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Introduction

ANDREW H. HORN

The handling and use of rare books, fragile books and non-book materials are not new problems to librarians. In recent years, however, and especially since World War II, libraries seem to have been acquiring non-book materials and developing special collections (which, if exhaustive, are sure to go beyond the conventional book) at an accelerated rate. As a result, a body of experience has been developed which might profitably be summarized at this time. The papers which comprise this number of Library Trends touch upon several categories of special library materials, excluding rare or manuscript books, memorabilia, and some of the less common special collections such as bookplates, little magazines, etc.

Even a casual comparison of the latest, 1954, American Library Directory with the 1945 edition will demonstrate the proliferation of special collections. This trend is being reflected in the organizational structure of libraries also. From the earlier Directory it appears that in 1945 only the libraries of Columbia, Indiana, and Stanford universities had coordinated their special collections under a department head. In the 1954 edition of the Directory, however, the following additional college or university libraries are listed as having departments, divisions, or supervisors of special collections: Brown University, Butler University, University of California at Los Angeles, University of Chicago, Dartmouth College, University of Georgia, University of Kansas, University of Kentucky, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of New Mexico, Northwestern University, University of Oregon, Rutgers University, Syracuse University, and Wellesley College. The libraries mentioned range in volume size from less than 200,000 to over 2,000,000; and "special collections" means something different in each institution.

The U.C.L.A. Department of Special Collections is perhaps the most comprehensive of all, including specialized services as well as collections: rare books, maps, manuscripts, pamphlets, posters, broadsides,
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newspapers, music (scores and records), non-musical recordings, microfacsimiles, microfilms, university archives, subject collections, slides and films, bookplates, pictures and prints, paintings, graphic arts materials, coins and currency, stamps, little magazines, scrapbooks, clipping files, blue-prints, photoduplication service and laboratory, and the library's exhibitions service.

The most commonly encountered materials in special collections units are rare books, manuscripts (i.e., collections of papers), local history (manuscripts, imprints, often museum objects), institutional archives, and unit collections on either subjects or types of materials. Of course a local history or unit collection, if at all comprehensive, is apt to include maps, manuscripts, microfilms, pamphlets and even slides and recordings. The preservation, organization and use of these valuable, or at least treasured, materials continue fraught with difficulties. Nevertheless, substantial progress has been made toward solutions of problems and toward fuller exploitation of the fragile or awkward library assets in question. The major research libraries and some of the large public libraries of the United States, the leviathans among our libraries, have pointed the way in many cases through their enormous specialized collections organized as separate departments. Such research libraries as the Clark, Clements, John Crerar, Folger, Huntington, and Newberry have provided technical as well as bibliographical patterns. Ideas of value have also been developed in the departments of miscellany found in smaller libraries where similarities in physical format (e.g., maps, prints, posters), or relationships between divergent formats (e.g., newspapers and microfilms, or manuscripts and pamphlets), or interdependence between equipment and holdings have been necessarily emphasized as a result of efforts to achieve maximum effectiveness with limited space, facilities, and staff.

Another post-war trend which has contributed to better exploitation of non-book resources in libraries is the spectacular development, particularly in public, college, and school libraries, of audio-visual facilities. Library literature between 1876 and 1920, if the Cannons Bibliography of Library Economy is to be trusted, made no reference to audio or visual aids as such; but there is ample evidence that already librarians were concerned with pictures, photographs, prints, lantern slides, motion pictures, and phonograph records. In Library Literature for 1921–1932 there is no subject heading for visual aids; but in the 1933–1935 index "visual aids" appears with two articles listed, a number which increased to 17 in the 1936–1939 index. In Library Literature for 1940–1942 there is a reference from "audio-visual aids" to
"visual aids." In the 1943-1945 index articles are listed under both "visual aids" and "audio-visual aids," the latter with subdivisions for the first time. Since 1952 "audio-visual materials" is the term used in Library Literature and the amount of writing on the subject, which rose sharply immediately after the war, has become prodigious. There seems also now to be a departure in audio-visual studies from emphasis on gadgetry and library service for illiterates to a fuller recognition of content value and the true relationship between "audio-visual media" and the more traditional types of library materials.

These two post-war trends in special collections and audio-visual organization, combined with others such as Army Map Service depository distribution and the better appreciation of archival or records management techniques on the part of librarians (this latter was substantially enhanced by the summer training institutes on archives and manuscripts collections conducted by Ernst Posner in Washington) are clearly leading toward improved service to scholars and the enrichment of libraries for the general patron.

The nine articles which make up this issue do not presume to encompass all non-book or special book materials in libraries. Rather they single out for review only a selection of types, with emphasis on care, preservation and use. Earlier issues of Library Trends, particularly that of October 1953, on cataloging and classification, and that of April 1955, on acquisitions, and the issue announced for January 1956, on conservation of library materials, should be examined for their bearing upon the articles here presented. A few references are cited below as supplementary introductions to this issue on special materials and services. The references listed do not constitute a bibliography, but they have directly influenced the spirit of this introduction and such little hand as the guest editor has been able to lend toward the organization of this issue.

**General References**


ANDREW H. HORN


What About Maps?

WALTER W. RISTOW

About a decade ago the present writer reviewed and summarized the literature on map librarianship.1 The study revealed two basic facts. First, that most librarians regarded maps as unwanted step-children, and secondly, that there was little agreement among map librarians as to how maps should be processed, filed, and serviced.

Some progress was made during the next five years in coping with certain of the problems which maps pose for librarians. A more optimistic note was apparent, therefore, in Library Journal’s “Maps in the Library” number of March 15, 1950,2 which brought together ideas and experiences of a selected group of map librarians. Several of the contributors still considered it necessary to “sell” librarians on the importance of maps in a well-rounded reference collection.

Developments and accomplishments of the past several years indicate that map librarianship has now come of age, and that maps are being accepted, on a coexistence basis at least, in most libraries. This is not to say that all problems of map librarianship have been solved. Far from it. The encouraging trend today is that librarians, who by choice or of necessity work with maps, are spotlighting and studying those problems and, by united and studied action, are attempting to find reasonable and workable solutions. The reports they are publishing today have a self-assured, confident and optimistic tone.

A number of these studies have been initiated, and carried to completion, under the sponsorship of the Geography and Map Division of the Special Libraries Association. Local and national meetings of the division provide opportunities to discuss mutual problems, exchange ideas, and to report on projects pertaining to various aspects of map librarianship. Many of the reports, as well as descriptions of individual map collections and libraries, are published in the Geography and Map Division Bulletin.3 Established in 1948, the Bulletin was issued semi-
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annually until October 1953, since which date it has appeared quarterly.

The "new outlook" among map librarians may be attributed to several factors and developments. Certainly World War II, touching as it did all parts of the earth, added to the map and global consciousness of the American people, librarians included. The cold war, U. N. police action in Korea, our new leadership in international politics, and an accelerated emphasis on travel, both for business and pleasure, have served to maintain interest in things geographical and cartographical.

A more compelling influence perhaps, was the depository program of Army Map Service through which a number of libraries acquired some 50,000 surplus war maps. Fifty maps can be easily absorbed in routine processing operations. Some librarians had even devised methods and techniques for "disposing of" as many as 500 maps. Fifty thousand maps could not, however, be disregarded. Something just had to be done about them. And, in most cases, something was done.

Librarians in colleges and universities discussed the problem with geography professors, while those in public libraries sought advice from colleagues in sister institutions where map rooms were already established. By miraculous shifting and rearrangement of existing collections a few square yards of space were cleared for map storage. Budgets were wrung dry to secure funds for purchasing storage cases, and a lower-echelon staff member was assigned the task of organizing and cataloging the map collection. Thus, new map libraries were born, and existing ones greatly expanded.

The number, distribution and size of such collections became a matter of record in 1954 with publication of the directory of *Map Collections in the United States and Canada*. Compiled by the Map Resources Committee of the Geography and Map Division of the Special Library Association, the directory records map holdings of 497 collections in the United States and 30 in Canada. Twenty-five of the collections have more than 100,000 sheets, and a number of others are in the fifty to one hundred thousand sheet class.

The directory gives only a general indication of subject and area interests. Detailed information on holdings of individual collections fortunately is available in published manuals and guides, or in articles printed in professional journals.

Large governmental collections for which guides are available include those of Army Map Service and the Library of Congress. A *Guide to the Cartographic Records in the National Archives* is sched-
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ruled for publication within the next several months. Meanwhile an approach to the archives collection is provided by several articles, and inventories of selected cartographic record “groups.” An introduction to the geographical and cartographical resources in a number of governmental libraries is provided by Gerlach in an article published in *The Journal of Geography.*

One of the few map libraries in the United States which has been in existence for more than a century is that of the American Geographical Society. Its growth from a dozen maps in 1852 to approximately a quarter million sheets today is described by Ena L. Yonge in a recently published article.

The Army Map Service depository program was particularly effective in stimulating the organization and growth of map collections in colleges and universities. In some institutions the map collection is administratively part of the main reference library. On other campuses it may be an adjunct to the geography or geology department. At least twenty-five college and university libraries today have collections of more than 50,000 maps. Especially noteworthy are the map libraries at California, Chicago, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, Illinois, Northwestern, Princeton, Stanford, Yale, and Wisconsin.

Army surplus maps also swelled map holdings in a number of public libraries, mainly those in which there were already well-established map rooms or departments. Regrettably, public libraries have lagged behind colleges and universities in making proper provision for maps. Less than ten public libraries, as reported in *Map Collections,* have in excess of 40,000 maps. Separate map rooms have been maintained for many years at public libraries in Baltimore (Enoch Pratt), Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Newark, New York, Oakland, Philadelphia, and St. Louis.

European librarians, too, have prepared inventories or directories of their cartographic resources. Some twenty map libraries in the London area are briefly described in a recent Library Association publication. Except for the British Museum and the Royal Geographical Society, the collections are small. Few of the others, the compiler notes, “have considered it necessary to provide anything more ambitious than a world atlas and a set of Ordnance Survey 1-inch sheets; and many have not even added to their local collection a comprehensive range of maps of their own area.” Brief listings of the more significant map collections in Germany and Switzerland have also been prepared.

In wrestling with selection and acquisition problems, map librarians
have perhaps experienced their greatest frustrations. The disorganized nature of map publishing, the non-existence of international and national map bibliographies, the large percentage of maps prepared by official mapping agencies, the varying quality of cartographic publications, the high cost of some maps and atlases, and the lack of manuals or guides on map acquisition have constituted formidable deterrents to even the best-intentioned librarian. Little wonder, therefore, that many libraries have been content to acquire only such maps that drift, unbeckoned, into their accessions channels.

The situation, unfortunately, is still far from ideal. Various finding lists and acquisitions aids, published in recent years have, however, eased appreciably the burdens of the map librarian. Most comprehensive in the international field is *Bibliographie Cartographique Internationale*, which lists, in its latest edition, some 30,000 official and non-official map publications of twenty countries. Included also is a list of catalogs of official mapping agencies in participating countries.

*World Cartography*, a United Nations publication, gives promise of serving as an international clearinghouse for cartographical information. Although separate maps are not described, the two numbers published thus far contain summary reports on cartographic activities in selected countries, with emphasis on the work of official mapping agencies.

“Distinctive Recent Maps,” a regular feature in *Surveying and Mapping*, describes some twenty or twenty-five noteworthy maps in each quarterly issue of the journal. The Geography and Map Division *Bulletin* and *The Professional Geographer* also regularly devote several pages to listing new maps and atlases.

The Library of Congress Map Division's annual report on acquisitions contains descriptions of selected maps and atlases, and general information pertaining to sources and techniques for procuring cartographic publications. Significant gifts and collections received by the Map Division are also described in articles published in the *Quarterly Journal*.

The *Catalog of Copyright Entries, Part 6* lists maps, atlases, and globes which are registered in the U. S. Copyright Office. Published semi-annually since 1947, each issue includes titles for some 1,200 or more maps, atlases, and globes published, for the most part, by American commercial and private map makers.

More than 20 agencies of the U. S. government publish maps. Most of these publications are described in lists issued annually, monthly or
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periodically by individual departments, bureaus, or agencies. Price List 53, available from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, includes a selected group of map publications. Most official maps, however, are sold directly by the publishing agencies, and are, therefore, not included in Price List 53. Information on where and how to obtain such maps is given in a recent article prepared by Nellie M. Bowman.28 Many large libraries are official depositories and receive certain government map series on automatic deposit.

General advice on acquiring cartographic publications is offered in several articles. At least three of the papers in the “Maps in the Library” number of Library Journal2 deal specifically with acquisitions. How to build a map collection in the college library is outlined by Espenshade in two papers.26, 27 The intent in both is “to introduce the librarian to the types of map sources, their nature, and the peculiar problems related to them, and to current bibliographic aids and methods by which he can keep abreast of map publications.”

A symposium on “Map Procurement” was a feature of the Geography and Map Division program at the Special Libraries Association convention in New York, May 29, 1952. Three of the papers presented at the meeting were published in the May-June 1953 number of Special Libraries.28 DeWald calls attention, in his paper, to the success of cooperative map acquisitions by a number of Federal map libraries during the past seven or eight years. Operating through an informal Joint Procurement Committee, some eight or more “government agencies pool their resources and consolidate their requirements to effect a united bargaining power in mapping markets.” This has resulted in systematic and active procurement in contrast to the disorganized and ineffectual map acquisition which characterized the years between the two world wars.

At the same symposium, R. E. Harrison, considering the “Evaluation of Modern Maps,”29 noted that, “The accurate appraisal of a modern map is extremely difficult for the layman and not too easy for the professional.” He suggested that maps be evaluated on the basis of (a) source material used in their compilation, (b) design (i.e. projection, scale and presentation of source material), and (c) execution, as expressed by drafting, engraving, and printing.

Two other papers on map evaluation, presented at the meeting, were published in multilith brochure by the Geography and Map Division.30 Woods observes that the real value of school maps “is to present visually certain significant physical, political, economic, or other feat-
ures of an area. Therefore, to be useful the school map must be large enough to be seen from all parts of a classroom which may seat fifty students or possibly double that number."

The evaluation of historical maps, Mrs. LeGear states "may be on the basis of (1) importance to a given collection; (2) historical significance as a link in the chain of cartographic development; or (3) monetary value. Closely allied with evaluation is correct identification, namely that a map is actually what it is represented to be." She concludes her paper by affirming that "the pleasure of collecting the best available cartographic materials is the reward of being able to recognize and evaluate old maps."

Hints on acquiring old and rare maps are also provided in articles by L. A. Brown and A. B. Carlson in Library Journal's "Maps in the Library" feature and in the chapter on "Old Maps" in Storm and Peckham's delightful Invitation to Book Collecting. "Intelligent evaluation of maps and charts," writes Brown, "is the first and most important factor in the administration and preservation of the material. Such an obvious statement of fact would not be worth repeating except that the true value of cartographic material has gained recognition only by slow and painful degrees."

Closely related to evaluation is the question of weeding. With most libraries pre-occupied in building up the map collection, only casual thought has been given to disposing of unwanted items. The larger and older map libraries are primarily concerned with this problem. In a previously-cited paper Miss Yonge states that "a judicious pruning or weeding from time to time helps to keep the collection from getting too cumbersome and congested."

A number of federal map libraries find it expedient to transfer older editions of maps to the Library of Congress. While recognizing its responsibility for maintaining as comprehensive and complete a cartographic collection as possible, the Library of Congress Map Division has also taken some steps to weed its files. Discarding duplicate copies of large-scale set maps, and older second copies of maps deposited for copyright are thinning projects currently in process or under consideration. The growth in number and size of map collections, both governmental and non-governmental, minimizes the need for retaining second copies. The current high cost of storage equipment and limited floor space are also important considerations in the decision to reduce the number of duplicates.

Surplus maps are made available, through the Library's Exchange and Gift Division, to other libraries. During the past several summers
the Map Division has conducted "Map Sorting Projects" to process a backlog of maps acquired by transfer from other governmental map libraries in the immediate post-war years. Graduate students from various college and university geography departments, as well as map librarians from other institutions, have participated in this program. Some have been employed, on a temporary basis, by the Library of Congress. Others, sent at the expense of their own institutions, assist in sorting and processing maps for the privilege of selecting duplicates. Between fifty and one hundred thousand surplus map sheets have been distributed annually by the Library of Congress during the past five years. There are still hundreds of thousand of sheets in the unprocessed backlog. Inasmuch as upwards of fifty per cent of the maps may be expected to duplicate items already in the Library of Congress collections, this constitutes, for other map libraries, a significant cartographic acquisition source, particularly for non-current and out-of-print items.

Among cartographic reference materials, atlases most nearly resemble books and in many libraries they are accorded normal processing treatment. Descriptive cataloging is most often in accordance with Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress.32 Printed Library of Congress catalog cards for atlases are available from the Library's Card Division.

There is less consistency with reference to classification. Smaller libraries, in general, classify atlases according to Dewey, while larger institutions fit such works into their own schedules. While provision had been made for atlases in Class G of the Library of Congress schedule, (published in 1910, second edition 1928), the classification was never used for atlases in the custody of the Map Division. The atlas schedule was revised several years ago to accord with the map schedule, which was issued in preliminary form in 1946. Both are included in the third edition of the Library of Congress Classification, Class G, published in 1954.33 Since 1951, atlases acquired by the Library of Congress have been classified in accordance with this schedule. Several years ago a project was initiated to convert the Map Division's area classified atlas catalog to a dictionary catalog.34

Loose map sheets must be sorted and arranged in some logical or prescribed order before they can be cataloged, classified or filed. The nature and extent of such preliminary processing depends upon the condition in which the maps are received, the number involved, the complexities of the cataloging and classification systems employed, and the type of map or chart.
Multiple-sheet topographic sets and nautical and aeronautical charts published by official mapping agencies require a great deal of sorting and arranging. A topographic set for a single country may include several thousand sheets. Moreover, the separate maps are published over a long period of years. As new sheets appear they must be sorted, arranged in sequence, and integrated with maps previously acquired.

