turning to the entries for the univer-
sity one finds a see reference from the
subheading "Audubon Sugar School" to
"LOUISIANA. SUGAR EXPERIMENT
STATION, AUDUBON PARK, NEW OR-
LEANS." Other examples could be cited
of references which should have been more
carefully cross-checked before publication.
Some references, such as "Louisiana. Board
of Labor. See LOUISIANA. DEPART-
MENT OF LABOR" might well have been
omitted. At the same time there are head-
ings which lack adequate cross references
from the significant words in their names.

Even as the preparation of the manuscript
of the Foote list was in its final stages ex-
tensive changes in the state's agencies were
made by the 1948 Legislature. The user of
the list must bear in mind the statement of
the compiler that "the status of the agencies
included within this list is that of December
31, 1947." The possibility of conflict be-
tween entries in the list and headings appear-
ing on future Louisiana documents is thus
to be expected and one will have to be on
guard and carry on some research to bring
up-to-date the status of the particular agency.
However, this should not detract from the
merits of the present list as a reference work
and cataloger's tool in the fields of state docu-
ments and American history. American gov-
ernment being always in a state of change
and reorganization, one can only hope that
such valuable lists as this will be kept reason-
ably up-to-date by revision or supplements
prepared from time to time.—Alice F.
Toomey, Library of Congress.
Notes to A.C.R.L. Board Members and Officers

The following memorandum, sent to A.C.R.L. board members and officers on May 11, is published here with the thought that it may be of interest to all the members of the division. Please send your comments and suggestions to N. Orwin Rush, Executive Secretary, A.C.R.L., 50 East Huron St., Chicago 11, Ill.

To A.C.R.L. Board Members and Officers:

In a survey undertaken in 1947 by an A.C.R.L. committee to obtain membership opinion as to the most important activities of the association, publications ranked highest on the list. With this information in mind I have made a special effort to encourage and initiate work along this line whenever possible. So that we may know what is actually underway or being considered for publication in the college, university and reference field, I list herewith items that have come to my attention.

It was my thought that if we had before us such a list we could better determine where the gaps are. Will you, therefore, please study this list and let me have your suggestions for needed publications not covered here.

Projects now under way

Administration. Guy Lyle is working on a second edition of his book. It will probably be published next fall.

Administration—Small Library. E. Hugh Behymer is writing a book on the administrative techniques for the small liberal arts college library.

Administration—Technical Processes. Maurice Tauber is at work on a book dealing with administration of technical services in libraries.

Archives—Manual. Librarian and archivist collaborating.


Book List—Basic Reference Books. Louis Shores has completed the manuscript for a third edition of his book, and it is being examined.


Cataloging—Special Collection—Rare Books. A manuscript is in Mr. Fontaine's hands and is being examined by critics.

Circulation Work. Manuscript promised A.L.A. for spring or early summer of 1949. This will be a book of principles with illustrations drawn from various types of libraries so as to give the book general application.

Index—Guide to Comparative Literature. This is a project of the A.L.A., A.C.E., and the College Section of N.C.T.E. About 175 scholars are contributing to this work. Manuscript due at A.L.A. within a few months.

Order Work. Manuscript due at A.L.A. within next few months.

Reference Work—Study of Evaluation and Costs. Something under way at Columbia. Approach has been made to four other graduate library schools to see if ways can be found for attacking this problem.


Resources—American Library. Robert Downs is working on a guide.

Shelf Work. William Jesse is now at work on the manuscript.

Other Proposals

Book List—Books and Serials for A and M Colleges. This suggestion, by Donald Thompson, has been referred to the A.C.R.L. Publications Committee.
Book List—Junior Colleges. This suggestion is now being studied by the Junior College Libraries Section and the American Association of Junior Colleges.

Circulation—Interlibrary Loans. Carl Melinat is working on a Master's thesis out of which might grow a manuscript for publication.

College Libraries—Instruction and Book Use. B. Lamar Johnson may draw up a project for foundation financing. By survey, questionnaire, etc., he would try to determine and report on what is going on to integrate the teaching program with the use of library materials.

Finance and Accounting—College Libraries. This book was proposed some time ago by Donald Thompson.

Index—Learned Society Publications. Louis Shores has done some work on this and expects to give it more attention now that the manuscript for the third edition of Basic Reference Books is completed.

Serials Work—Manual. The A.L.A. Editorial Committee has received suggestions from a number of official groups regarding the need for and content of such a manual. As yet no one has been found to write it.

Statistics—Manual. Very little actual work has yet been done but a good deal of thought has gone into this project on which A.L.A. has been working since 1935. The A.L.A. Editorial Committee has decided that this should not be a book about statistics but a compendium of applications of statistical methods to library situations and library data. The introduction will have only enough theory to make the applications understandable. Edward Wight and G. Flint Purdy will attempt to develop the manuscript.

Men Who Control Our Universities
By Hubert Park Beck

"The most exhaustive survey of university trustees that has yet appeared. . . . A scholarly approach to a controversial subject."—Benjamine Fine, N. Y. Times.


College Retirement and Insurance Plans.
By William C. Greenough

A complete survey and analysis, based upon information from 800 college and university presidents and business officers.

