of the Higher Education Act’s provisions than will those of the reference librarian. We have already glimpsed enough of the bibliographical world of the future to be impressed by the necessity of taking every advantage of the kind of investigation and planning that this Act will make possible.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESOURCES AND TECHNICAL SERVICES

BY HELEN M. WELCH

It’s great to be a librarian in 1966, even a technical services librarian! It’s respectable, now that libraries are costing the federal government so much. Education—including libraries—and welfare, they tell us, will be second only to national defense in the federal budget during fiscal year 1967.¹

If you want to be profession-proud, browse in the four volumes which make up the Senate and House committee hearings preceding the passage of Public Law 89-329. The set should be a best-seller for academic librarians. Note the easy acceptance by the Congressmen of the importance of libraries to this country, and consider that this is the result of a steady building process since the first major library bill in 1956. Note the implied and sometimes explicit request to librarians for guidance on what is needed. Note the gratitude expressed by both Chairman Morse and Chairman Green for the introduction by librarian-witnesses of the completely new proposal which became Part C of Title II. And note Senator Morse’s appreciative statements on Edmon Low and Germaine Krettek. It’s all in the record.

For technical service librarians, Title II, Part C is much the most important part of the Higher Education Act. It has several aspects that lift the heart. First of all, it’s so short. Only seventeen lovely lines out of a document of fifty-two pages! Secondly, it establishes centralized cataloging—the thing we’ve wanted so much that we’ve even talked of paying for it ourselves! Thirdly, it was inserted in the bill by members of our own profession and was welcomed by the congressional subcommittees working on the bill. It’s pleasant to ask for something you need very much, to be granted that thing, and then to be thanked for asking for it.

According to John Cronin, the proposal had its beginnings in a meeting of the RTSD Subcommittee on the National Union Catalog, held at LC in 1963. The committee’s request that LC prepare alternative proposals for a centralized cataloging program led eventually to ARL’s creative use of the hearings on the Higher Education Act to insert Part C into Title II. The whole process can give us pride in our profession: the subcommittee’s request; LC’s response to it; the ARL insertion into the hearings; the careful watching of the legislative process, and guidance through it by the ALA Washington office; and LC’s masterly planning to implement the Act.

Those of us who work in day-to-day operations, acquiring books and giving them bibliographic addresses in our collections, sometimes feel that the great powerhouse of research libraries which the Association of Research Libraries represents is pretty far removed from our operations, that the head of a large library doesn’t recognize the desperate flailing of the arms as we try to keep from going under for the last time in the flood of materials which come to us in ever increasing waves. But it was ARL which set up a Committee on Shared Cataloging and in 1964 voted unanimously to give its highest priority to

“developing a program for decreasing the amount of original cataloging.” And it was Chairman William Dix of the committee who with great skill inserted centralized cataloging into the Act. At the hearings, Chairman Green of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor called the proposal “perhaps more significant than any part covered in the bill.” Chairman Dix was abetted by other heads of libraries and by Executive Secretary Jim Skipper, whose library career from acquisitions to technical service head to university librarian had familiarized him with the problem and made him see it as a basic one which would have to be solved if libraries were to meet their increasing responsibilities, and who was determined that the problem would be solved. (We’re not fools. Last Midwinter RTSD made the ARL Executive Secretary an ex officio permanent member of its Planning Committee.)

Librarians must see that centralized cataloging is continued beyond the original five years authorized by the Act. First, we must do all we can to make it work and to show better services and savings as a result of it. Second, we must be ready when the ALA Washington office warns us to speak and write to those who will decide its future. Lack of full initial funding for fiscal year 1966 has already reduced the proving period to four years.

LC Implementation Plans

Let me remind you now of the Library of Congress plans to implement centralized cataloging and the acquiring, so far as possible, of “all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship.” The main emphasis of the program at the outset is on foreign publications, omitting periodicals and nonbook materials. With these exceptions, LC is attempting to secure all significant titles published with imprint date 1966 and later and all titles listed in 1966 issues of current foreign national bibliographies regardless of imprint date.