Various techniques and procedures are followed in sorting and arranging maps, and all entail a certain amount of monotony, routine, and drudgery. Low-level employees ordinarily perform these tasks, and consequently few studies have been made to devise methods for speeding up the operations. Brief descriptions of the steps involved in such preliminary processing of maps in the Library are included in the Library of Congress Map Division's Manual\(^\text{35}\) and in Mrs. LeGear's *Maps, Their Care, Repair and Preservation in Libraries.*\(^\text{36}\) Certain problems in processing and cataloging large scale maps were considered by Miss Yonge in a recent paper.\(^\text{37}\) She points out that "almost every country has its own topographic survey, each with a different method of indexing and numbering the sheets, some extremely complicated and maddening, and different ways of giving the date of publication."

An approach to the separate maps in a "set" is provided by an index map overprinted with a grid giving the location of each sheet. Shelflist sheets, on which names of each map with edition date or dates are entered, provide further control. One catalog card may suffice for an entire set.

Single maps, i.e. those presenting a specific area on one sheet (which may or may not have several parts), on the other hand, must be separately cataloged and classified. No map cataloging and classification systems have as yet been generally accepted, and there is little new to add to Ottília C. Anderson's excellent summarization published in 1950.\(^\text{38}\)

Most United States map libraries catalog and classify maps according to the Boggs-Lewis or Library of Congress systems. From its publication in 1945 to about 1949, the Boggs-Lewis manual\(^\text{39}\) exerted a major influence on libraries which were organizing or expanding their map collections. College and institutional libraries, in particular, adopted Boggs-Lewis or adapted the system to fit their own particular needs.

During the past five or six years Library of Congress cataloging methods and procedures as outlined in *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging,*\(^\text{32}\) and the map classification set forth in the revised edition of the Library's *Class G,*\(^\text{33}\) have been gaining supporters. This stems in part
from the fact that the Library of Congress prepared printed catalog cards for maps distributed in the Army Map Service depository program. Printed L.C. cards are also available, on a continuing basis, for all atlases and for a selected number of maps received by the Library.

Because of staff limitations, only a small percentage of maps acquired by the Library of Congress are cataloged and classified. The remainder are "titled" (i.e. identified by a typed slip bearing authority, title, subject, scale and date of the map, which is pasted to the back of the map sheet) and filed in an area-subject-date sequence.

While Library of Congress practices dominate map cataloging today, they are not without their critics. Shortly after publication of the preliminary edition of *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging*, the Special Libraries Association's Geography and Map Division established a committee to review the chapter pertaining to maps, atlases, and globes. In a preliminary report issued in December 1948 and a final report published in October 1953, the committee strongly opposed the L.C. *Rules*. It took issue especially with the use of an authority heading for the main card, and proposed that an area-date-subject heading be substituted. The committee felt "that the A.D.S. heading and tracings alone would provide simply and economically an adequate key to many small map collections. For a larger collection, the transcription could be added to identify each map."

Each of the large governmental map libraries continues to employ its hand-tailored cataloging and classification system. The Army Map Service's "Modified Williams Classification System," with essential data recorded on Remington-Rand "machine" cards is described in *A Researcher's Guide to the Army Map Service*. A new edition of the *Guide* is in preparation at present.

The map library, which includes the former State Department and Office of Strategic Services collections, uses the check card cataloging system and the classification scheme which were devised by O.S.S. during the war. Maps (i.e. cartographic records) deposited in the National Archives are filed by "record groups" rather than by geographic area. This system is described in a leaflet published by the General Services Administration and in previously-cited articles.

Map cataloging and classification problems are of concern also to librarians in other countries. A draft of rules for cataloging maps, designed to furnish the basis for discussion by the Belgian Documentation Association was published in 1951. Classifications used in several Italian libraries were reviewed by Barbieri in a paper published in 1952.

At its Seventeenth Congress held in Washington in August, 1952,
the International Geographical Union established a Commission on the Classification of Books and Maps in Libraries. Dr. Andre Libault of France is chairman and Dr. Arch C. Gerlach of the Library of Congress is the United States representative. As its first task, the Commission compiled a list of existing classification methods. A preliminary report was published in 1954.46 A more complete report, prepared following a meeting of the Commission in London in September 1954 was published in the May 1955 issue of the International Geographical Union Newsletter.46

With few exceptions map rooms occupy library space that was not planned for storing and serving such non-book materials. Probably fewer than a dozen library buildings in the United States included cartographic departments in their original plans. Preoccupied with justifying their existence, and in formulating and devising procedures for processing and servicing their collections, map librarians have been able to give little time and study to the question of the ideal map room. Mrs. LeGear devoted several pages to this topic in her pamphlet on Maps, Their Care, Repair, and Preservation in Libraries.47 The question was also briefly considered by Whitmarsh in Fussler's Library Buildings.48 Two of the world's largest map collections, it is interesting to note, have recently been re-established in new quarters. In 1952 the Library of Congress Map Division, after 55 years in the Library's Main Building, began a move to the Annex which was completed early in 1955. Although some adjustments have had to be made to accommodate map storage cases on book decks, the new quarters are on the whole quite satisfactory. The Map Reading Room has been completely re-furnished with natural-finish birch tables, chairs, and book shelves. New map and atlas cases are being added, within budgetary limits, to replace obsolete equipment which was discarded. As for the second, new installations of the Department of Maps and Plans of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris are discussed in a recent report.48 The article also describes storage and preservation methods and equipment.

Map librarians in the United States are almost unanimous today in favoring large metal cases with shallow, horizontal drawers for map storage. A number of equipment companies manufacture acceptable cases. Most are made in units of five drawers which can be stacked two, three or four high, depending upon the size of the collection, available floor space, location of the cases (i.e. in reading room or in deck area), or preference of staff members. With a two-unit arrange-
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ment the tops of cases can be used as a counter on which maps may be spread out for consultation. When stacked in tiers of four, portable steps may be required to remove maps from top drawers.

Unfortunately, there are a multitude of drawer sizes no one of which can claim to be "standard." Drawers with inside measurements approximating $32 \times 43 \times 2$ inches seem to be most practical. In large collections it may be convenient to have a few oversize drawers as well as some smaller units in which to store multi-sheet sets of large-scale topographic maps. Maps on sticks or rollers constitute a particularly difficult storage problem. Perhaps because of the challenge they present, almost every map librarian has devised his own pet method and equipment for handling rolled maps.\textsuperscript{59-51}

In map preservation the most significant trend is the increasing use of laminating procedures and the consequent decreased dependence upon hand mounting. With the exception of the large custom-built flat-bed press at the National Archives, laminators previously available could handle sheets only up to $20 \times 25$ inches. Within the past several years, however, W. J. Barrow has constructed laminators for the Library of Congress and the Army Map Service which will take maps up to $30 \times 40$ inches and $32 \times 42$ inches respectively.\textsuperscript{52} While the cost per map is appreciably less than for hand mounting, the initial price for such a machine is perhaps beyond the means of small libraries.

Maps, like other library holdings, are meant to be used. And they are being consulted more and more by library users today, as witness the increased number of map libraries and map librarians. But to most people a map has not yet become "as an open book to be read and thoroughly comprehended."\textsuperscript{53} Their potentialities as basic reference and research aids have been realized only to a very limited extent.

Contrary to popular belief, the utility of maps is not restricted to geographers and historians. In this complex and interesting world almost every field of human enterprise and activity has problems which are best solved by information presented on maps. Library readers, for the most part, however, are neither aware of the existence of cartographic reference tools nor do they have the essential training and skills to read and interpret maps with understanding. To unearth these treasures and to facilitate their use is the challenging responsibility and opportunity of the map reference librarian.

The literature of cartography is quite rich and comprehensive—almost overwhelmingly so to the initiate. The Bibliography of Cartography\textsuperscript{64} card catalog in the Library of Congress Map Division includes
some 50,000 entries, and it is far from exhaustive. Bibliographic guides to this storehouse of information are, unfortunately, few in number and limited in scope. With the hope of remedying this situation, Special Libraries Association's Geography and Map Division established at its 1954 annual meeting, a Committee to Select Reference Materials for a Map Library. The objective of the committee is to compile a comprehensive but concise guide to cartographic research.

Selected periodical references, relating to maps and map making, are listed regularly in *Surveying and Mapping*, Geography and Map Division *Bulletin*, and *The Professional Geographer*. *Imago Mundi*, an annual serial devoted to the history of cartography, includes listings of periodical works in this field.

The Library of Congress Map Division has been, since its establishment in 1897, the primary producer in this country of cartobibliographical publications. Phillips' *Maps of America* and *List of Geographical Atlases* are classics among cartographical reference works, despite their age. Librarians and students of cartography are, therefore, eagerly awaiting publication of Volume V of the *List of Geographical Atlases* which is currently being compiled by Mrs. LeGear. Currently in production at the press, the LeGear supplement to Phillips' will list all world atlases (approximately 2,200) acquired by the Library of Congress since 1920. A projected Volume VI, still in the preliminary planning stage, would include regional atlases added to the collections since that date. Titles of American atlases dating from 1776 to 1953 are listed in Mrs. LeGear's two volume bibliography of *United States Atlases*. The first volume is limited to Library of Congress holdings, while the second includes also titles contributed by some 130 cooperating libraries.

With the exception of the above-cited works, Library of Congress cartobibliographical publications in recent years have been of more limited scope. They include lists of special purpose maps, bibliographies on specialized aspects of cartography, and procedural manuals.

Some general suggestions on providing map reference service in libraries are offered by Woods in a paper presented before the Geography and Map Division at the Special Libraries Association convention in Toronto in June 1953. The contributions of exhibits to cartographical and geographical reference work in libraries were considered, at the same meeting, in papers presented by Dalphin and English, and Ristow.

A number of libraries and museums, it is interesting to note, have
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featured map exhibits in recent years. Most elaborate was the display of rare historical maps, entitled The World Encompassed, which was sponsored by four Baltimore institutions and held at the Baltimore Museum of Art in 1952. The catalog of the exhibit includes valuable notes on historical cartography as well as reproductions of a number of the rarities which were on view.67

Map librarianship is a branch of library science which has been almost completely disregarded by library schools. Only at the University of Illinois is specialized training available to the prospective map librarian.68 In addition to offering a regular course on Maps and Cartobibliographical Aids, Illinois conducted a map workshop for two weeks in the summer of 1952, and another was held this past summer. Lectures and discussions on the making, reading, bibliography, care, classification, cataloging, and use of maps, atlases, and aerial photographs were conducted by faculty of the Library School, the Library, and the Department of Geography.69

A number of map librarians, as well as graduate students of geography, have received practical experience in processing and filing maps by participation in the Summer Projects of the Library of Congress Map Division, described previously. Provision has been made each year for participants in the project also to visit other cartographic libraries and map producing agencies in the Washington area.

Librarians abroad are also endeavoring to learn more about handling and servicing maps. Many visiting librarians specifically request that a tour of the Map Division be included as part of their orientation in the Library of Congress. A Polish course in cartography for librarians is described by Dr. Stefan Kotarski in the January-March 1952 issue of Przegląd Biblioteczny.70

In summary, it is gratifying to report that the foundations of map librarianship have been greatly strengthened during the past ten years, largely as a result of the energetic and enthusiastic work of a small group of specialists. Continued cooperative action should result in further progress toward standardization of processes, techniques, and equipment and in the compilation of additional reference tools and aids.
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The Place of the Newspaper

ICKO IBEN

This article primarily attempts to discover the place of the newspaper today and in the predictable future as a part of permanent book collections. Thus, it deals with the general political newspaper in all its forms, as it was visualized, for instance, by the compilers of the Union List of Newspapers, published by the H. W. Wilson Company in 1937. The thoughts and statements found in this article are derived from expressions about and observations of conditions in Western countries only, primarily the United States.

There is no doubt that the peculiar nature of the newspaper is responsible for its problematic position among the various materials acquired by libraries. And it is not only its form, its mass, its rate of growth that is offering unusual problems to its integration in the library's book stock, but even more perhaps its internal character, its content. The general attitude towards the newspaper, shared by many men of the book, is traceable to the inevitably continuous intrusion of this protean vehicle of the printed word, with its gossip large and small, its sensational news and its sensational advertising, and to the casual way in which it is used.

But man concerned with studying seriously his own environment has for some time discovered that the newspaper is by its very nature a source for his purposes for which historians of pre-newspaper times rightly envy him. The work of many historians reflects this value of the newspaper. J. F. Rhodes and Lucy M. Salmon, two eminent Americans, have not only used newspapers extensively in their works, but shown in critical works how they may be used. Rhodes said in 1909 that it is not the duty of the historian to find out whether the newspapers are as good as they should be, but to study their influence upon their environment and their importance as contemporary and universal news agencies of the past. Max Weber, the sociologist, pointed to the need for studying the newspapers for their part in shaping men and in
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molding or transforming basic tenets and beliefs. The Norwegian scholar and librarian L. L. Daae⁴ said in 1872 that even the smallest local paper had historical importance and proceeded to solicit all Norwegian newspapers for the University Library in Oslo. It would lead too far here to bring on further testimonials, suffice it to quote Martin Spahn,⁵ historian and member of the German Reichstag, who said in 1910, during the long deliberations about the scope and methods to be pursued in collecting the newspapers of his country, “that all whose expressions of opinion have come to my knowledge have said that in the future all newspapers must be collected.”

Though these views are not universally accepted in all countries today and have not lead to a well-defined and systematic program even in Germany, it is apparent that the newspaper has established a definite claim upon the serious attention of the librarian. Occasional attempts at justification of collecting newspapers on a limited basis have included efforts to arrive at an answer by collecting statistics of use of existing collections. It is difficult to collect valid statistical data due to the constant shifting of emphasis in research, not to speak of the improvement of newspaper collections and their accessibility. It is very likely that serious efforts to know the real extent of the present-day use of newspapers would justify amply the preservation of at least one copy of every newspaper published. The curator of the newspaper collection of a Western historical society wrote: “A whole monograph could be written on the variety of uses by the public.” A visit to the newspaper reading room of the Library of Congress is bound to give the skeptics some food for thought. The State University of Louisiana has placed four microfilm readers at the disposal of newspaper research.

The argument sometimes heard that newspapers which have no indexes should not be collected at all hardly deserves serious consideration. The almost complete absence of published indexes however points to untold opportunities for bibliographers, librarians, and journalists for emulating such efforts as the indexes prepared for the Hampshire Gazette or the Cleveland Plain Dealer, and other similar indexes prepared during so-called “depression times.”

The relatively late recognition of the newspaper as serious source material has, as it has in the case of archival records, served to delay its complete acceptance by librarians as their responsibility. This serious lag is illustrated most eloquently by the late appearance of bibliographies and catalogs of newspapers, still more by the abundance of incomplete files recorded. It is important to establish the need for per-
manent preservation of newspapers without exception, before the next step can be taken with assurance, i.e. making plans for collecting and preserving newspapers permanently. Once the premise of universal need has been established, the task is one of facing the quantitative aspects of the problem. Unlike modern archival records, whose incorporation into permanent archives is usually preceded by the elimination of great quantities of secondary and ephemeral materials, the newspapers require incorporation of every issue of every edition.

In a related paper published a short while ago the author attempted to pursue this topic, adducing somewhat more extensive historical evidence and reporting on the status of collecting newspapers in some twenty different countries, including the United States. Since then further facts have become known, which indicate a definite trend towards acceptance of the principle of collecting newspapers on a universal and at the same time cooperative basis. In this article significant developments in the United States are reported.

In the United States several nationwide efforts are running side by side, supporting and supplementing each other, to make sure that no important sector of the country's intellectual record is left unattended. The American Library Association, through its Committee on Cooperative Microfilm Projects, a subcommittee of the Board on Resources of American Libraries, has for some time taken cognizance of the importance of newspapers and of the urgent need for their preservation. The principal points of a program of preservation have been included in a *Statement of Principles to Guide Large Scale Acquisition and Preservation of Library Materials on Microfilm*. The first among these points was agreed to be the urgent need for interlibrary cooperation in the acquisition and preservation of certain library materials, among which newspapers of the wood pulp period are named first, before "disintegrating periodicals" and "out-of-print books." Nothing is said about the extent or limitation of such a program, though obviously no alternative to filming is even contemplated. The second important point was agreed to be the "need for further planning which will augment current activity and resources, and will induce a greater number of libraries, associations and other organizations which are interested in the preservation of the record of our civilization to assume a share of the responsibility for that preservation."

The above mentioned statement outlined a program of action needed by research libraries. This program suggests adoption of and adherence by research libraries to principles which should govern coop-
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erative microfilming activities and services such as "A Satisfactory Set of Standards for Microfilming Newspapers," which has been prepared for the Association of Research Libraries and is included in A Guide to Microfilming Practices Prepared by the A.L.A. Committee on Photoduplication and Multiple Copying Methods; a similarly satisfactory system of pricing microfilm copies; an adequate loan policy for microfilm copies; and adequate consideration of the ownership of original and rare materials microfilmed, when considering reproduction.

The Library of Congress possesses the largest collection of newspapers in the United States. It published in 1953 a second edition of the union list entitled Newspapers on Microfilm and simultaneously a Selected List of United States Newspapers Recommended for Preservation by the A.L.A. Committee on Cooperative Microfilm Projects. The latter list is an effort in supplying a stimulus and a core. The Union Catalog Division of the Library of Congress which issued both lists above has had, since 1949, a Microfilm Clearing House, whose purpose it is "to provide a central source of information on extensive microfilming projects planned, in progress, or completed." Much of the information received by this office has been published in the Microfilm Clearing House Bulletin, an irregular supplement to the Library of Congress Information Bulletin.