Trends in Engineering Education: The Columbia Experience. By James Kip Finch

"Recommended to all persons interested in the education of scientists and engineers."—Journal of Chemical Education.

The Columbia Encyclopedia
"The first one-volume encyclopedia in English worthy of the name."—N. Y. Times.

The Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature
Horatio Smith, General Editor. Covers authors and literature of Continental Europe from 1870.

Write for textbook catalogue

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
2960 Broadway New York 27, N.Y.
Virginia Metal Products Corporation is internationally known for the quality and expert design of its library products.
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The type of library work recently completed and now underway is proof of the outstanding recognition now enjoyed by VMP.

A contract with VMP means expert engineering, manufacture, estimate and erection by one firm. Those who demand the best consult Virginia Metal Products Corporation (Library Products Division).

VMP craftsmanship has recently been employed, or is now being utilized, in the following projects:

- Sacred Congregation of the Oriental Church—Completion Vatican City, Rome, Italy
- Library Addition, University of Washington Seattle, Washington
- Library, Florida Agricultural & Medical College Tallahassee, Florida
- The University of Texas Austin, Texas
- Carson-Newman College Jefferson City, Tennessee
- Medical College of Virginia Hospital Division, Richmond, Virginia
- Law School, South Carolina State A & M. Orangeburg, South Carolina
- Henderson State Teachers College Arkadelphia, Arkansas
- Boston College School of Business Boston, Massachusetts
- University of South Carolina Columbia, South Carolina
- Law Building, Richmond Public Library Richmond, Virginia
- New York State School for the Blind Batavia, New York
- Addition, Ohio State University—Bookstack and Conveyor Columbus, Ohio
- Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Dayton, Ohio
- Sullins College Library Bristol, Virginia
- Law Building University of Virginia Law Library University, Virginia

For Quality Service in Library Erection
Consult VIRGINIA METAL PRODUCTS CORPORATION

It Actually Costs Less to Have the Leader in the Field Meet Your Specifications!
Association of College and Reference Libraries

Officers for 1948-49

- President: Benjamin E. Powell, Librarian, Duke University, Durham, N.C.
- Vice President and President-Elect: Wyllis E. Wright, Librarian, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
- Executive Secretary: N. Olwin Rush, A.L.A. Headquarters, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago
- Treasurer: Robert W. Orr, Librarian, Iowa State College, Ames
- Directors: W. P. Kellam, Assistant Librarian, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Elizabeth Neal, Librarian, Compton Junior College, Compton, Calif.; Anne M. Smith, Head, Reference Department, University of British Columbia, Vancouver
- A.C.R.L. Representatives on A.L.A. Council: Katherine Anderson, Head, Reference Department, Library Association of Portland, Ore.; Edith M. Coulter, Associate Professor, School of Librarianship, University of California, Berkeley; J. Periam Danton, Dean, School of Librarianship, University of California, Berkeley; Homer Halvorson, Librarian, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Arthur M. McAnally, Librarian, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque; Harriet Dorothea MacPherson, Professor, School of Library Science, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia; Foster E. Mohrhardt, Director, Library Service, Special Services, Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C.; John H. Moriarty, Director of Libraries, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.; G. Flint Purdy, Director, Wayne University Library, Detroit; Louise Savage, Acquisitions Librarian, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville; Edwin E. Williams, Assistant to the Librarian, Harvard College Library, Cambridge, Mass.

Section Officers, 1948-49

Agricultural Libraries Section
Chairman: John H. Moriarty, Director of Libraries, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana; Secretary, Nelle U. Branch; Director, Jackson E. Towne.

College Libraries Section
Chairman: Ermine Stone, Librarian, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N.Y.; Vice chairman and chairman-elect, Wyman W. Parker; Secretary, Janet Agnew; Director, H. G. Bousfield.

Engineering School Libraries Section
Chairman: Madeleine Gibson, Librarian, Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Houghton, Michigan; Secretary, Natalie Nicholson; Director, Harold Lancour.

Junior College Libraries Section
Chairman: Ardis Anderson, Librarian, Waldorf College, Forest City, Iowa; Vice chairman, Francis L. Meals; Secretary, Daisy L. Anderson; Director, C. Lawrence Lynn.

Reference Librarians Section
Chairman: Robert W. Christ, Assistant Librarian, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina; Vice chairman and chairman-elect, Dorothy M. Black; Secretary, Katherine G. Harris; Director, Margaret Hutchins.

Libraries of Teacher Training Institutions Section
Chairman: J. H. Lancaster, Librarian, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee; Secretary and chairman-elect, Frances G. Hepinstall; Director, Ethel M. Feagley.

University Libraries Section
Chairman: Stephen A. McCarthy, Director of Libraries, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York; Secretary, Raynard C. Swank; Director, Eugene H. Wilson.
Stechert-Hafner Inc.

invites you to make use of their service for procuring all Books and Periodicals.

We always endeavor to maintain a complete stock of the latest scientific publications and of the more significant works of general literature from as many foreign lands as possible.

Stechert-Hafner Inc.
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New York 3, New York

Booksellers since 1872, with offices in London and Paris, and agencies all over the world.