Close working arrangements with the publishers of national bibliographies provide early acquisition of new titles, which are delivered by air mail. Acceptance of the bibliographic descriptions in the national bibliographies for descriptive cataloging copy provides swift cataloging of each title. In countries where the book trade is not well organized and there are no national bibliographies, LC is expanding its already existing purchase arrangements, sometimes adding an agent in the field. To insure against loopholes in its acquisition arrangements, LC duplicates orders made by libraries in this country, such as: 1) blanket orders of several libraries with foreign book dealers; 2) Farmington Plan receipts; and 3) all series on continuation order in reporting libraries.

Coordinated acquisition controls, consisting of a depository file of LC catalog cards for current imprints, are sent to cooperating libraries, i.e., all ARL members and other interested libraries, and offer both early distribution of cataloging copy and a means of notifying libraries which titles have already been cataloged. Titles ordered by cooperating libraries and not found in the control file are reported to LC, so that early acquisition and cataloging can be arranged.

Implications of Title II-C

What are the implications of these LC arrangements for technical services? In cooperating libraries all orders for 1966 and later imprints must be searched in
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the control file and procedures must include some satisfactory way of reporting to LC those titles not found. The chance of finding most monographs proposed for order—whether foreign or domestic imprints—are excellent, and the bibliographic information on the catalog card is complete, including price and bibliographic citation. Noncooperating libraries can gain the same information in the published National Union Catalog. The increasing completeness of this prompt record should greatly reduce the amount of time now spent in bibliographic verification during the order process.

Title II-C benefits all libraries, but, like a tax cut, it benefits the large operation more than the small. Earlier and more inclusive supplying of cataloging copy is, of course, its prime objective, and it is hoped that, in place of the approximately 50 per cent availability of needed catalog copy reported under various studies made last year, eventually more than 90 per cent will be available under the new procedures. The LC cards provided for the depository control file can be used either for card reproduction or for ordering LC cards by number. Although initially this LC catalog copy comes in card form, it may be provided in machine-readable copy later.

Both major cooperative acquisitions projects—the Farmington Plan and the PL 480 Program—will probably be affected by the new program. Farmington Plan participants will continue to receive publications under their assignments but will no longer be responsible for cataloging them. This change will keep the better part and drop the worse, since as the Plan worked out, it sometimes seemed to insure late cataloging of those titles received under it. Participants in the PL 480 Program may be able to reduce their substantial annual contributions for the cooperative cataloging of PL 480 receipts.

With the gradual reduction of cataloging duplication in libraries across the country and the concentration of standard cataloging in the Library of Congress, we can expect a high quality of cataloging, both in relation to materials which present difficulties because of format or language and in relation to fullness of description and added entries.

STANDARDIZATION

Those who now modify LC catalog cards will have greater need to justify such activity when centralized cataloging is fully implemented. A greater number of hours will be going into this activity than before, and savings for such libraries will be less than for those libraries which accept all elements on the card. When LC cataloging copy is delivered in machine form, even more ingenuity will be required to justify a tailoring of the copy, since it is more costly to change the machine record than to make a modification manually.