The degree of success of the newspaper preservation program varies greatly among the states of the Union. About some of them it is not even known what has been done, though absence from the lists mentioned, or lack of a report in the Microfilm Clearing House Bulletin does not justify negative conclusions.

Many newspaper publishers, in practically all states, for years, have sent current issues for binding and preservation to the public collections in each state. In most states a number of publishers have begun to have their current files microfilmed; in some cases they have extended this to the existing files of former years. But in very few cases have they so far taken a practical interest in the systematic collection and permanent preservation of newspapers.

The Kansas State Historical Society is perhaps the most effective agency in collecting newspapers in America, because the Society was founded by the newspaper editors and publishers of the state. In Minnesota, which has one of the most complete collecting programs, the Minnesota Editorial Association has gone on record repeatedly that it is backing the work of the Minnesota Historical Society Library. It has formed a microfilm committee which is working with the Library on its microfilm program. This committee gives "splendid sup-
port before the legislators” and in February 1955 gave $1,250.00 to buy additional equipment for filming. The Mississippi Department of Archives and History reports that the newspaper publishers are “willing to cooperate with the stand we have taken,” i.e. of collecting systematically the newspapers of the state. The president of the Nebraska Press Association is an ex-officio member of the Nebraska State Historical Society, which endeavors to collect all newspapers of the state while, in Utah, the publishers of newspapers as a group have endorsed the program of the University of Utah to collect the entire newspaper resources of the state and to film them as far as possible.

In the following an attempt is made to give a succinct account of the state of the newspaper collecting program in the 48 states. The figures in parentheses refer to the population, the number of dailies and the number of weeklies in each state, taken from the Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals, 1954. Other information was secured by means of a questionnaire sent to one, or several, institutions in each of the 48 states during April, May, and June, 1955. Additional information was secured from data generously supplied by George A. Schwegmann, Jr., Chief of the Union Catalog Division, Library of Congress.

**Alabama (3,062,000 – 18 – 124)**

The Department of Archives and History at Montgomery “has a very large collection of newspapers dating from about 1813.” An act of the legislature requires all newspapers in Alabama which contain legal advertisements to be preserved in the county of origin. There is no systematic effort to film. Newspapers On Microfilm, hereafter referred to by the symbol NOM(1953) reports at least seven dailies as being microfilmed. Some thirty early files, mostly small, are listed.

**Arizona (750,000 – 13 – 45)**

The Department of Library and Archives at Phoenix collects all newspapers of the state for permanent preservation and has a project for filming existing files. The Arizona Pioneers’ Historical Society at Tucson also has a statewide collection dating from 1859, but no film program. NOM(1953) reported the filming of the two dailies in Phoenix as well as of the two dailies in Tucson in their entirety.

**Arkansas, (1,910,000 – 35 – 146)**

Arkansas University is reported to have a project but its nature is unknown.
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**California (10,586,000 – 134 – 624)**

The State Library at Sacramento has the "backing of the state legislature for eventual coverage of the entire state." The University Library at Berkeley "has been filming systematically its files of California newspapers through June 1947 and including all holdings as of that date." Planning is going on at various points in the state. The Regional Resources Committee of the California Library Association "now surveying newspaper holdings in the state, hopes one result [of its work] will be a formal definition jointly by libraries of a collecting policy worked out in terms of specific area responsibilities. Present working agreements between major libraries in this state are completely informal," NOM(1953) listed over 300 titles, 6 or more of these were filmed currently.

**Colorado (1,335,000 – 28 – 144)**

The Division of State Archives has filmed considerably over 100 titles for the State Historical Society at Denver, which are listed in NOM(1953). About three-fourths of these are filmed on "a more or less current basis." The Society "has been collecting state newspapers almost from its beginning."

**Connecticut (2,007,000 – 26 – 63)**

For twenty-five years or more it has been one of the functions of the State Library at Hartford to collect and preserve the newspapers of the state, in order to have "so far as possible a complete file of every newspaper published in the state." The Library has no film program. NOM(1953) listed about 40 titles, 18 of which were filmed currently.

**Delaware (318,000 – 3 – 18)**

NOM(1953) listed about 40 titles as having been filmed, two of them currently.

**Florida (2,771,000 – 46 – 152)**

The University of Florida at Gainesville has initiated an ambitious program of filming and of encouraging filming by other agencies. NOM(1953) registered around 100 titles, about 20 were current.

**Georgia (3,445,000 – 31 – 201)**

Georgia is reported to have several plans, one involving state agencies such as the Department of Archives and History at Atlanta and another stemming from Emory University. The University at Athens
also has "a modest program," at present financed by an alumni foundation fund. It collects systematically 37 weeklies. Both current issues and back files are being filmed "as funds and time permit." NOM (1953) listed 25 titles filmed, 9 of them current.

**Idaho (589,000 – 14 – 77)**

The Idaho Library Association has a Newspaper Microfilming Committee which functions with these aims: the education and solicitation of newspaper publishers to recognize the importance of filming and to microfilm both their old and current files, while calling for the identification and location of Idaho newspapers of historical importance. Some 20 titles, mostly older files, have been filmed by the newspaper companies since adoption of the program while another 10 titles were filmed by the University Library.

**Illinois (8,712,000 – 96 – 682)**

The Illinois Historical Library has a collection of about 11,000 volumes and 6,500 rolls of films of Illinois newspapers, which is richer in 19th century Illinois papers than any other collection in the state. The collection at the University of Illinois Library of around 13,000 volumes and 1,600 rolls of film is, on the other hand, much the richest for the 20th century. The University is and has been collecting for about 40 years two-thirds of the dailies and a good third of the weeklies and is getting papers from all but 2 counties, whereas the Historical Library is now receiving "55 papers from 48 counties (35 on microfilm) – 40 dailies and 15 weeklies." The Illinois Library Association has had a Committee for Local Illinois Newspapers for a number of years, which has worked under the assumption, that the microfilming of dailies would be taken care of by the efforts of the Historical Library and the publishers, while the question of the "local papers" is still being investigated by the committee. NOM(1953) recorded about 130 titles, 30 of which were current.

**Indiana (3,934,000 – 88 – 285)**

"The Indiana State Library at Indianapolis is required by law to collect material on the state." From this mandate the administrator deduced that he was "committed to acquire and preserve as complete a collection of Indiana newspapers as possible." The Library's microfilming program is primarily aimed at obsolete titles of the wood pulp era and the current files of small weekly papers, where local communities are not able to undertake the work. Its advisory service encourages
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filming by publishers and libraries. It subscribes to positive copies of current films done by other agencies. NOM(1953) listed over 80 titles, 18 of which also were filmed currently.

Iowa (2,621,000 - 44 - 415)

Two agencies are collecting Iowa newspapers for permanent preservation, the Department of History and Archives at Des Moines and the Historical Society at Iowa City. The former is receiving about “200 weekly and 38 daily newspapers.” The latter is still binding 20 dailies and 17 weeklies and microfilming 30 weeklies. The Department of History and Archives is also microfilming dailies at a slow pace. NOM(1953) listed over 30 titles, 15 of them current.

Kansas (1,905,000 - 55 - 319)

The Kansas State Historical Society at Topeka was founded by the editors and publishers of the state in 1875, and the collection and preservation of Kansas newspapers has been a major activity from the beginning. “We now have, with a few minor exceptions, virtually every issue of every newspaper ever published in Kansas,” according to the secretary’s statement. The Kansas newspaper collection includes now more than 56,000 bound volumes and more than 4,800 reels of microfilmed newspapers. For over ten years the Society has been filming old files with its own camera. The publishers have in almost all cases bought positive copies, those who had their own files filmed have donated positives to the Society. Most of the 120 titles reported in NOM(1953) were and are filmed by the Society.

Kentucky (2,945,000 - 33 - 151)

The Kentucky University Library at Lexington has collected since 1931 “all the county newspapers which the publishers will send.” There is “no state-wide acquisition or filming policy.” NOM(1953) reported about 30 titles, 8 were current.

Louisiana (2,684,000 - 23 - 105)

The State University Library at Baton Rouge is “attempting to film all newspapers that have been published in Louisiana.” It is also trying to film all current titles not filmed by publishers. To date they have concentrated on weeklies. NOM(1953) lists over 100 titles, mostly credited to the University and 30 of them current. The Library has reported over 20 additional titles since 1953.
The Maine Historical Society at Portland and the State Library at Augusta have large collections. Maine has no film program. NOM (1953) listed 17 titles, 6 of them current.

Maryland (2,343,000 – 12 – 82)

The Enoch Pratt Free Library in Philadelphia is collecting all newspapers published in Baltimore, at least one daily from each of the other towns and cities with papers and, most weeklies throughout the state. There is no extensive film program in the state. NOM (1953) reported about 20 titles, 11 of them current.

Massachusetts (4,691,000 – 62 – 210)

The American Antiquarian Society at Worcester has the well-known collection of early American newspapers before 1820, not equalled anywhere. The State Library has a large collection of Boston, Worcester, and Springfield papers. There is no systematic effort made in the state to collect or to film newspapers. NOM (1953) listed some 80 titles microfilmed by libraries and publishers, 26 of them current.

Michigan (6,372,000 – 55 – 362)

"The Michigan Library Association and [the] Michigan State Library have had a joint program to achieve state-wide collecting. Michigan dailies are well-covered, but much still needs to be done on weeklies. . . ." There is no over-all program of filming back files and current issues. Important collections are at the Michigan State Library, the University of Michigan, and the Detroit Public Library. Several cooperative agreements for filming certain titles have been developed between newspapers and librarians. NOM (1953) listed over 70 titles, 30 of them current.

Minnesota (2,982,000 – 30 – 400)

The semi-official Historical Society which is in part supported by legislative appropriation has been collecting and preserving Minnesota newspapers since 1849. The Society has more than 25,000 bound volumes, which is estimated to represent 75 to 80 per cent of all newspapers that were published in the state. It is collecting over 90 per cent of the current Minnesota titles. Since 1947 the Society has been receiving money from the legislature for microfilming equipment and operators, it is working on a ten-year plan for microfilming the entire collection and current files. Only negatives are made, but positives are pre-
pared whenever needed. NOM(1953) listed some 30 titles, 10 of them current.

**Mississippi (2,179,000 – 20 – 120)**

The Department of Archives and History at Jackson "is required by law to collect all newspapers printed in Mississippi, in so far as we are able." It has the most comprehensive collection of Mississippi newspapers in the state. Though there is a possibility of filming, through the Board of Public Contracts, not much has been done; weeklies are considered first. The Mississippi State College has microfilmed 12 of the 20 titles reported in NOM(1953).

**Missouri (3,955,000 – 59 – 378)**

NOM(1953) listed some 180 titles, 80 or more of them credited to the Missouri Historical Society at Columbia.

**Montana (591,000 – 19 – 81)**

NOM(1953) reported 3 titles, 1 of them current.

**Nebraska (1,326,000 – 20 – 277)**

The State Historical Society endeavors to collect all Nebraska newspapers. It is about to microfilm its entire collection and has received an "initial appropriation for the development of a long term program." It is emphasizing two groups in this program, to start with, weeklies whose publishers are unlikely to be in a position to have their own papers microfilmed, and papers which have ceased publication. NOM (1953) reported about 40 titles, 12 of them current.

**Nevada (160,000 – 9 – 20)**

All county recorders are required by law to subscribe for and preserve at least one and not more than three newspapers printed and published in their respective counties. The Nevada State Library at Carson City, the Nevada Historical Society Library and the University of Nevada Library at Reno collect and preserve newspapers of Nevada. There is no systematic film program. NOM(1953) records one small 19th century file.

**New Hampshire (533,000 – 9 – 44)**

The New Hampshire State Library has an extensive collection of newspapers published in the state, and it is collecting "the major newspapers" now. NOM(1953) reported 10 files on film, 3 of them current.
New Jersey (4,835,000 – 28 – 279)

NOM(1953) listed some 50 titles, 17 of them current.

New Mexico (681,000 – 15 – 44)

The University of New Mexico Library at Albuquerque has for a number of years tried to collect and also film as many of the state's newspapers as possible. Two other institutions in the state are doing some filming. The New Mexico Library Association Committee on Cooperative Microfilming reported microfilms for 11 papers in August 1954.

New York (14,830,000 – 125 – 548)

The New York State Library "has an extensive newspaper program." Large collections are also at the New York Public Library and in the New York Historical Society. There is no systematic film program. NOM(1953) listed over 300 titles, more than 80 of them current.

North Carolina (4,062,000 – 48 – 158)

Duke University at Durham is collecting on a large scale. The University at Chapel Hill is pursuing a limited program. The State Library Association is working on a film program. NOM(1953) listed 35 titles, 21 current.

North Dakota (620,000 – 12 – 113)

NOM(1953) listed 3 titles, 2 of them current.

Ohio (7,947,000 – 106 – 358)

The Ohio Code provides that "the leading newspapers of each political party" for each county be subscribed to by the county commissioners and filed in the county auditor's office "as public archives" and for "at least ten years," thereafter they may be transferred to the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society at Columbus. The Society has now about 35,000 bound volumes and 14,000 rolls of microfilmed papers. It is getting 196 Ohio newspapers on current subscription. Since 1946 it has been storing on deposit the negative film copies of the current issues of 43 Ohio newspapers, in return for which the Society receives the current issues free. Another program recently inaugurated provides for deposit of positive film copies of 23 current newspapers, which practice they "hope in time [will] include all Ohio newspapers which are being currently filmed." The Society is attempting also to "replace on microfilm selected runs of Ohio newspapers." NOM(1953) reported about 120 titles, over 30 of them current.
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Oklahoma (2,233,000 – 52 – 247)

NOM(1953) listed 50 titles, 14 of them current.

Oregon (1,521,000 – 20 – 109)

The University of Oregon Library at Eugene collects current newspapers systematically and aims at completeness. All dailies are being filmed, most of them by the Library. Some old files have been filmed and there is a possibility of a cooperative agreement between the Library and the Oregon Historical Society for the filming of back files systematically. The Oregon Newspapers’ Publishers Association has endorsed the University Library’s microfilming program and some publishers are cooperating by purchasing positive copies and helping to fill in gaps.

Pennsylvania (10,498,000 – 137 – 411)

NOM(1953) listed about 170 titles, 55 of them current.

Rhode Island (792,000 – 7 – 16)

The Historical Society at Providence has since its founding in 1822 attempted to maintain complete files of all newspapers in the state; since 1870 it has been “official depository” of the state’s newspapers, “with an annual appropriation from the State Library” for the purpose of subscribing to and preserving these papers. The current titles are filmed either by the Historical Society or by their publishers. The Society is trying to secure an appropriation from the Legislature to film the existing files of 3,000,000 pages. The present appropriation for filming purposes is $1,200. NOM(1953) listed 8 titles, 4 of them current.

South Carolina (2,117,000 – 17 – 74)

The South Carolina Library at Columbia “takes about two-thirds” of the state’s newspapers. There is no film program. NOM(1953) listed 24 titles, 10 of them current.

South Dakota (653,000 – 12 – 159)

The Historical Society at Pierre “has essentially 100 percent of all newspapers published since 1902 and has either in the original or on microfilm about 33 percent of those published prior to that date.” It has been microfilming, since 1953, all current newspapers and existing files, when possible. Many back files are secured from the publishers on positive microfilm, while the Society furnishes positive film copies for files in its possession. NOM(1953) listed 5 titles, 4 current.
Tennessee (3,292,000 - 28 - 131)

The State Library and Archives at Nashville is collecting all the dailies of the state and about 80 per cent of the weeklies, for preservation in the original or on microfilm. It will film or buy on film the existing files of the state. The films of all dailies filmed regularly are bought on a current basis. NOM(1953) listed 50 titles, 12 of them current.

Texas (7,711,000 - 115 - 560)

The Texas statutes require the state librarian “to complete the files of the early Texas newspapers in the State Library; and he shall cause to be bound the current files of not less than ten of the leading newspapers of the state. . . .” At present the State Library receives and preserves 44 Texas newspapers in the original form and 72 on microfilm. There is some duplication, but the number of individual newspapers preserved is above 100. There is no systematic effort made to film current or existing files. NOM(1953) listed nearly 100 titles, 35 of them current.

Utah (689,000 - 5 - 55)

The University of Utah Library at Salt Lake City has agreed with the Universal Microfilming Corporation on a program to film all of the state’s papers not filmed so far. The corporation has a list of 53 titles already filmed. The Library has acquired positive prints of all films available to date.

Vermont (378,000 - 10 - 28)

The State Library at Montpelier is committed to the policy of collecting all Vermont newspapers for permanent preservation. No plan for filming exists. NOM(1953) listed 4 titles, 1 current.

Virginia (3,319,000 - 33 - 119)

The Virginia Library Association has had committees work on this problem. The Virginia State Library at Richmond and the University Library at Charlottesville have divided the responsibility for collecting certain Virginia papers some years ago; as a result, “a great number of the smaller papers are being preserved. . . .” The Virginia State Library has a working program of filming back files; one camera is “devoted almost exclusively to this work.” The University has also filmed some back files. NOM(1953) listed over 50 titles, 16 of them current.
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Washington (2,379,000 – 25 – 175)

Upon studies and recommendations of the Historical Newspaper Microfilm Committee of the State Library Association the legislature provided an initial appropriation of over $20,000 for microfilming Washington newspapers. The committee named recommended to the State Library, authorized to do the filming, that it emphasize the production of master negatives, to establish a price for copies with a view to providing funds for continuation of the project and to designate newspaper publishers as representatives on the committee. NOM (1953) listed over 50 titles, 6 of them current.

West Virginia (2,006,000 – 32 – 92)

The Department of Archives and History at Charleston and the University at Morgantown have both initiated programs to film the state’s newspapers. NOM (1953) listed over 80 titles, 9 of them current.

Wisconsin (3,435,000 – 40 – 300)

The Historical Society at Madison is “charged with the responsibility of collecting and preserving materials relevant to the history of Wisconsin, and since we consider newspapers the best available source for much local history, it is our policy to collect and preserve as nearly as possible all of the newspapers of the state. Since 1943 we have collected on a current basis all Wisconsin newspapers but four or five very small weeklies which will not cooperate. Before 1943 collecting was selective and included all major daily papers and about two-thirds of the weeklies.” Since 1943 the Society ceased binding the newspapers and began to film what was not available on film elsewhere. The latter are bought. Bound papers in the Society’s own files are filmed only if they must be saved from disintegration. The program of filming existing files outside the Library is largely confined to weeklies “whose publishers are not likely to film their files” and to files of daily papers held by libraries and no longer forming part of an existing current paper. NOM (1953) listed about 450 titles, over 330 of which were current.

Wyoming (291,000 – 10 – 36)

NOM (1953) listed the Wyoming State Tribune of Cheyenne, 1951 to date.

The record which, of course, is quite incomplete reveals that in some states considerable success has been achieved, notably where the interests of the ultimate “consumer,” the historian, and of the “producer,”
the press itself, have been concerned with the ultimate outcome. This becomes particularly apparent in the case of Kansas, where the Historical Society has been identified from its beginning with the editors and publishers of the state’s newspapers. Wherever historical societies have been thoroughly concerned, effective programs have been developed, as is shown in the cases of Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. State libraries too are obviously in a good position to approach the ideal: Indiana, Tennessee, and Virginia furnish good examples for this category of collecting agency. Some state university libraries have developed exemplary programs; examples are Georgia, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oregon, and Utah. Collective efforts of librarians have resulted in effective plans in a number of cases such as Idaho and Washington.

In order to achieve completeness for the United States as a whole obviously more would have to be done. For the sake of a clear understanding of the size of the problem it seems worthwhile to appraise it in its bare quantitative aspects. The 1,900 dailies published in the United States represent around 12,000 and the 9,500 weeklies around 3,000 bound volumes per year; a collection of all U. S. newspapers for 1954, would be equal to an estimated 15,000 volumes. This roughly corresponds to a collection of around 150,000 octavo volumes which is not much more than the present annual increment of the University of Illinois Library. The total number of volumes in the existing newspaper collections in the United States of U. S. newspapers might be ten times that figure. Most of that material falls in the wood pulp era. It would, therefore, be necessary to think of both the existing files and the current increment in terms of film copies. A complete collection of United States newspapers on microfilm could probably be accommodated in double rows on 250 sections of ordinary steel shelves, which would grow annually by another 25 sections.

The many problems connected with the standardization and cost of filming could not be discussed here. However, one fact may be related as particularly significant: among the twelve or more commercial firms dedicated to filming newspapers in the United States one particular firm has succeeded in filming about 60,000,000 pages of newspapers and is now filming more U. S. newspapers than any other company or “better than 60 per cent nationally.”
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Prints, Pictures and Photographs

MAY D. HILL

Most people will agree that the term photograph means a paper print made from a photographic negative, but it may be necessary to set up definitions for the terms print and picture. By prints we mean, in this discussion, fine arts prints (original engravings, etchings, etc., but not photographs); the term pictures may overlap the above terms and will also be used to cover all other forms of pictorial materials, such as clippings from miscellaneous printed sources. An example of each would be: photograph, an unpublished shot of a well-known politician eating watermelon; print, an etching by Rembrandt; picture, an illustration of the Taj Mahal clipped from a travel brochure.

"Picture collections" often include all three types of materials and more—charts, maps, and graphs may find their eventual resting places in the picture files because of their flat format. Indeed, the main reason for storing these pictorial materials together has been their similarity in format or shape, rather than the subject nature of the materials.

One effective stimulus to the creation of many new picture collections during recent years has been the example of the larger collections such as the excellent one directed by Romana Javitz at the New York Public Library. Business firms and publishers have found this enormous collection so helpful that they have followed suit and set up their own picture libraries. Most public libraries place the picture collection in the children's room or in the art department, but the New York Public Library has pioneered in establishing a separate department. The growing use of pictures as documentation may well lead to a general relocation of picture collections, particularly in large libraries.

The increased recognition of the photograph as documentary evidence has led to the preservation in special libraries and archives of many negatives and unique positives, and, eventually, to the detailed cataloging of such collections. A good bibliography on the cataloging

Mrs. Hill is Librarian of the North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh.
of non-book materials can be found in the *Library Trends* issue on trends in cataloging and classification.\(^2\) While many collections of a broad general nature may be filed in such a way as to make cataloging unnecessary, larger photographic collections and, especially, collections of negatives must receive cataloging and indexing as detailed as that given to books. Fine prints also require cataloging if they are to serve a useful purpose within the library or museum.

The use of microfilm images of pictorial material on the individual catalog cards themselves, introduced in the Library of Congress' Division of Prints and Photographs in 1946, has been described by Milholllen.\(^3\) The saving in time for the staff and for the searcher who no longer has to examine every picture will more than offset the loss of actual contact with the original material itself so deplored by one picture library curator.\(^4\) In fact, the use of a small image on the card may permit the user actually to see far more pictures than would be possible in searching the cumbersome picture files. This method has proved to be useful in libraries of publishing concerns, in the Marburg Archives, and in the Belgian Central Iconographic Archives for National Art.\(^5\) Punched cards and electronic sorting devices promise to revolutionize picture selection in the future, but precision is not expected to be a feature of this type of sorting, since the number of choices must necessarily be limited.

Although the catalog of a picture collection may bear close resemblance to the card catalog of a book collection, the care of picture materials is very different from that of books. Storage facilities vary, but the majority of libraries in this country and abroad now use steel vertical filing cabinets with manila folders or dry mounts for collections of mixed pictorial materials. The techniques involved in mounting pictures and prints have some affinity to the techniques used in the care of fine books. Even the necessity for binding arises occasionally, particularly with collections in special libraries such as that of the Museum of Modern Art, where similar materials can be shelved together permanently and where material is not circulated.\(^6\) When possible, historically important material is kept in its original unmounted condition.

Storage of prints and larger pictures is comparable to map storage. Large pieces are stored flat to avoid folding and warping, in separate oversize cabinets, which may be kept below the smaller files or stacked and used as table surfaces where material can be spread out. Indeed the standard map case equipment, with drawers for flat horizontal filing, is widely used in print collections.
The circulation of picture materials varies little from the circulation of books, except that the library usually finds it desirable to provide some kind of wrapper, folder, tube, or portfolio in which to issue the pictures to protect them from damage and from loss. Photographic copying facilities have lessened the need in some libraries for circulating delicate materials and may eventually obviate the need for lending pictures. Where pictures are freely circulated, charging systems have been set up similar to book charging systems, but simple counting of items, rather than piece by piece charging, is often considered sufficient.

Miss Javitz has pointed out three types of picture collections: (1) those for a single specific purpose within an organization such as a business or museum library, (2) those limited to pictorial units of national importance produced by a specific source, as the collection at the Library of Congress, and (3) the all-inclusive, general picture collection of the public libraries.

The public library picture collection is more apt to combine broadly all types of pictures than is the special or archival library. The Chicago Public Library is now filing together its clippings and mounted pictures, according to Matilde Kelly, and it is notable that only $300 is spent annually (1950) for clipping sources and additional reference works. Unlike art libraries which have specialized files limited to art, esthetics, and art techniques, the public library's pictures comprise a general documentary collection, the value of which is based on variety and breadth of subject organization. Although specific subject headings filed alphabetically seem to be the preferred arrangement in larger public library collections, the use of the Dewey and other classification systems is more popular in smaller ones, particularly in England. There are several classification schemes published in full or in part for use in setting up a picture collection. The New York Public Library, on the other hand, uses 8,000 specific subject headings subdivided by region, chronology, style, type, and name. This collection is described by its director as a combined gazetteer, biographical dictionary, and general encyclopedia. This description can well be applied to most public library picture collections, whether recognized in the organization of the files or not.

Local history pictorial collections are often foundlings among libraries, since they may be part of a public, university, school or museum library collection. Their value is chiefly documentary, like the materials in the public library files, but their organization and preservation problems link them with the special—even the archival—library. For this reason it may be better to treat them separately.
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The North Carolina Department of Archives and History at Raleigh maintains such a local history picture collection consisting of (1) 20,000 negatives bequeathed by an unusually far-sighted local photographer, Albert Barden, who set up a photographic studio in Raleigh during the early part of this century, (2) about 10,000 negatives deposited by the Raleigh News and Observer, a newspaper still operated by the sons of Josephus Daniels, and (3) several steel cases of unique positives accumulated since 1905 by the department itself. This whole collection is numbered serially and indexed by subject, donor, and number. Much use has been made of the material by newspapers, magazines, and private citizens seeking grandpa's class picture. The availability of photographic services in the Hall of History, where the collection is located, has added to their use and cut down on the space which would be required to house both negatives and positives.

This particular local history collection is better organized than would be possible where the community is smaller and the collection of photographs more diversified. It is a small collection, however, compared with the collections of the same type in the National Archives, where one collection has more than fifty different indexes, and in the Library of Congress, where serial numbers are also used to locate nearly three million items. The Library of Congress indexes, which have been mentioned earlier, contain short descriptions and microfilm images of the items they identify.

While schools, colleges, and universities all use picture materials for instructional purposes, the school picture collection differs from its big cousins in that it may include pamphlets, clippings, and all other picture material in a common file. This is largely the result of the newer teaching methods utilizing all source materials toward the enrichment of the classroom activities. Frequent weeding is recommended for such collections not only to keep them up to date but because popular materials are apt to wear out quickly and need replacing more often than in large collections. Housing of the school collection is usually much the same as for public libraries.

College and university picture collections generally contain the same materials as museum collections, especially if such collections are connected with art departments; but they differ from museum collections in their relationship to the teaching function and also in that they may include teaching materials for history, anthropology, social science or physical sciences. Picture files are apt to be scattered over the campus, with each department maintaining files according to its needs. Some large groups of materials may come into the general library when they
are believed to be too large to be handled elsewhere, or if their use is general rather than special.

The housing of university collections varies according to whether the user handles the files or whether an attendant brings him the requested material. If the latter arrangement is used, buckram boxes or wooden bins, rather than steel files, often house the collection, in which case a card index to the material would be necessary. Actually, in most college and university situations students and faculty are allowed direct access to the picture files.

Cataloging these collections is an intricate task requiring precision in cataloging technique and a knowledge of the subject field covered. When staffing is inadequate for complete cataloging, separate indexes of portraits, architects (if architecture is filed by locale), etc., are valuable aids. Graduate students often do the indexing and cataloging of college and university collections.

The use of fine arts photo collections in universities varies. In some institutions pictures are incidental student aids used chiefly in seminars when slides are not available, or for graduate research. North Carolina affords an example of such use: the Weil collection of about 14,000 Alinari and Anderson photographs of works of art in Italian museums is a useful study aid. Other universities with larger collections often place pictures on reserve for certain courses. At Princeton each course has an alcove where photographs of the material covered in the course are displayed.

Print rooms, like local history collection rooms, may be found in various institutions—university libraries, art departments, and museums—and they usually constitute a separate collection. At Princeton both the main library and the fine arts departments have separate print rooms. Storage is usually in buckram pamphlet boxes and, for larger prints, flat cases. Display areas are usually provided in the room, often on the outside of cabinet doors. Since prints seldom circulate, provision must be made for their use in the print room.

The preservation of prints has received much study and needs not be dealt with in this paper. Many of the techniques are passed from expert to expert, and the collection which can boast a well-trained print restorer is indeed fortunate. Needless to say, fine prints are not mounted in the same manner as other picture material but are carefully hinged to mats cut from the best quality stock available. Prints should always be matted before they are framed. Frames are kept as simple as possible and carefully sealed against dust.

Museum picture libraries have as one of their chief functions the
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preservation of a photographic record of each item in the museum. Pictorial records are often kept of each exhibition as well. The Museum of Modern Art in New York City binds its exhibition photographs in chronological order and mounts other photos of museum objects in loose-leaf binders arranged alphabetically by artist. Such collections often include photographs of objects in other museums, architectural works, etc. Extensive use is made of museum photograph collections for publicity and for the publications of the institution.

The Museum of Modern Art also maintains a general vertical file information collection. Hannah B. Muller reports that it contains, in manila folders housed in steel cabinets, "... catalogs, announcements, photographs, biographical notes, reviews, tear sheets, clippings, programs. ... For every vertical file folder, there is a corresponding card in the catalog, bearing the appropriate name or subject designation and stamped Miscellaneous Uncataloged Material." When the material on one artist or subject gets too bulky, catalogs and clippings are removed and mounted, bound, and treated as books, while the photographs are mounted as explained above. These are then classified and cataloged.

Special libraries in business establishments use some of the methods developed in handling large picture collections, but are apt to specialize in a particular category and to work out intricate refinements to suit specific needs. In a periodical publishing house such as the National Geographic Society the index to the magazine can serve as the index to the original photos which have been reproduced, and the latter can be filed by volume and page number. Indexes for unpublished pictures are carefully compiled. All pictures are dry-mounted, and oversize material is stored in a series of giant pigeonholes for quickest reference. Albums are used for material which should and can be kept together as correlated material.

The September, 1954 issue of Special Libraries is devoted to picture libraries and gives accounts of twelve different collections. A noticeable feature is the rate at which each library seems to be growing. This rapid increase in size has fearsome implications for the future. Special librarians may well give serious consideration to the means of condensing their collections, for example, by the use of microfilm and the accumulation of negatives rather than positives. The development of centers for pooling negatives from which positives and slides or filmstrips can be ordered is one of the possible solutions and represents a promising trend in Europe and the United States. The Marburg Archives, (Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, a part of the Kunstgeschichte
Seminar der Universitaet Marburg), has been providing this service for Europeans and Americans for many years, and the organization of Taurgo, Inc., in New York, where negatives from many different institutions have been pooled, operates as an invaluable aid.21

Picture collections are becoming more interested in the identification of photographers, living or dead, and their subject specialities. Local history collections have special need for information of this kind, as do larger picture magazines and collections of photos compiled by government agencies. The future may see librarians working on more and more problems of attribution, or at least preserving these facts more carefully. Finally, the use of the picture collection for publicity purposes is evident in every type of library. It speaks well for the clear-sightedness of librarians, from the school library right through to the Library of Congress, that they recognize the value of pictorial material to serve a double-duty role as historical record and institutional promotion.
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Musical Scores and Recordings

VINCENT H. DUCKLES

Scores and recordings have a way of forcing themselves upon the attention of the librarian. They are problem materials, potentially, which can be either the dispair or the particular pride of the library which houses them. The question as to whether these materials belong in the library or not need no longer be raised. Scores at least are fully accepted, and recordings are rapidly establishing their place as legitimate library material in the eyes of both the library patron and administrator. Yet the integration of music into the library is not quite complete chiefly for the reason that its materials demand special handling, special equipment, and frequently specialized personnel. The adjustments made by libraries in response to the growth of music and record collections are many and varied. It is difficult to generalize about practices because no two patterns of administration are the same, but the common interests of librarians concerned with music have brought them together in a remarkable way considering the limited scope of the field. The best evidence for this community of interest is the existence of the Music Library Association, one of the most active of the special library groups. Its quarterly journal, Notes, has a distinguished reputation with a body of readers extending far beyond the ranks of professional librarianship. The success of the American organization, which dates from 1931, influenced the founding twenty years later of the International Association of Music Libraries. This group now has its own journal, Fontes Artis Musicae, and a number of working committees engaged in studying the international aspects of music cataloging, bibliography, exchange services, and the administration of record collections.1 No librarian concerned with the problems of music in his collection need look far to find kindred minds.

The administration of a self-contained music library is not the same thing as the handling of music in a general library, but the difference is merely one of scale. Although music, more than any other subject
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field, lends itself to special treatment only the larger libraries are in a position to create music divisions with the specialized equipment and personnel to go with them. The music library as a separate unit is the exception rather than the rule. Sometimes an alliance is made between music and the fine arts collections, sometimes with an audio-visual center. More often than not responsibility for the music materials is undelegated, but this does not prevent music from making its impact upon a wide range of library procedures. The discussion to follow is therefore organized in terms of the three traditional divisions of library practice: (1) cataloging and classification, (2) reference and bibliography, (3) processing and storage, all of which pertain to the treatment of material once it has arrived within the library. Space does not permit the consideration of other equally important areas which concern the way scores and recordings get into the library, namely, selection and ordering, nor will there be much opportunity to discuss music literature and its relation to other parts of the music collection. If books on music creep into the discussion it will be the result of their natural resistance to separation from kindred materials. The thing which gives coherence and meaning to the diverse music materials scattered throughout a library is, after all, the art of music, an area of rich humanistic interest which draws related elements together in spite of the librarian's misguided efforts to keep them apart.

Early in the present century American librarians recognized that music required certain extensions and modifications of ordinary cataloging procedure. Cutter's Rules for a Dictionary Catalog, 1904, and the American Library Association's Catalog Rules of 1908 both contained sections devoted to music. Other sporadic attempts followed, but the real initiative in the preparation of a specialized set of rules was taken by the Music Library Association's Committee on Cataloging and Classification as late as 1941 when preliminary sections of its Code for Cataloging Music began to appear. Portions of this code were published in the revised A.L.A. code in 1949, and a great many of its elements were incorporated into the Library of Congress Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the same year. Since then L.C. has been the dominant influence. It expanded its program of card distribution in the music field in 1943, and ten years later the first issues of the special supplement to the Library of Congress Catalog: Music and Phonorecords appeared.