Both centralized cataloging and automation, then, are forcing libraries toward standardization. In time the modification of catalog copy to fit local conditions may come to seem as impractical and unwarranted as it would be to tailor subject headings in periodical indexes to bring them closer to local needs. Subject headings used in periodical indexes are accepted as they are received—and gratefully. The prospect of a foreseeable future in which LC will supply machine-readable cataloging copy almost as soon as a title is published makes the locally tailored catalog seem an indefensible luxury, particularly when, in the far distant future, the great collections at the Library of Congress are open to inspection through on-line computer access, and the advantage is apparent of being able to approach both the home collection and the LC collection through the same avenues.
The new LC acquisition-cataloging program under Title II-C invites those libraries which have not achieved a balanced acquisition-cataloging program, i.e., one in which each year's acquisitions are processed for use during the year of receipt, to make again the effort to put the year's program on balance and to move toward reducing arrearages. The goal is to subdue bibliographically all the publications which the library needs and can afford to acquire. In general, those libraries which have solved the problem have done so by being content with modest collections. Those which have not solved the problem have generally tried to build substantial collections and have created cataloging backlogs. The latter practice of taking collections while they are available and hoping to catch up one day might be said to have been reduced to an absurdity by one university library which last year spent close to four million dollars on its acquisition program, of which less than 1 per cent went for binding, compared to the average 10 per cent binding expenditure in the libraries listed in the ARL "Academic Library Statistics." The same library spent 20 per cent of its total operating budget for staff salaries and wages compared to an average 57 per cent for all libraries reporting.

With centralized cataloging opening up the possibility of processing so many more titles, a balanced operation with a respectable acquisition program begins to seem possible. More extensive use of standing orders for current publications offers dividends in decreased processing costs. Blanket order titles arriving in the library with no records yet made can be matched with the catalog card in the control file, cards can be reproduced within the library, and volumes marked for the shelves with none of the intermediate records which add to processing expenses but which in the end produce nothing of permanent value for the collection.

Serials

The forgotten people in all of this, as in the past, are the serials librarians, particularly the serials catalogers. The Library of Congress does not catalog new periodical titles until the first volume is complete. In addition, LC has considerable arrearages among its serials awaiting cataloging. The decision to omit periodical titles from the initial stages of centralized cataloging was a practical one, but it seems to put the serials librarians and users even further from the Promised Land. Whether a proposed proofsheet service, including all titles listed in New Serial Titles with LC classification numbers provided, can give serials operations some relief is yet to be seen.

Resources

Part A of Title II, directed toward increasing college library resources, is commendably broad in its interpretation of "library materials." For small college libraries, the basic grant of $5,000 may represent a significant increase in book budget, and supplemental grants to fill demonstrated special needs for additional library resources may be even more significant. For libraries already large and well supported, the $5,000 basic grant and supplemental grants are most welcome, and the assistance to smaller libraries might also be thought of as aiding large libraries by reducing requests for interlibrary loans and photographic reproductions. Actually, I suspect that the more resources a small collection offers, the more titles scholars can identify to request.

The special purpose grants of Title II and funds provided in Title III to strengthen developing institutions both point toward interinstitutional projects,
either the consortium to develop common programs, or the partnership of an established and a developing institution, to offer a helping hand. In the area of resources, such cooperative programs not only stretch library funds, but also stretch the dwindling supply of older books in the open market.

Perhaps the greatest boost in resources growing out of the Higher Education Act will be the aid to libraries in catching up with their cataloging backlogs and thus making bibliographically available those resources which are presently hidden.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Part B of Title II offers the possibility of providing demonstrations of well-planned technical services departments employing the best available tooling, a project which RTSD Executive Secretary Elizabeth Rodell has been advocating for some time. For the host library of such a project, able to create a model operation with adequate financial resources, how exciting an opportunity! For the questioning technical service librarian, how useful to be able to see in operation well-designed and well-equipped procedures! Some libraries have been asked to assume a large portion of the burden of entertaining visitors with no regular outside support.

STAFF SHORTAGES

In the matter of available staff to process our collections, the Act offers several vectors pulling in different directions. We can hope they will add up to a state of equilibrium. Title II-B aids in training more librarians; Title II-C, by offering centralized cataloging, reduces the number of catalogers needed across the country; Title II-A, with its funds to increase library purchasing power, implies increased needs for processing personnel; and the Act as a whole, with its splendid infusion of energy into higher education, suggests more bodies moving busily among the book trucks, the bibliographies, the catalogs, and/or the magnetic tapes.

INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The Library of Congress, in its excellent plans to carry out the intent of Title II-C, has pointed out the bridge it offers to greater international cooperation in cataloging. LC proposes, you will remember, to use for cataloging purposes the descriptions offered by the national bibliographies of practically all European countries. Only the form and choice of main and secondary entries are adjusted.

Too often U.S. foreign programs start with the assumption that our way is best, and cooperation means that the foreign country changes to conform to our way. The LC report, following its close scrutiny of the national bibliographies, showed that the title description used in national bibliographies is equivalent to or fuller than the present LC standard as established in the LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging. Recognition of the good bibliographic standards of other countries and acceptance of the work produced under those standards offers a long stride toward international cooperation in cataloging.

Thus the suggestion of an anonymous Englishman, made in 1876, even before Ralph Ellsworth’s efforts in the forties to centralize cataloging, may now be taken up. Edward Holley reports in his forthcoming book on the organizational meeting of the American Library Association in 1876 that an ex-librarian writing anonymously in The Academy (London) on March 18, 1876, observed:

When I was a librarian myself, I always wondered at the extraordinary waste of power in cataloguing new books. While I was writing my slip, according to the rules followed in most English libraries, I felt that there were probably a hundred people doing exactly the same work which I was doing, not only in England, but in every civilised country of the world. Yet what would be easier than to have
my slip printed, and any number of copies sent round by book-post to every library in Europe. With a little arrangement, every English book might be catalogued at the British Museum, every French book at the Bibliothèque Nationale, every German book at the Royal Library at Berlin, every Russian book at St. Petersburg, &c. At a trifling expense these printed slips might be sent to every small or large library, and each of them might have three or four kinds of catalogues—an alphabetical catalogue of the authors, a chronological catalogue, a local catalogue, a catalogue classified according to subjects, &c. Even when a library is too poor to buy a book, the slip might be useful in its catalogue. The saving that might thus be effected would be very considerable. The staff of librarians might be greatly reduced, and the enormous expense now incurred for catalogues, and mostly imperfect catalogues, would dwindle down to a mere nothing.

Perhaps one hundred years later, in 1976, the anonymous ex-librarian’s rational suggestion may well be a reality.

FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION

BY CHARLES F. GOSNELL

ALTHOUGH I have not been asked to be brief, my remarks will be. Anything that brings in new and usable money—to an administrator—is certainly good.

The implication of my assignment, given months ago, was that there were or would be many problems to which we should give deep thought and attention. My paper was to be submitted many months ago, so that day after tomorrow, you might read again what you hear here today. I objected to that time schedule for two reasons. One was that things might happen between the deadline for the paper and today. I did not want to be in the position of throwing overboard what had been written months ago, and what would be published next week, for something really worthwhile today. As you all know we did get the money like lightning, just two weeks ago.

The administrator is supposed to be a problem solver. Last March, as far as I was concerned, the only problem was that we did not have any problems. There was a law, but there was no money, no rules and regulations, no blanks to fill out. I felt like an MS student at Columbia library school of years ago, trying to get a thesis subject approved. The problem was to find a good problem. My only problem was to explain to my President why we were not doing anything—no money.

It is characteristic nowadays for the federal government to take off with grandiose plans, to pass ambitious enabling legislation—to please everybody—and then fail to provide any money. What problem we had was a political one. It was handled admirably by our ALA Washington office and by our college and university presidents.

By now you may suspect that I had some skepticism about this program. I did. I still do, but not as much. It got off to a good start in the best bureaucratic fashion, there were regional meetings to explain everything to everybody. Of course the real details could not be explained, because there were none. And nobody knew when, if ever, there would be any money.

When it began to look as though we might get the five thousand dollar basic grant, I ventured the opinion that it might take some $5,000 in administrative time and effort to gather data, fill out forms, etc., to get the $5,000. That often happens, particularly in a large and efficient organization. But I was wrong.

We studied the provisions of the law, and tried to guess what we would have to do. Fortunately, we did not work too hard at it.