A similar sequence of events has marked the development of a special code for the cataloging of recordings. First steps in this direction were also taken by the Music Library Association in 1942 in
the publication of its Code for Cataloging Phonograph Records. There followed a long period of discussion in which the views of record specialists throughout the country were expressed, and in 1953 L.C. issued its Rules for Descriptive Cataloging... Phonorecords in a preliminary edition. This was an event of far-reaching importance because it established beyond question the place of recordings in the library and provided a means whereby libraries could supply adequate cataloging treatment for their record holdings. The Library of Congress is not the only source of printed cards for records. One enterprising record dealer has developed a business in supplying libraries with pre-cataloged recordings using a modified A.L.A. and L.C. technique. There is still a definite need for a practical manual of cataloging procedure to supplement the Code. The University of California Music Library developed a series of such manuals a few years ago for internal use. These were circulated among libraries with similar collections and the interest aroused, indicated by inquiries and requests for additional copies, showed that there was a genuine need for literature of this kind.

The trend in music cataloging, for scores and records alike, has been in the direction of increasing complexity, particularly in the use of detailed notes and in the assignment of filing titles. The use of the filing title, or conventional title, is perhaps the most distinctive feature of music cataloging. It is an essential device for identifying and bringing together in the catalog all editions and arrangements of the same work. The effort to apply conventional titles appropriate to a music collection as large and diversified as that of the Library of Congress has led to some unwieldy entries, of which the following is by no means an extreme example: "Sextet, violins, violas & violoncellos, no. 1, op. 18, B-flat major, arr." Some of the same experts who brought the present codes into existence are now directing their efforts toward the development of rules for simplified or brief cataloging more applicable to collections of moderate size.

In many respects the cataloging of music is still in its infancy in spite of the intensive work of the past decade. The field is a challenging one. Here is an area in which descriptive cataloging, so often a matter of mere routine, can partake of the nature of creative research directed toward the establishment of accurate composer and title entries. A vast body of early music remains virtually untouched in this respect. Reliable lists of composers' works and sources of information about early music printing are scattered and difficult to find. Libraries can best meet this situation if they recognize that successful
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music cataloging cannot be carried on without access to a substantial battery of music reference tools and the application of minds well versed in music literature and bibliography. This principle is set forth most convincingly in a dissertation by Minnie Elmer, "The Cataloging of Music," Columbia, School of Library Service, 1946. Miss Elmer's study contains not only a clear discussion of the problems of music cataloging but an extensive annotated list of reference tools useful to the cataloger.

Subject cataloging for music, another area of unfinished business, has been stimulated by the publication of Music Subject Headings Used in the Printed Cards of the Library of Congress, Washington, 1952. This publication, closely allied to the L.C. classification system, provides useful subject headings for a large-scale dictionary catalog of which music is a part. More work needs to be done in determining headings for a self-contained music catalog of the kind found in a music school or conservatory. Furthermore, the L.C. list is not entirely satisfactory for recordings. More careful analysis needs to be made to determine just what interests bring the record listener to the catalog. It may be an interest in the specific work recorded, an interest in the performer or conductor, or a more general interest in the work as representative of a form, historical period or medium. Not all of these requirements can be satisfied by the accepted headings for music books and scores.

The L.C. classification schedule for music is, of course, only one of several approaches to the problem of organizing the contents of a music collection, but it is certainly one of the most satisfactory for a large library. Smaller libraries will find value in the condensed L.C. schedule drafted by a Music Library Association committee and published in the June, 1951, Supplement to Notes. The same committee has prepared a modified outline of the Dewey 780 class which helps to overcome some of the difficulties inherent in Dewey as an instrument for the classification of music. If the material is shelved in a closed stack, as most record collections are, there is less need for a detailed classification system. Most libraries have been satisfied to shelve recordings in order of accession with a simple classification according to size or playing speed.

Cataloging and classification are background areas of library practice with an important but indirect bearing upon the library user. In the foreground areas of reference and bibliography where music impinges upon the realm of ideas and makes its most direct contact with the patron, significant developments have also taken place in
recent years. There has been a rapid growth in the higher academic
disciplines of the music field at the college and university level. Musi-
cology has come into its own in American academic life, and music
librarianship, for better or worse, has allied itself with scholarship.
The author feels that the alliance will work to the advantage of both
fields, but there are those who have accused the Music Library Associ-
ation of being more concerned with problems of bibliography and
research than with library techniques. No one can deny that this might
be called a renaissance in music bibliography which parallels another
such period of intensive activity in the early years of the present
century. New and more effective reference tools have been developed,
and the concepts of music history, particularly for the pre-Bach eras,
have expanded and changed. A glance at the coverage of some of the
standard guides to reference materials is revealing. The seventh edition
of the Mudge-Winchell Guide to Reference Books contains more
than twice the number of music entries listed in the preceding edition
of 1936.11 Besterman's World Bibliography of Bibliographies cites
more than 250 items under the heading, "Music," while the somewhat
more specialized guide prepared by the Music Library of the Uni-
versity of California in 1952 lists approximately 450.13 In 1953, two
full-scale bibliographies of musicological literature appeared on op-
posite sides of the world: in Germany, the Repertorium der Musik-
wissenschaft, and in Southern California a compilation edited by
Helen W. Azhderian called Reference Works in Music and Music Lit-
erature in Five Libraries of Los Angeles County.15 The latter work is
more comprehensive than its title suggests; it contains some 4,500
items while the German book offers approximately 2,800. The year
1954 brought a new edition of Grove's Dictionary of Music, and
since 1949 music has had its index of current periodicals in the Music
Index.17 These are only a few of the new resources available to the
reference librarian in the music field. The culmination of all this ac-
tivity in music bibliography will be reached when the International
Association of Music Libraries in cooperation with the International
Musicological Society completes its Inventory of Musical Sources, a
monumental undertaking now in progress which will bring all manu-
script and printed sources before 1800 under bibliographical control.
Projects of this kind may seem remote from the work carried on at the
ordinary library reference desk, but they indicate the progress in a
rapidly expanding field in which librarianship is closely involved.
Reference work with phonograph records is a very recent develop-
ment; a few years ago it was practically non-existent outside of the
large city libraries. Already that situation has changed. Reference tools in this area have moved out of the realm of listener's guides, and hints on how to build a home record library, to authoritative works of international coverage such as the *World's Encyclopedia of Recorded Music*, and the catalogs of the Unesco sponsored *Archive of Recorded Music*. A new word, "discography," has been added to the vocabulary of librarianship, and no reputable biography of a composer is now considered complete without a list of his recorded works. Technological changes have had a direct bearing upon the content of record libraries. The advent of the long-playing record has restored a great deal of hitherto inaccessible music to life, not only from the past but from the corpus of contemporary music as well. Librarians are faced with an embarrassment of riches. They know how to analyze the needs and interests of readers but the interests of listeners are still relatively unexplored.

The problems raised by music in the library seem most acute in matters which relate to processing and storage. Here the peculiar physical properties of the materials, their size, shape, and fragility are most in evidence. Scores fit awkwardly into the type of shelving designed for a book collection. Their size is not uniform with respect to width of spine or broadside dimensions. Miniature scores are of a size in themselves, but unless they are segregated and shelved separately they are easily lost on a shelf which also contains folios and oblong quartos of varying weight and thickness. Satisfactory music shelving calls for two features not present in ordinary book stacks: (1) generous width of shelf, preferably eleven or twelve inches as a minimum, gaged to accomodate the larger types of scores; (2) fixed but adjustable partitions, not sliding bookrests, set from eight to twelve inches apart to check the leaning and crowding of the scores. Equipment of this kind will not solve completely the problem of multiple sizes of material mixed on the shelf, but the danger of bending or jamming will be reduced. The use of wide, partitioned shelving has the added advantage in being suitable for recordings as well as music, and such adaptability is an important factor in the planning of a flexible stack area. The ordinary record album is fourteen inches in width. It will project some two inches beyond the edge of a twelve-inch shelf, but far from being a disadvantage the projecting spine offers a convenient finger hold for removing the album from the shelf.

There are few libraries in the country which have music stacks designed in terms of the special nature of the materials, but the day of depending upon makeshift equipment for music collections is fast
drawing to a close. As of 1955, on the West Coast alone, there are at least six new music buildings just completed or in process of construction. Most of these have special facilities designed for their music collections. The same trend could doubtless be observed in other parts of the country. Manufacturers of library furniture are now prepared to supply music stacks of the kind described above so that there is no longer any need to endure inadequate shelving in the music section of the library.

The processing of sheet music has always been a problem for libraries. Here is fragile material whose unit cost is fairly low, but binding costs are high. If sheet music forms a part of the circulating collection, the only answer seems to lie in the use of a protective binder of some kind. A prepared type of binder of the kind used on pamphlet materials is one of the most satisfactory. This is certainly a better solution than binding assorted items of sheet music in composite volumes, a practice still used by some of the older libraries. The kind of binding protection required depends, of course, on the use intended for the material. In libraries where sheet music is stored as archival material, horizontal shelving in letter-file boxes, or in paper wrapped parcels, is quite adequate.

The housing and maintenance of the record collection is one of the crucial problems in this realm of librarianship. If the collection is intended primarily for circulation, as in most public libraries, it is necessary to provide carrying cases for the protection of the discs. Reference collections, on the other hand, which are confined to library use, call for listening facilities on the premises, expensive equipment, sound controlled space and other features which cannot be installed without affecting the library's total pattern of service. It is not surprising that there is very little standardization as yet in types of service or equipment. The extent to which practices vary is brought to light very clearly in a report prepared by the Audio-visual Recordings Sub-Committee of the California Library Association. In 1953 this committee undertook to survey 66 record libraries in California in an effort to find out what type of equipment they were using, what kinds of circulation policies were in effect and what cataloging and processing procedures were used. Not only did the patterns vary from library to library, but there was considerable discrepancy between theory and practice. In spite of the current interest in high-fidelity reproduction, only three custom-built playback units were listed. All recognized the superiority of diamond styli as a protection against record wear, but only two libraries had installed them. It is obvious from this
survey that libraries are still moving cautiously in the development of the record playing facilities. Their attitude seems to be characterized by improvisation rather than careful planning. The audio dealers are partly responsible for this situation. Extravagant advertising and the glib use of semi-technical terms have cost them the confidence of the layman; librarians, traditionally the most conservative of professional groups, have hesitated to invest heavily in equipment that might be obsolete in a year or two. But even if librarians are uncertain as to the specific types of playback equipment to install, they need no longer be doubtful as to the requirements it should meet. Recordings have had a short history in American libraries, but not too short to give rise to some very definite standards that will be embodied in the new library buildings under construction throughout the country. Briefly, the requirements for listening equipment in the library are four in number: (1) it must be sturdy, particularly as to motors and turntables; (2) it must be simple to operate, with a minimum of controls and speed adjustments; (3) it must have good tone quality, within the practical limitations enforced by its location; and (4) it must be economical in the matter of record wear and ease of maintenance. Equipment to meet these requirements can be found in the audio catalogs of today, and with a little patience and forethought it can be adapted to library use.

There are libraries in all parts of the country which could be cited as examples of practical, successful programs in the handling of record collections. They are not to be found, necessarily, in the large well-established institutions; most of these are too encumbered by space limitations and fixed patterns of routine. But examples of a progressive kind will come readily to the mind of anyone who has done a little investigation in this field. The listening facilities at Converse College, Spartanburg, South Carolina, are custom-designed throughout by the M-P Concert Installations, Inc., Fairfield, Connecticut, one of the first firms manufacturing playback machines for library use. The University of Washington, at Seattle, has developed a system in which all recordings are played by a library attendant and "piped" to students seated at various listening stations; Massachusetts Institute of Technology has emphasized its library facilities for recreational listening, and, as might be expected, has high quality equipment of the latest type. The plans being developed at the University of California, at Berkeley, for a new music library with specially designed tape and disc playback equipment have been described in a recent issue of the Music Library Association Notes.25
An interesting example of the integration of a record library with an audio-visual department is furnished by the Cincinnati Public Library where a new library unit is under construction. Examples of this kind could be multiplied indefinitely. It is fruitless to look for uniformity in a field so tied up with technological changes and the rapidly fluctuating economy of record production. The administration of record collections will remain one of the frontier areas in librarianship for many years to come, which is one of its chief attractions for those who are concerned with this field of library development.
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Films in the Library

DOROTHY L. DAY

The library, whether it be school, public, university or industrial, is still so closely associated with only the printed page that with the introduction of other materials in non-book forms the acceptance of such has been relatively slow. The "storehouse of knowledge" in many respects has not been retarded by just the patrons, but by those who work directly with the library tools. With the increasing means of communication and the vast need for a quicker and broader knowledge of world problems the libraries have been slow to use the new media. Our complex civilization requires more and more understanding; therefore, the library no longer should act as a "storehouse" but a "communication center" serving its patrons with the quickest and most thorough materials.

The extensive use of motion picture films and other audio-visual materials during World War II pointed out to the American educators the tremendous potentialities of this new medium of communication. Unlike the printed materials, films have from the very beginning had a large potential audience. The barrier of illiteracy that has prevented the spread of knowledge and information by means of the printed word is no longer a stumbling block with the use of films. Communication by the spoken word in addition to the visual media can provide a revelation to those who have remained untouched heretofore by the library.

Of course, as in any medium there are disadvantages. Films, as books, must win respectability and acceptability as a tool of learning. The printed page has held an honored position as the symbol of learning for many generations. For centuries even after the invention of the movable type, book learning was almost the only learning and limited to certain classes in the community who by virtue of position or wealth could afford to become literate and to gain access to the printed materials which until the last century were very restricted
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in quantity. Print, for a long time, was almost exclusively an instrument of communication for information and what used to be called literary culture. The mass production of light novels, mysteries, and other forms of popular entertainment so familiar today is chiefly a development of this century.

On the other hand, motion pictures first achieved wide use as a popular medium of entertainment and have remained primarily such ever since. The association of films with entertainment, which exists in the minds of the majority of old and young alike, has been a distinct handicap in developing any widespread use of films for other purposes.

Fortunately the public and the educators have begun to recognize the educational value of films. The producers have become aware that the medium must be used with the full range of its own possibilities and not in the limited scope of printed materials. The development of the documentary technique in film making and the animated drawing alone have created minor miracles in winning acceptance. In spite of the unpleasantness of World War II, the armed services did serve as a proving ground for the tremendous possibilities of films in the training programs. The amazing effectiveness of films in these programs demonstrated beyond all doubt that as an educational and informational medium the film has indeed come of age.

The next problem that arose in the use of films for educational purposes was that which involved all audio-visual services: to what extent should audio-visual and book services be correlated in a single library program? The usual arguments against library participation were that the methods and philosophy of audio-visual instruction differed from instruction through books; and that these methods were not understood by librarians; audio-visual education is a specialized field with its own materials, problems, and objectives; and the average library is not regularly equipped or staffed to care adequately for the materials and equipment from a technical point of view. A kindly argument has also been voiced that the audio-visual field justifies independent status parallel to the library.

On the other hand, it can be strongly argued that audio-visual aids ought not to be viewed in opposition to printed aids, but should be integrated with them. Both are instructional aids used together in the same educational process, and, if properly related, supplement each other.

The motion picture compels attention. It shares this characteristic with certain other visual materials, especially those projected on a
screen in a darkened room, but the movement and change in a motion picture attracts the viewer and holds his attention. With sound the film may provide an experience of high emotional quality. Like other audio-visual materials including print, the motion picture is an edited version of reality. This very editing, which may involve manipulation of time, space, objects, can heighten reality by eliminating distractions and point up relationships that might be overlooked.

The motion picture, if combined with the printed word, can become the greatest influence towards universal culture and understanding the world has ever known. The need, therefore, for an educational film program exists in every city in the United States whether it be large or small. By no means should the rural areas be excluded from such services. Progressive librarians know that the printed word in its various forms is no longer enough to meet the demands of our complex society. They know that interest and demand are present in their communities waiting to be developed. Experience has shown that wherever film programs have been started they generally have been enthusiastically received and supported.

In 1924 the American Library Association created the Visual Methods Committee which in 1940 became the Audio-Visual Committee. Meanwhile, in 1939 a survey of motion pictures was made and questionnaires were sent to 251 libraries and library agencies by the Visual Education Committee of the American Library Association. Of the 119 replies received only four libraries reported they owned and loaned films, but ten others reported the sponsoring of films in connection with adult education work. Projectors were owned by three libraries. Forty-six of the libraries offering advisory service concerning films reported that there was little call for it. Of those that answered the questionnaire sixty per cent subscribed to the Educational Film Catalog. In summing up the results of this questionnaire Mary U. Rothrock stated in the article "Libraries and Educational Films" in ALA Bulletin, "as yet libraries do not take motion pictures seriously as a means of diffusing ideas."

During World War II, the demands for the use of 16 mm films came into prominence. In 1947 the Carnegie Corporation made a grant to the American Library Association for the establishment of a Film Advisory Service at the American Library Headquarters to assist librarians on policy, administration, selection of materials, bibliographic and reference work in films and to promote library cooperation with other agencies working with information films. At the time this office was established, with Mrs. Patricia Blair Cory as library film...
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advisor, only a dozen libraries had film collections of their own. Before the war the general-interest films numbered only five hundred titles, in contrast to 25,000 films produced the first seven years after the war. Today almost 4,000,000 feet of new film per year are made available to the 16 mm users. In 1948 the first edition of the U.S. Department of Education's Directory of Film Libraries listed 576 film libraries. Of this number only twelve were public libraries in the United States maintaining film collections; and 137 were members of a cooperative film circuit. The next edition of the 16 mm Film Libraries Bulletin, in 1949, identified 897 such libraries. The third edition, issued two years later in 1951 listed 2,002 libraries. In the Bulletin, 1954 there are 2,660 listed. In March 1954, the public libraries in the United States reported the circulation of 54,689 16 mm films shown to 3,840,482 patrons.

The public library, which is a center for the distribution of information, is one agency that can serve the needs of the community for films. It should be pointed out that the library has the staff already skilled in cataloging materials, correlating various types of related materials, and acquainting the public with materials available.

According to a report made by Mrs. Cory in 1948 to the Educational Film Association,¹ the American Library Association recommends that a library must serve a city of at least 25,000 to 40,000 population before it could be able financially to own and maintain a film library. The report also recommends that any library regardless of size can be a center of information as to available materials and their sources and a place of assistance to community members. However, establishing and maintaining a fully adequate service is not only beyond the budget of most smaller libraries, but the use of a small collection of films soon reaches the saturation point in the smaller communities. A film collection should not be given room in the library unless the budget is so arranged to cover adequately the expenses of maintaining an up-to-date collection. Also the budget should provide for a professional staff to service the collection. Since it is difficult to achieve and maintain these standards on a small budget, the answer to film service in the smaller cities and towns is the cooperative film circuit.

A library should have as high standards for its film collection as for its book collection. The problems of selection encountered will be the same. A film library which is over balanced with out-of-date government films, shorts which are old and in poor taste, or the classroom type film is of little use to the community. Again, the attitude of a library toward accepting a film that is sponsored by an organi-
zation to promote its point of view is the same as accepting a book under similar circumstances. Most libraries do not reject books because they represent a philosophy from that held by those responsible for their selection. Therefore, the criteria can only be: is this film an honest approach to the problem, or theory, or point of view, it is presenting. No one individual should assume the full responsibility for selecting or censuring films. A group composed of representatives of various organizations or a screening committee to recommend the acceptance or rejection of films can be useful. The groups may vary with each film subject.

After selecting materials, the next question is how to help people make the best of them. The cataloging should provide for careful annotation based upon the particular needs and uses of the specific community. Surveys and studies can be made to find the needs of the community in terms of materials. Having the person or persons responsible for cataloging the films work part-time with the film borrowers is another excellent means of learning the requirements.

Workshops or demonstrations to instruct people in the techniques of using films and projection equipment correctly should be offered. These instructions should be given to not only the interested public or members of community groups, but more especially to the staff of the library. Within a system the staff should be made acquainted with the philosophy behind the organization of a film collection and then informed regularly about the addition of new materials.

Staff members should be greatly encouraged to correlate materials, both book and non-book. It is also ideal to render a service of supplying units of materials or lists to accompany films, including related books, bulletins, pamphlets, magazine articles, still pictures, posters, maps, and other illustrative aids.

Newsletters or published lists are means of acquainting the public with materials available in their community. The establishing of Film Previews or Film Forums help to bring the community into the library, but more especially to give the community an insight into the possibilities of the library. Motion pictures in the public library serve as an ideal vehicle for public relations as well as for education. They attract people who failed to realize that their library had anything to offer that would interest them. They serve many times as the first introduction to the library for a citizen who thus becomes exposed to library services through the trained library personnel. Such public relations are more subtle and effective than many forms of library publicity, and more than justify the small expense involved.
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In an effective film program, one of the most important features, in addition to good promotion and service, is the care and handling of the film. Unlike printed materials, the staff as well as the patrons of the film library must be carefully instructed in the care and value of the materials used. Specific regulations should be set up for the loaning of films to the users. This may be in the form of a time limit the film is to circulate to one user. Also directions should be given to the projectionist concerning the proper care toward the film. Many film libraries have the regulation requesting the patron not to rewind the films after using. This has become almost universally standard. Therefore, upon returning the film to the library the process of that film for the next user is somewhat simplified.

A systematic check of all films used should be the routine in all film libraries. Whether the films are checked by an electronic film checking machine or through the slower manual methods, the important thing is preventive measures that will save future film damage. Careful repairing and regular cleaning, along with lubrication will prolong the life of the films in any library.

A good training program that acquaints the library staff with the correct methods of using projection equipment and the processing of film is of primary importance. The staff in turn can impress new users with the importance of correct film handling. There are a number of films demonstrating the proper operation and care of various projectors as well as films that bring out the significant facts in the use of films. It is advisable that a small collection of such films be made available to patrons for their instruction.

Film services for children have so far played a minor role in libraries for several reasons. The majority of films produced for children have been mainly intended for classroom use, and in many areas the schools are using these films to great advantage in providing supplementary material to the classrooms. Still there are not, today, enough children's literary films to build an adequate library service for children. But with the increasing demands for motion pictures not only in the field of children's films, but also in the hundreds of related fields, the producers are beginning to realize the value in producing films of high quality.

The awareness of the public library's responsibility toward adult education has been increasing. As early as 1926 the Council of the American Library Association authorized the appointment of an Adult Education Board whose function was to promote interest in adult education and to cooperate with the national and regional or-
ganizations whose program included various phases of adult education. The field of informal education is one in which films have just begun to make themselves felt. Films have given to libraries a new medium of information that is dramatic as well as educationally sound. They have vitalized both librarians and library programs and have enabled libraries to reach farther into their communities than before. In other words, the people come to the library and the library goes to the people. Films are helping the public libraries to fulfill more completely the role in American life assigned to them by the American people.

Agencies other than the public library are responsible to the community to provide film services such as the schools, churches, universities, health organizations, business, professional, and fraternal groups all having common objectives of enlightenment and enrichment. The motion picture can be one of the important facets in the program of services these agencies offer the community. To use their film resources fully all agencies having film collections seek some means for cooperation, working together for the common interest of the community rather than combating each other for control.

Colleges and universities have frequently been more diligent in the promotion of film use in the public school than they have on their own campuses. The bulk of 16 mm films is that used by the public schools. Nevertheless, the universities are aware that a communication revolution has created a different world for the college student of today—one which calls for a revision of college teaching.

The extension divisions of American universities and colleges were responsible for questionnaires sent to a sampling of thirty colleges and universities thought to be representative throughout the United States. Of the eighteen institutions that responded their case studies document the impact of films on college teaching, and indicate that universities are also producing films for their own need.²

Thirty years ago the foreign classroom began using 16 mm silent films. Some of these films were produced in the United States, other production being confined to a few of the European countries, particularly Great Britain, Germany, and Sweden. The war brought an interruption of several years during which educational film production virtually stopped except for the United States. In the last five to ten years there has been an increase in the international production of instructional films. Private producers in England, France, Belgium, Sweden, Australia, Japan, and the United States are making a significant contribution to world education.

[180]
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The educational film is clearly allied both in function and substance to those older media of communication which have gained universal sanction as library materials. As an instrument possessing unique virtues in disseminating facts and ideas, the film's already substantial role seems destined to increase in scope and importance.
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Microfilm and Microfacsimile Publications

HUBBARD W. BALLOU and JOHN RATHER

It is indicative of the relative novelty and the fluctuating state of microcopying that most reports on the subject must begin with a description of the various types available at the time of writing. How these variant forms are listed and classified depends upon the degree of progress at the time of writing and the feature and purpose being considered. It may pay the reader to compare the following with two previous Library Trends articles.\(^1\)\(^2\)

A simplified outline of what is rapidly becoming a confusing array of micro-techniques, is as follows:

1. MICROFILM (Transparent)
   a. Ribbon (Integral)
   b. Sheet (Integral)
   c. Composite Forms (Fragmentary)

2. MICROPAPER (Opaque)
   a. Photographically Printed (Integral)
   b. Mechanically Printed (Integral)
   c. Composite Forms (Fragmentary)

Microfilm is the older form and serves also as the first stage in the production of micropaper. The image of the original appears, greatly reduced, on a transparent medium, which is usually cellulose acetate (safety film). It is read by means of an optical instrument which projects light through the film. Microfilm inherits the problems and techniques of its parent, the moving picture film.

In the case of micropaper, the original is photographically reduced on microfilm and then printed on paper. It is read by means of an optical instrument which reflects light from the paper.\(^3\) A micropaper reader can therefore be considered a miniature version of its cousin, the audio-visual opaque projector.

Mr. Ballou is Head of Photographic Services, and Mr. Rather is Associate in Library Service, Columbia University.
Ribbon microfilm is at present used in three principal widths: 16 mm (\(\frac{3}{8}\)"), 35 mm (\(\frac{1}{3}\)") and 70 mm (\(\frac{2}{3}\)""). There is some validity in regarding 16 mm "duo" filming (the images are exposed down one half of the film and then up the other half) as an unsplit 8 mm width. One also hears of a proposed width to be about twice the present 70 mm, but would the purist consider this microfilm? Fortunately for librarians, most of the film they are asked to administer is of the 35 mm variety.

In this country ribbon microfilm is usually stored on reels holding 50, 100 and sometimes 1,000 feet, the length of the original determining the length of the film. In Europe the short strip ribbon frequently is found. This is usually about 210 mm (\(1\frac{1}{4}\)") long, and includes ten pages of text and a descriptive title frame. A lengthy original may demand numerous strips.

Sheet microfilm is similar to ribbon except in shape. It is, however, often made on a heavier weight film base; and it requires a different type of camera. Besides placing the exposures in a series of tandem positions, these step-and-repeat cameras must also be able to lay down a line of frames next to the row previously exposed. The sheet, or microfiche as it is called abroad, has been developed to a greater extent in Europe than in the United States. There it is found in many sizes ranging from 75 x 125 mm (\(3\times5\)") up to 105 x 150 mm (\(4\frac{3}{4}\times5\frac{1}{4}\)"). There are even a few other non-standard sizes reported.

There have recently appeared two versions of the microsheet in this country to give challenge to the established position of the integral ribbon. As the first of these is produced by laminating short strips of ribbon, usually made on 16 mm film, onto sheets of acetate, it must be considered a composite microfilm rather than an integral sheet. This is the Frederic Luther Unitized Acetate, which carries on a process begun by the Diebold Company. These are made in the standard 3 x 5 inch and 5 x 8 inch sizes, and they are used primarily for the cumulative microfilming of hospital records. The other is the Micro-Research-Card, which is a combination microfilm and punched card. It is 5 x 8 inches of acetate which will hold from 75 to 80 pages of text and up to 208 coding holes. At present it is used for disseminating geologic research materials.

Eastman Kodak is presently developing the Minicard which is certainly fragmentary, being only 16 x 32 mm (\(\frac{1}{4}\times1\frac{1}{4}\)") in size. It is, however, an integral sheet of film made from a section of 16 mm ribbon. It will hold up to twelve frames of photographic images, filmed at a reduction ratio of sixty diameters, and about two hundred and
fifty bits of digital information. Without the photographic images it will hold 2,940 bits of information, which is about three times the capacity of the standard I.B.M. card.

The frozen nature of a hundred-foot roll of ribbon microfilm has vexed many a reader who wanted merely to look at one or two frames in the middle of the roll. The European strip film, the sheet film, the 70 mm unitized film, and the micropaper forms do not give rise to complaints on this account. For the user of 16 and 35 mm ribbon there is a way to break the chain up into its component links, which can then be rearranged. This is by use of those composite forms, the aperture and jacket cards. These come in many of the standard sizes for filing cards. The aperture card is one with a hole cut in it. This hole is framed with a band of pressure-sensitive adhesive tape (like Scotch tape), and a microfilm image can be cut out and placed in this window. There may be one aperture or more, depending on the requirements and the type of card used. If it is necessary to individualize a very short series of exposures, the jacket card is the answer. Here the strip is slid into a grooved opening in the card much as a drawer is slid into a bureau. Both of these types of cards are also available from the Filmsort Company in the marginally punched (Keysort) and electrically sorted (I.B.M.) types. Thus the condensation of microfilm is combined with the selection of the punched card.

The Microcard is the best known form of photographically printed micropaper. This 3 x 5 inch card, which includes cataloging information as well as the microtext, is really just as much a photographic print as those made over a holiday weekend with the ubiquitous kodak. It is produced by printing onto photosensitive paper from a sheet microfilm negative or from a composite negative made from ribbon microfilm. When spelled with a capital "M" the Microcard (a registered term) remains 3 x 5 inches in size and is governed by a code of standardization. One suspects, however, that the small "m" microcard will come into our language very much as has the small "p" photostat. Be that as it may, the photo-printed micropaper will not be content to remain imprisoned in the 3 x 5 inch size. It has already appeared in the Microlex card which is 6½ x 8½ inches in size and carries two hundred pages of text on each side. Another producer is considering a 5 x 7 inch card, and a reading machine is available which will handle cards up to 8½ x 14 inches. Micropaper is being taken over by government and business, and librarians are wondering if they should join the parade which was started by a librarian.

[184]
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Mechanically printed micropaper is at present represented by the Readex Microprint card alone. This 6 x 9 inch sheet is made up of one hundred pages of text reduced by microfilming and then printed with ink onto paper. As ink and paper are cheaper than silver and paper, the Microprint can be produced more cheaply in large editions, once the greater composition costs are taken care of.

For those who wish to roll their own, the micropaper outlook has been rather bleak until quite recently. Microfilm has been made by the individual scholar, especially if helped by grants-in-aid, and by small libraries for a number of years. The entrance of business into the field brought the efficient machines and techniques used today. Micropaper has so far been the product of a few commercial agencies. With the advent of the composite Microstrip and Microtape it is possible for the small institution to prepare minimum copy editions. The Microstrip is a ribbon of micropaper, either 16 or 35 mm, printed photographically, and backed with a plastic-type adhesive. When moistened, short strips can be cemented to a file card of any size. Microtape is a similar ribbon of 16 mm micropaper laminated to a double-surface pressure-sensitive tape. It does not require moistening, merely stripping off the protective layer at the back. At present these cost about twice as much as positive microfilm, but time and competition may bring them in line.

It has been pointed out that: "With relatively minor additions to provide for physical form, the rules for cataloging books can be applied to [microreproductions of printed matter]." Classifying them is not such a simple matter nor is there general agreement about the best procedure. In 1940, most writers on the subject felt that classification of microfilm was neither desirable nor necessary, yet examination of catalog cards from twelve research libraries revealed that some sort of system, however simple, was used in almost every case. This divergence between theory and practice may still be said to exist today.

The conflict arises from the opposition of a desire to exercise more than accession-number control over a growing collection of microreproductions and the apparent difficulties of organizing the material. Two factors may weigh against a decision to classify: (1) inclusion of more than one title per microfilm reel often makes even moderately close classification impossible; (2) the nature of microreproduction precludes meaningful browsing, one of the arguments in favor of shelving by classification order. Still, pressure for some sort of broad classification may be created if the availability of several reading
machines makes it possible to distribute the collection among a number of library divisions. 25

Early attempts to organize the microfilm collections at Stanford and the New York Public Library were based on a simple number arrangement. 26, 27 In contrast, the University of Chicago Library considered subject classification of microfilm essential in anticipation of vastly expanded collections. Both letters of the Library of Congress classification (used throughout the library) were used in combination with serial numbers. Decimal subdivision provided for later additions. 28

The effort to avoid classifying serials gave rise to many practical difficulties at the New York Public Library. Originally, a straight alphabetical arrangement was used for newspapers, and Cutter numbers (merely another form of alphabetizing) for all other serials. Since reels were stored ten to a box, this system necessitated a good deal of shifting and relabelling to allow interpolation of new titles and current additions. When regular microfilm cabinets were obtained, it was decided to retain the alphabetical-plus-date arrangement for newspapers, but to assign broad class marks plus a number, title-by-title, for other serials. Thus open entries and long runs could be handled by single call numbers. Book-microfilm continued with class-marks plus reel-by-reel numbers. 29

A 1947 review of microfilm cataloging at thirteen large research libraries showed that these libraries were nearly evenly divided between using some variety of accession number alone and using such a number in connection with classification letters. 30 An informal survey in 1950 seemed to indicate a trend toward broad classification. 31

The microreproduction collection at the School of Library Service Library of Columbia University offers a working example of extremely broad grouping. Six separate number series are maintained. Most monographs and all closed entry serials are arranged by accession number in the “F” series. Items to which additions must be made are in “FN”. Columbia dissertations are in an “FC” series, arranged by University Microfilms number. Short-Title Catalogue imprints are in an “FP” series. Microprint and micro-strips are in “FS” and “FR” respectively.

The Library of Congress microfilm collection provides a striking instance of successful arrangement without any classification by form or subject. The system of using two distinct series—one for closed entries, the other for open ones—proved satisfactory even though the collection grew from 9,000 to 60,000 reels. Subsequently, the collection
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was distributed among several divisions of the library, but this was more for convenience of use than due to a breakdown of the system.\footnote{32}

Although Fremont Rider had hoped to solve the problem of cataloging and storing Microcards at one stroke by filing them in the main catalog of a library,\footnote{33} practical considerations make such a plan unacceptable. Either Library of Congress or typed cards are more economical for recording Microcard holdings with necessary added and subject entries. Microcards themselves are filed in a separate catalog by author or by classification number.\footnote{34, 35} It is not clear that the latter arrangement has a special advantage since the curling of Microcards makes them difficult to thumb through. Large-size forms of microtext present no cataloging problems essentially different from those of books. Actually many microprint issues can be treated like collected sets.

Little has been written on the servicing of users of microcopy collections, but it seems clear there are two schools of thought. The more conservative contends that the user should not be permitted to handle the microfilm, thread the machine, or change reels.\footnote{32} This attitude appears to stem from the days when microfilm was less common and users frequently wrought some damage because of ignorance of the mechanics of the machines and the basic principles of microfilm care.

The opposed view is that the user should be expected to learn the operation of the machine after brief instruction. At Columbia University between one-third to one-half of the users require some briefing.

Another factor in deciding how to serve users is the location of the reading area in relation to the librarian’s desk. The more conservative system has been perpetuated at the Library of Congress because the machines are within a few feet of the librarian. In many libraries, such as that of Columbia University, the readers are in the stack area beyond direct observation by the desk attendant. Under such circumstances, reader self-service is almost obligatory.

The problems of the stability and storage of microcopies are so closely related that it is impossible to discuss one except in terms of the other. Of what value is it to purchase efficient and expensive storage cabinets for microfilm, if it turns out that this film has been improperly processed and is not of archival quality?\footnote{36} On the other hand, should all microfilm be considered as necessarily archival? Some of it can be used as a tool and then discarded when its usefulness is over. The major uses for microreproductions have been stated as: condensation, acquisition, preservation, distribution, and publication.\footnote{37} Preservation is one of this pentagon, not a necessary adjunct of the other
four. The business world is rapidly becoming aware of microfilm as a tool for everyday use. A voice of government speaks up for microfilm "as a means of increasing efficiency, which means increasing productivity". Whether microfilm is used for low reference material that must be kept for a long time or for high reference active files, it must still be stored under stable conditions.

The life expectancy of the microreproduction is dependent upon both the care of processing and the conditions under which it is stored. One is the responsibility of the agency producing the microcopy, and the other that of the curator. The producer should know whether the record is intended for short term (ten to twenty-five years), moderate term (ten to fifty years) or archival (over fifty years) storage, and regulate his processing controls with that in mind. The librarian should be aware of the dangers of careless processing and should let the producer know that he is so aware. In fairness to the producer, the curator should also have available the necessary storage conditions to keep the film for the period decided upon. He should acquaint himself with the problems that the technician must face to keep the optical quality of his film up to standard. As he is bibliographically knowledgeable and the producer is usually not so inclined, he must arrange that the necessary bibliographical controls are attended to before the filming is done. A guide prepared by librarians in terms which the technician would understand has been prepared for the filming of newspapers, books, serials, manuscripts, and maps.

Microcopies inherit the physical problems and the storage solutions of their related forms. Ribbon microfilm is kin to the movie film and the audio-visual filmstrip. Sheet microfilm is a variant of the photographic negative. Photoprinted micropaper is just another type of photographic print. Mechanically printed micropaper is merely another sheet of paper printed with ink like all the others in the library. For all of these the recommended storage climate is given as: a temperature range from 60° to 80° F., a relative humidity of 40% to 50%, and freedom from dust and acidic gases. But then, that is what is recommended for the people who spend their time in the library, too. In parts of the world where variations in excess of these norms are to be expected, one should take precautions which one's own comfort would dictate.

The greatest enemy of the microcopy is still the person who will administer it or use it, and carelessness is second nature to some. Periodic inspection and cleaning of the film will tell a good deal
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about the climatic conditions of storage, and periodic cleaning of the reading machine will prevent many annoying scratch marks. Diplomatic observation of the reader at the reading machine has saved many a film from breaking and overheating.Judicious restriction on the accessibility of the sheet microfilm and micropaper will keep misfiling, abrasion, and bending to a minimum.

Ribbon microfilm is most frequently stored on reels of thin metal or plastic kept within labelled boxes of light cardboard. These should be tight enough to keep out dust but should let in air so that the film can "breathe." In air-conditioned stacks these boxes may be kept directly on the book shelves. Where one finds extremes of relative humidity or much dust, it is advisable to use microfilm filing cases which have provision for evening out variations in humidity.

Microfilm for use is usually kept on reels of 100 or sometimes 50 foot capacity, although this is wasteful of space if the film is of shorter length. Master negative microfilms used solely for making positives are often stored on reels of 1,000 feet or greater capacity. The problems of administration have decreased the use of the shorter strips in individual pillboxes. Where these are still the practice, the filing systems developed for the miniature camera enthusiasts are often used to advantage. The 8½ inch strip uses the pocket file that it inherited from the miniature camera user also.

Sheet microfilm should be stored in protective envelopes or sleeves. These should be made of paper which is as bland as possible. The chemicals in cheap paper often have a deleterious effect upon the film emulsion. The seams should not overlap excessively or they will catch during filing. The films should be inserted with the base (non-emulsion) side towards the seam so as to protect the emulsion from the chemicals in the adhesive. Side-seamed envelopes tend to cause "fanning" of the accumulated file, but center-seamed envelopes put the seam next to the data-bearing middle of the microsheet. Cabinets for storage are very similar to those in use in all libraries for filing cards. As the aperture and jacket cards come in standard filing sizes, they involve no problem of special cabinets.

The storage of the Microcard presents a conflict. As a Microcard usually has an emulsion on one side only, it tends to develop a concave curl with time. Storage under pressure will discourage this but at the same time raise the danger of abrasion as the card is withdrawn and inserted. The Microlex card with its double surface does not develop this curl. Neither does the mechanically printed Microprint sheet. Both of these come with their own storage cases.
The composite Microstrip and Microtape have not been in use long enough to show whether they will endure frequent handling. It is suspected that if hurriedly made, they may tend to become unstuck, especially if they are carelessly filed. Time and use will show whether the adhesive of the Microtape will stand up under the heat of the reading machine. If it creeps out from behind the strip, as does the adhesive on Scotch tape, it may cause problems in close storage as well as serious difficulty while in the reader.

It is at the reading machine that the library patron usually meets the microcopy for the first time. The reaction to this optical barrier between him and the text that he desires is a subjective one. If he enjoys changing the ribbon on a typewriter or takes pleasure in threading a movie projector (and libraries do have both of these), he finds the microfilm reader a simple tool. If he get headaches in the movie theatre or from a television screen, he will complain of eyestrain after a short session with the reading machine. Not even the most enthusiastic advocate of microfilm will choose a microcopy over the original all other factors being equal; but as they never are equal, the consensus appears to be that the reading machine is a necessary evil along with eyeglasses, telephones, and automobiles.

One study of what the user wants in a reading machine seems to indicate that a machine for either microfilm or micropaper costing $100.00, or a machine for both costing $200.00 would be desirable. On the other hand, another study reports that the “favorite make of reader among libraries reporting is the Recordak.” A machine for ribbon microfilm only which is currently listed at $725.00. The dream of a practical reading machine costing no more than a portable typewriter has not yet been realized, but it looks as if it will not be long now. Portable typewriters are now pushing up over the $100.00 mark, and reading machines for both microfilm and micropaper are available for less than $200.00. When readers can be sold in quantities as great as portable typewriters, they can be sold for less.

A glance at world-wide listings of reading machines seems to indicate that for microfilm the tendency is away from the translucent screen and towards the opaque screen. This bears out the observation that eyestrain appears to be greater with the translucent screen. On the other hand, a listing of the four currently available micropaper readers shows them all with the translucent screen.

A comparison of American reading machines with those produced abroad shows a certain analogy to a similar comparison of automobiles. Americans appear to require expensive, convenient, high-power read-
The European scholar seems willing to use a cheaper, less convenient machine giving lower magnification and using lower wattage lighting. The machines produced abroad will often take both ribbon and sheet microfilm. In American readers it is usually one or the other. The recent appearance of a sheet reader that is an adaption of an earlier ribbon model would seem to indicate that if the demand were greater, the same would be available. It is probably too early to hope for a combination reader for both microfilm and micropaper. Optically and mechanically it would be possible to make, but it would have to sell at a prohibitive price if produced in quantities to satisfy present demands.

Microreproductions have certainly made a place for themselves in the library. At times it would appear that they entered the way a burglar does, by holding a drawn gun on the librarian. The invention of the continuous web machinery that allowed paper to be made from wood pulp in such quantity and of such low durability was the foot in the door. Should microcopies be asked to stay and become useful members of the household? That is up to the librarian. It has been stated: "Librarians can do much, in an individual capacity and through their professional groups, to influence the direction of improvements in microreproduction services." One direct way is by placing the problems and requirements of libraries before the National Microfilm Association, an organization made up of producers of microfilm equipment, microfilm service agencies, and microfilm users. So far the attendance at their yearly conventions has been woefully short of librarians. The microcopies made by members of the N.M.A. will eventually repose in some form of library. The librarians should have some say about their future charges.
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Pamphlets, Broadsides, Clippings, and Posters

JOHN COOK WYLLIE

The specifications for this article called for a discourse on "printed ephemera . . . as contrasted with books—emphasis on care, preservation and use." Without venturing, therefore, up the bypath of describing the limits of printed ephemera among bound books, the first task facing the next-to-last author in this series is one of stressing the obvious fact that format and long life are related only statistically. The chief problem set is the contradictory one of preserving ephemera, or, in plain English, of conferring long life on short-lived objects. "Care" and "use" are corollaries of "preservation" unless one postulates a state of inert preservation requiring only cubic footage in a clean dry place. Preservation without use would need a discourse not from a librarian but from (if anyone) an architect for a time capsule.

Furthermore, lest anyone suppose that this article attempts to report questionnaire results on "the state and progress" of its subject matter "in the libraries of the United States and abroad," it needs to be emphasized even before the fact is demonstrated that for multiple square and round holes, there is no median oval peg that will fit all of them. In this article, then, wherever there is a generalization, it is based on the practice of a few specialized American libraries. The great mass of libraries can and do adhere to one of three general practices when dealing with "ephemera." (1) Most libraries don't let it inside the building. (2) Some libraries keep some ephemera and say it isn't ephemeral. (3) A few libraries keep everything they can get.

This article is not an attempt to indict such libraries, most of which operate under the most practicable and wisest plan for their own purposes. But it is an attempt to describe something, and since (1) and (3) above need no description, and (2) would involve a description of individual library objectives, this article therefore rules out the
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statistically average library, and considers normal practice to be that of the central scatter from an aimed shotgun. It is not an attempt to define the area of the target or the "ideal." This may be bad statistics, and is certainly a mixed metaphor, but it has made possible the writing of an article on what at first appears to be an impossible subject. Definitions, then, and a few rules of thumb are in order.

Any way one looks at them, clippings are mavericks and need to be handled gingerly unless they are in process of assembly by the library itself. Clippings are never simply clippings, but are something else as well. The most common clipping collections acquired by libraries fall into the category either of pulp paper for the scrap pile or personal papers for the manuscript collection. Jefferson's newspaper clipping books of contemporary fugitive verse, for example, seem to have permanent value; those of Kilroy do not.

But between the clippings of the nonentity and of a great man there is a wide gap. Joe Doaks' clippings from contemporary newspapers about the Burr trial might have more practical use than Jefferson's clippings of fugitive verse. Of newspaper clippings since 1870, the approximate date of the introduction of wood pulp, a good rule of thumb to follow is: if the clippings are worth microfilming or mounting, they are worth saving. The logic here is inescapable if the rule is reversed, because pulp clippings that are not microfilmed or mounted are destined for oblivion anyway as soon as their use becomes heavy enough to justify their having been saved.

Other clippings obviously will belong in the picture collections, still others will occasionally belong among the maps, just as a map will occasionally become either a book or a broadside. And frequently a clipped serialized story or article from a succession of newspapers or magazines will be properly treated either as a pamphlet or a book, either in the rare book room or in the general stack. Vertical files are, of course, sometimes heavily mulched with clippings, but American librarians generally have found few special reasons to treat clippings as clippings. Logical and most useful exceptions may be called to mind: one library regularly clips obituary notices, and has in this manner built up an extraordinarily useful file of local biographies.

One average research library currently destroys without record about a third of the clipping collections accidentally acquired. This library assumes (it may be) that there is ready access through existing indexes to the clipped material in its unclipped form. The same library films, say, another third of their clipping acquisitions before destruction. And the other third is retained, mostly as personal papers.
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Broadsides, broadsheets, and posters are all of a single leaf, with exceptions in practice noted below. As far as classification is concerned, whether this single leaf is a full, half, quarter, or some other fraction of a sheet, and whether it is printed on one or two sides, has made no difference to the librarian, who makes such distinctions where needed by means of his cataloging process, with annotations of "Broadside" for items of a single page, or "2 p.,” or even “3 p.,” or “4 p.,” since librarians have sensibly not prevented themselves from unfolding a single fold, or from including, in such a case at the first text of a Faulkner speech, a several-leaf mimeographed news handout.

The descriptive word used on the collation line in cataloging, it should be pointed out, will have no necessary relation to whether the item is handled as a broadside or as a poster. The descriptive word will, in fact, probably be “broadside,” “sheet,” or “folder,” because these are the three words that come most readily to the surface in the Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress where the words are not defined. The descriptive word chosen for a catalog card, in the rare instances in which a broadside is being separately cataloged, is followed by the item's size in centimeters. With broadsides this measurement is occasionally given for both leaf size and, in parentheses, for the type-page size, so that two identical but dissimilarly trimmed broadsides will not appear to be different ones. The reason will be obvious to anyone who is curious enough to plot on a piece of typewriter paper (full and half pieces) two textually identical broadsides that would be correctly described as “28 x 21.5 (7 x 16) cm.,” and “14 x 21.5 (7 x 16) cm.” The height, of course, is always given first.

In the matter of classification, on the other hand, the distinction between broadside and poster, perhaps under other names than these, has been found useful by librarians, also for physical reasons.

Separately cataloged broadsides, when they have not been made into "books," are handled in acid-free legal-size folders (14½ x 9½ in. or 38 x 24.2 cm.), shelved in boxes (16¼ x 11½ x 3 in. or 41.5 x 29.5 x 8 cm.) A typical call number might be “Broadsides / 1826 / J456.” Fixed container sizes mean that many broadsides are folded. Posters, by arbitrary definition, are larger than the legal-size folders and cannot be folded. A poster is to a broadside, what an oversize folio is to a book and, like oversize folios, are special problems in physical location. Some posters are printed on a card-stock, where folding would be immediately destructive. A folding prohibition may, however, be exercised on a poster lithographed, for example, by Toulouse-Lautrec on
an easily foldable paper. Posters such as a Toulouse-Lautrec "Jean Avril," however, should go to the Rare Print Collection without any nonsense from the handlers of printed ephemera, who should confine their poster talents to such interesting items as the announcements of the annual undergraduate performances of "Ruddigore" or the First Jefferson Inaugural printed in 1801 on silk.

It should always be borne in mind, of course, that either a single broadside or a group of them may be converted into a book. Thus the first Royal Charter of Virginia plus a solander case is normally a book in American libraries; among groups of broadsides made into books, multiple announcements of a single private press may be offered as a real example.

The proportions of broadsides kept, cataloged, and eliminated from a collection will vary widely with special interests in a collection. One library excludes say seventy-five per cent of broadsides received, individually catalogs less than one per cent, and arranges the remainder in manageable groups catalogable by box.

No one has satisfactorily defined the word pamphlet, but everyone will agree that a multipaged, single-sheet, center-stapled or stitched non-serial is a pamphlet as long as it has a paper cover. The minute one of these gets a hard binding or a slipcase, however, it too is a book.

Multisheet, stitched or side-stapled non-serials are pamphlets as long as they have paper covers, but only up to a certain point. The American College Dictionary says "generally less than 80 pages." Nevertheless, in current library usage, a paperback of less than 80 pages is still not a pamphlet, and sometimes a paperbacked book of 160 pages is pamphlet-handled.

Pamphlets scheduled for a place in the permanent collection are treated singly, in systematic groups, or, like sardines, in the mass; that is, without cleaning or scaling. Those treated singly become books, are so cataloged and classified. The run-of-the-mine general collection pamphlets singly handled are hardbound for the purpose, either straightforwardly in the book binding routine, or through some such widely used makeshift as a Gaylord binder. Those for the Rare Book Collection may sport nothing more than an acid-free folder trimmed to a suitable size, or nothing less than a morocco case. In between are the Bailey cases, from green flap-folds for the thinnest, to snap-backs for the fattest.

Pamphlets treated as groups are subdivided, roughly by size, and to taste by subject, though a subject arrangement may be as simple
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and all-inclusive as "Miscellaneous Pamphlets." Those for the general stack are hardbound in groups of about 15 or 20 to the volume, and the volume then presents a handling problem no different in kind from a Festschrift. Libraries generally have an open-entry multivolumed set of, say, "Railroad Pamphlets," which requires only one subject card for all volumes. A single author card for each pamphlet then completes the public catalog record, and a carbon copy of the typed table of contents is kept in a loose-leaf folder at the shelf-list record, against the necessity for withdrawing author entries when a volume is lost.

Rare pamphlets group-treated are cased rather than bound, unless already bound when received, but otherwise the handling is the same, though the group divisions are likely to result from respect du fonds rather than subject matter: thus the Brock, Streeter, or Hazard pamphlets; or, indeed, the Thomason Tracts.

There are two kinds of temporary side-tracks for pamphlets in American libraries: the reference division's vertical file and the uncataloged, subject box-files. The ancient system of subject binding without main-entry cataloging has largely been abandoned because of the enormous duplications resulting. (The order of magnitude in American libraries is currently about thirty per cent.) Either one of the side-tracks between permanent retention and outer darkness places pamphlets on current controversial topics into immediate and sometimes urgent use: thus currently those on Red China, Formosa, or Segregation.

Disaster may overtake a library if it tries to adhere to an iron-clad rule designed either to retain all ephemeral material or to discard it all. While it is presumably better to operate a system that accidentally retains fifty copies of a Ford Motor Company broadcast than it is to follow a practice that accidentally sends a Tamerlane to the Salvation Army's paper salvage, there is a safe channel followed by some American libraries between the Scylla of all and the Charybdis of none, namely the collective exercise of common sense through a committee. Both the membership of this committee and its criteria for pamphlet selection will vary widely in nature with the library. The important thing in selection is for reasonable people to have clearly in mind what they want their library to be. If they want it to be a research collection on the history of railways, they will save an out-of-date railway timetable that to a small public library trying to furnish current information might be only a source of annoying misinformation.

In the following notes on a pamphlet committee, therefore, a middle
ground is adopted for descriptive purposes. The committee described supposes a library midway between the small college library and the New York Public Library, or midway between the small public library and Harvard University Library. The committee presupposed is therefore generally made up of representatives from the divisions of rare books, reference, and circulation.

Each week for 5 or 10 minutes (or more or less as occasion demands), the curator of rare books, say at his convenience on a Monday, skims through the week's take of presumably ephemeral material put aside by Acquisitions, who have already set aside any *Tamerlanes* they have noticed. Maybe the curator of rare books will take out one or a dozen pamphlets, or more likely none, from the week's wheelbarrow load.

On say Tuesday, the reference librarian or his deputy examines the once-screened lot, pulling the currently hot material for the vertical file and perhaps reinserting some now cooler items that have already served their stint. Remaining items are divided into pamphlets for the permanent collection, pamphlets for temporary subject boxes, and pamphlets for discard or exchange. Acquisitions will already have eliminated pamphlets that would certainly or probably require separate treatment and will have started them on the way to becoming books, but throughout the screening process, other pamphlets are diverted by other people to separate handling.

Then finally, say on a Wednesday, the circulation representative surveys the result. Looking over the three piles of Permanent, Temporary, and Discard, the circulation representative generally approves the bulk of the decisions and refers a small group back to Reference for reconsideration. Occasionally the librarian will be called upon to arbitrate a stubborn disagreement, but this is likely to depend more upon the weather than the pamphlets.

The discards then go to Exchange, where they get their final sorting. The separation at this point may be made by a book dealer or a staff member: in either case the basic division is into a pile for the pulp paper man, and pamphlets that may be of use to other collections.

Most libraries separate out very few pamphlets for individual sale, and these are likely in fact to have been separated out at some other point in the machinery. But most libraries do have special bulk arrangements, casual or quite formal, with other libraries, whereby, for example, all pamphlets of Virginia interest will be shipped express collect to the University of Virginia, or the Kentucky ones to the
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University of Kentucky. The kinds of arrangement depend directly on the nature of a library, but such arrangements make it possible for a library with restricted interests to see that the pulping process does not destroy a unique if relatively minor item that belongs in some other collection.

The only inescapable conclusion in all this is that to handle ephemeral material intelligently, it is necessary to have intelligent handlers—a conclusion hardly worth so much palaver. Librarians are among the few people in the world who have it constantly brought to their attention that they need to satisfy not only a single present generation of readers, but also a succession of generations with widely differing and often conflicting interests. Most librarians know that the greatest and most useful library in the world could be formed in three generations by putting into a collection the books from other libraries that have not been used for any given 20-year stretch. But while all librarians seem to know what is necessary, there are few enough who have admitted even to themselves which of the necessary things are also possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

The earlier professional literature on the subject of this article may be traced through the professional indices, notably Library Literature, and through the bibliography appended to Lester Condit's admirable A Pamphlet about Pamphlets (Chicago, 1939). The author of the present article has not, however, attempted to mine anything from this body of professional literature, since sample drillings yielded discouraging results. This is not to disparage the writings sampled: they happened to be descriptions of specific practical solutions to specific practical problems that did not readily lend themselves to the kind of generalization intended here. They were all models of their kind of writing.

Condit's own comprehensive treatment of pamphlets, however, is a horse of another color. It is so good that it would have discouraged the present writer from laboring the subject if he had discovered the Pamphlet on Pamphlets before the completion of the present article.

Works cited in the following list, heavily loaded with broadside references because these are not dealt with by Condit, are included for a variety of reasons: two are merely period pieces; the work on posters is only a concession to the present article's title and should be supplemented by reference to the article on prints in this symposium. The introductory matter in most of the works cited will, however, be of permanent value to anyone interested in the subject of the present article, and most of the catalogs listed are essential in any library seriously engaged in research. Even the following catalog list can be usefully extended by reference to Condit's Tables II and III on pages 28 and 30 of his Pamphlet.
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Managing Manuscript Collections

Neal Harlow

Manuscripts, like other library resources, create few problems until they—and their tribe of users—increase. But of all the “special” library materials, they tend to get out of hand most readily. Characteristically unique, they observe few rules and stick to no subject. If they relate to one person, they are as likely apropos to two. Their form is often irregular and fragile, their content difficult to classify and decipher, their “date” and “place” incomplete or missing, and their use hedged about with many restrictions.

Nevertheless, manuscripts may be the richest ore among a research library’s collections. They may comprise primary sources in a wide range of subject fields and offer opportunities for original investigation. Their existence may make possible the re-interpretation of studies based upon secondary evidence or the revision of conclusions reached by inferential means. Often manuscripts stand in an intimate relation to thought and action, having played a vital part in their development. When well integrated with other research materials, they comprise prime human records.

Manuscripts are generally most useful when they are concentrated in limited subject fields rather than sprinkled thinly over a wide scholarly terrain. Even when their value per unit is low, they build up to impressive documentary strength in large cohesive collections. But the existence of such wealth is no guarantee of productive use. Organizing manuscripts, providing guides and assistance in use, and making them known and freely available are indispensable preliminaries to an active research program.

Among libraries, methods of managing manuscript collections have varied widely in their details if not in their basic intent. Often policies and practices have grown up with scant reference to experience elsewhere. Similarities in procedures have resulted more from a familiarity with common problems and with standard means of dealing with printed matter than from following a general plan. More recently, in-
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fluences for standardization, such as the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Manuscripts, set up by the American Historical Association, experience in the National Archives, publications such as the American Archivist, and the preliminary Rules for Descriptive Cataloging... for Collections of Manuscripts, issued in 1954 by the Library of Congress, are doing much to promote useful conformity and an acquaintance with a variety of pertinent practice.

If, in prospecting for trends in handling manuscript materials, a pattern of management can be discerned which will improve library economy, impel librarians to get their manuscripts processed, and provide cooperative copy for a union catalog, more standardization can hardly be desired. Quite enough ingenuity will always be required to put these unique materials to research use under varying local conditions.

Some general tendencies are visible among present day manuscript depositories. Management principles which have been increasingly applied to collections of books and journals, to government publications, music, micro-copies, and even to maps, are invading the manuscript field in force. They have come both from library practice and from the methodology of the archivist, and the resulting attitudes and procedures have gradually superseded the more craft-like methods of the antiquarian and the lone practitioner. Following what is probably a generally expanding pattern in American research libraries, an interest in acquiring only those manuscripts which are of high intrinsic value in traditional periods and fields, has been expanded to take in recent materials of large bulk and low per-unit value. The presence of these huge acquisitions, and the increasing emphasis placed upon making them available for use, have brought about the adoption of processing means which are rapid as well as useful.

The influx of new material and the emphasis upon use; the tendency to treat manuscripts in groups rather than by piece; the adoption of similar record forms; the development of standard equipment; and the amalgamation of archival techniques of record description with library cataloging procedures illustrate present day trends.

By manuscripts is meant primarily recent historical manuscripts, personal and business records, and, to a lesser degree, governmental archives. Interest is centered in the general manuscript collection rather than in the strictly official archive wherein source of material and the relation of the archive to it, purpose, and use may be highly specialized. Medieval manuscripts, literary works, music, and other notably individual types are not specifically included. Although the "unit"
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will in general be the collection or “record group” rather than the item, detail in treatment may be pursued to any degree desired, and there is little reason to suppose that the approach and bibliographic forms referred to will not have general pertinence.

The plain objective of collecting and processing manuscripts is to secure and make them available for continuing research use. How they are handled will perforce depend upon their intrinsic value and quantity, the urgency of use, and such local factors as staff and administrative practices. It would be useful if a standard “I. Q.,” (using intelligence in the sense of “information”), could be formulated for rating manuscript collections (aggregate research value ÷ number of items) as a guide in processing and use. Material of high research interest per page would get highest priority treatment. Such detail as might be indulged in while handling a collection of twenty items could not ordinarily be afforded when processing as many lineal feet of papers, although some individual documents in the latter group might be more significant than those in the former. If these two collections comprise the total receipts and backlog for the current period, the library’s attitude toward them would be somewhat different than if other material is steadily coming in. When a scholar stands with one foot in the work room door, impatient to have a file placed in his hands, or if students or part-time assistants are depended upon to do some of the sorting and listing, still other influences are brought to bear. Which is only to say that conditions alter cases, and that supply and demand in relation to material, time, and use may have an effect upon procedures quite out of proportion to what they would have in a purely theoretical scheme.

Since a measure of basic processing seems essential before the use of manuscripts begins, either full treatment must be provided at the start, a hasty lick and a promise given, or the work must be carried out in progressive stages from rudimentary to advanced, depending again upon material, time, and use. The user may be kept happy with his material idling temporarily in processing step one or two, and work may meanwhile be carried on in other collections. It may be that the preliminary step is the maximum the manuscripts deserve, but if fuller treatment is intended, management must see that it is not overlooked. At the primary stage, the material has at least been accessioned, sorted and arranged, and sufficiently analyzed to provide an entry and general description in the public manuscript catalog—and union list.

It should be noted that there is a wide difference of opinion in re-
gard to the amount of guidance which should be offered to users. By some it is held that the librarian is only to provide order and sufficient clues to suggest where the scholar might search: the reader must be prepared “to dig through a peck of chaff to reach his grain of wheat. That is what constitutes research.” On the other side are those, affected particularly by trends in scientific documentation, who regard research primarily as a study of findings rather than as the exercise required by the hunt, and argue for a maximum of assistance. All direct their efforts mainly toward the competent scholar. Since in most instances libraries are unable to offer more than a minimum of description and listing, the debate over service will likely remain an academic one until cheaper or more effective methods of keying and indexing are developed.

Manuscripts, as suggested, are generally treated as collections or groups centering about a person, family, institution, or subject; separates may be given special handling or be placed in miscellaneous collections. Insofar as possible, the arrangement and inspection of a group is completed in one operation. In any event, sorting, scrutiny, and note-taking should be done with enough care to eliminate repetitive handling. However far the preparation of guides is to be carried (overlooking detailed calendars), sufficient data should be recorded at the outset, or in ordered stages, to make regular recourse to the originals unnecessary for operational purposes. This does not imply that the manuscripts will hold no further interest for the staff member, only that he must not dally with them in the guise of cataloging or he will deprive the scholar of their use.

An adequately trained individual (and subject knowledge should not be overlooked) should always make the preliminary inspection of the collection, investigating contents and observing whatever clues to arrangement and meaning may exist. He must make decisions about the permanent order and perform any acts which require special skill and knowledge. The “professional” job is to recognize and understand, create or restore order, and reveal meaning; the actual arrangement, even the making of notations, and the manufacture of records is very often carried out by others under supervision.

Except for the broad arrangement of collections according to geography, subject, or form, and the inclusion of individual manuscripts in categories provided for books, the subject classification of manuscript collections is hardly typical or practicable. Manuscripts are maintained under closed stack conditions, and their arrangement is strictly geared to administrative convenience. The system should be simple, capable of expansion, and easy to handle by informed staff members.
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In one library, collections are divided between Eastern and Western hemispheres; in another by linguistic and geographic areas, plus a few subject specializations; still another into government archives, private papers, and subject specialties; in a fourth, literary manuscripts, historical material in its special field, and all others; and a business library, which is in itself a subject collection, classifies by "industry," interestingly enough abandoning the scheme for large collections. One institution in which fairly detailed subdivisions have grown up is expecting to forego all but the broad headings and particularly to give up minute subject detail.

Within such broad categories (if any) the individual collections may be arranged in order of accession number, by title, chronological period, or by other means. One or more miscellaneous groups are usually found, to accommodate separates, a few related documents, or material acquired because of an interest in signatures, for example, instead of in content.

Arrangement within the collections themselves affects the use of the material far more directly, and organization should reveal the scope of the papers and make them most meaningful and accessible. Within large collections there may be sub-groupings by form, such as personal correspondence, business papers, diaries, speeches, etc., by subject or organizational divisions, or by period or place. Within groups of historical material a chronological arrangement is preferred, since this is the order in which they were produced; they may be sub-arranged alphabetically. For literary manuscripts, and even for some historical material, an alphabetical arrangement by name of writer may be desired; in one instance incoming letters have been so arranged, outgoing letters by date, as a useful compromise between the two possibilities. If a collection comes well bound in a different order or in some other arrangement with an adequate index, the existing scheme might be preserved. No arrangement should be disturbed without due process of examination lest a too callous treatment destroy unique contemporary relationships.

Enclosures are filed either with the accompanying documents or in their own proper places, with cross references made. Non-manuscript materials are generally segregated for convenience in handling (carefully recording the transfer), but typescripts, transcripts, facsimiles, and printed papers closely tied to manuscripts by personal or subject relationships or by agreement with donors may be incorporated. Practices in regard to photographing and destroying originals, to the preservation of samples only, and to the discarding of categories of records which are not worth preserving or for which adequate summaries are
available will only be mentioned here as existing; these represent an advanced stage in policy formation but are essential considerations in a mass collecting program. Neither will routine processing procedures be reviewed, for example, whether correspondence is first segregated by author, for indexing, then refilled by date, although the insight and effectiveness with which these are carried out will affect the program radically.

Several types of records of institutional or public utility have been devised or adopted by librarians in working with manuscripts. First, for pure convenience, it is useful to maintain a docket of information pertaining to each collection, incorporating correspondence and papers which have accumulated in relation to acquisitions, custody, and use. This “case file” may include whatever property lists have been prepared, documents recording terms of gift and restrictions, and information about donors.

A primary file, however, it may be styled, is the familiar accession record. This is the summary of official information for staff use, abstracted from numerous sources. Typed in loose leaf form it may give the customary accessions number (used jointly with a title for identification), title (often having a mnemonic value), date of receipt, source, order number, and cost. It may also include information about access and ownership status, a description of the collection in general terms or in some detail (primarily a description of content rather than of paleographic features), size and contents, information about donors and provenience, and other pertinent data. Since the accession book includes confidential information, the parts which are useful to the public should be carried over into another record or should only be suggested here and worked out in detail for general use.

The more public record is the inventory, register, or collections list. This finding aid may also be in sheet form and might include all of the information about the collections which will be essential for future processing. In whatever detail each collection is to be treated, similar categories of information should be provided for all, and it is helpful to enter it under the standard headings in this file: title and number, provenience, size of collection, indication of scope of contents, information about individual or organization which produced or collected it, any restrictions upon use, and a citation of available guides or calendars. To this may be appended a list of the material by group, series, or container, or it may be summarized by group and itemized by container if this is desired. Following this may come a list of persons, or a selection of them, with whom the manuscripts are concerned,
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perhaps giving inclusive dates of correspondence after each. A standard form of record will assist staff members in studying the material and in avoiding omissions which might otherwise occur. This record may also serve as copy for a printed guide to the institution's collections, which use should then be kept in mind. A copy of the name list might be forwarded to the donor, with an acknowledgment of gift, and much of the information will be raw data for the cataloging process.

The library's policy in regard to public service is perhaps best reflected by the manner in which the collections are represented in the public catalog. Treatment may vary from providing a single card for a collection to a "comprehensive attempt . . . to bridge the gap between the traditional calendar and ideal inventory of the archivist and the general catalog of the librarian."  

The fundamental card is the collection card, although what has been termed the "describable item" or the "catalogable unit" may be either smaller or larger than the accessioned collection. The form of main entry is familiar, being by author or title, which are often supplied in processing. To this may be added the standard items: size of collection, description, terms of use, and available guides. Notes may be added as the collection and conditions warrant: about significant correspondence, single important items, references to particular subjects, relationship to other collections, arrangement, etc. The card catalog, as a finding aid, selects from the register or inventory only those leads which seem of sufficient importance to justify inclusion by name in a general alphabetical list.

According to local need, added entries may be made for personal and corporate names, political and administrative designations, subjects (less generous than in book cataloging and more broad in scope), functions of organizational units, and types of material. They may refer to individual documents or to several items in a collection and give specific date references or inclusive dates for a group. They may appear as unit cards or as analytics, and if numerous name references are provided these may be added to abbreviated unit cards which give only the name of the collection. Sometimes chronological cards are made, as a guide to material by year or by decade. In other instances calendar cards are provided, summarizing contents; calendars as such are likely to be the object of the scholar's disdain and the librarian's despair, being a poor but expensive substitute for originals. The listing of individual names is often restricted to the register sheets, to which an index may be supplied, and most libraries which collect in the
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recent period find extravagant the making of card entries for any but the most important names and see the listing of individual pieces as almost beyond their reach.\textsuperscript{25-28}

Standard rules for form of entry, added entries, description and indication of scope, size, content, provenience, etc., are proposed in the \textit{Rules for Descriptive Cataloging \ldots for Collections of Manuscripts}.\textsuperscript{3}

Cards are generally filed in separate manuscript catalogs, either in dictionary form or in one or more files by collection, writer, archival unit, or chronology. They sometimes also appear in the general public catalog or in departmental files. Catalogs in manuscript divisions may also have union catalog functions for a university campus or may include references to pertinent resources in other institutions.

To assist in returning individual manuscripts to their proper collection, light pencilled notations may be made upon the documents themselves, usually upon the verso, including the number of the collection and sub-collection, and perhaps date, particularly if the original is difficult to decipher. Some objection is made to defacing valuable manuscripts in this way, and marking may be impracticable for material of low per-item value in large collections.

Conservation practices are similarly varied, but the minimum is to unfold and flatten all pieces and to give careful inspection and treatment if there is evidence of dampness or of insect infestation. Documents of sufficient importance are set aside for repairs when required, and of course only materials of sufficient transparency and permanence are to be used in mending. Lamination is expensive and bulky but is useful for material of prime value. Correspondence and other important documents are placed in strong paper folders (of proper chemical stability), put in manuscript containers, and shelved either horizontally or vertically, with provision to keep the sheets upright. Sometimes letters are bound, being tipped to sheets and made into volumes. Air conditioning is desirable where temperature, moisture, and air borne particles require control. Supervision of use is essential in order to maintain a balance between present and future research needs. A wide literature is available in this field.

A survey of some twenty research libraries made a decade ago\textsuperscript{29} revealed a wide variety of conditions in manuscript collections. Like isolated communities, with their own traditions, mores, and practices, these resources have developed in a variety of milieu, have broadened and developed, made sudden spurts and slow declines, experienced periods of fat and lean, and have reached their present status without much respect to age and position. With present day bibliographic
Managing Manuscript Collections

knowledge and understanding, alert and aggressive policies of acquisitions and administration, competent personnel, and cooperative programs of expansion and use, an increased trend toward the effective exploitation of manuscripts in scholarly research can be expected.
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