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Editor's Note

Hardly had the red, white, and blue euphoria of the nation's 200th birthday begun to fade before the American Library Association burst on the scene with a gala centennial conference in Chicago. Since Melvil Dewey, who had always been a mover and shaker in the library world, applied for copyright of his decimal classification in a letter to the Librarian of Congress dated March 22, 1876, that venerable and valued aid to librarians, now in its eighteenth edition, also reached the century mark this year. Another aid to catalogers, the Library of Congress printed card—as well as the division responsible for distributing cataloging data—reaches its seventy-fifth birthday in October 1976.

The Library of Congress will salute the American Library Association on September 21, when the Library of Congress Thomas Jefferson Building, long known to many readers as the Annex, is dedicated. Officers of ALA will be honored guests at the ceremony, at which Librarian of Congress Daniel J. Boorstin will pay tribute to the association. The ALA held its first meeting October 4-6, 1876, in Philadelphia with 103 members present. Today it boasts 33,560 individual and institutional members.

When the Joint Committee on the Library held hearings in 1897 on the "Condition of the Library of Congress" preparatory to the removal of the Library to its new building, both Melvil Dewey and Herbert Putnam, then librarian of the Boston Public Library, were among those who testified. Mr. Dewey, with his characteristic enthusiasm, waxed eloquent on the idea of catalog cards prepared and printed at a common source and distributed to any library that requested them. He said that the making of a satisfactory catalog costs "infinite labor and much money."

All over the world it is the thing that frightens trustees and brings out the criticism of the public, because it takes so long, and yet the ablest administrators have studied for years and beyond a certain point find it impossible to reduce either the time or cost that must be given, for a library without such catalogues is of little use. It differs from the well-organized library exactly as a well-trained army differs from a mob. Whatever it costs, it is essential, and the fact that the cost is so great only emphasizes the necessity of doing as much of this work as possible in the national collection, where the work, which is for the benefit of the entire country, can be done at the common expense of all.

Citing the number of public libraries in the country, he estimated the number of copies of each book bought by these libraries and deplored the resulting duplication of cataloging effort. Distribution
of printed catalog cards from a central source, he told the members, was a dream long held by librarians.

Mr. Putnam was a little more reserved in his evaluation, saying that he agreed with Mr. Dewey “that, in case of new publications, a national library can save money to the United States by simply employing persons to have copies made of the entries.” In a letter to the committee in which he amplified some of his testimony, he commented on the lack of uniformity in card sizes, saying that “the various sizes of these bits of cardboard” prevented “some of the most important cooperative undertakings in cataloguing.” He continued, however, to say that should centralized cataloging by the national library prove feasible and if that cataloging could be distributed on printed cards, libraries should adopt uniformity of entry as well as of size and weight of their catalog cards. Two years later Putnam became Librarian of Congress, and in 1901 he announced that LC was prepared to distribute copies of catalog cards which it was currently printing and, if they could be supplied from stock, cards printed earlier. Today the Library distributes cataloging and authority data not only on cards but also on proof-sheets, tapes, and microfiches and in books. Paul Edlund, former chief of the Cataloging Distribution Service, reviews the seventy-five-year history of this operation in “A Monster and a Miracle.”

Dewey also had a hand, although indirectly, in the establishment of the Decimal Classification Division at the Library of Congress. The first edition of his classification ran to 44 pages; the eighteenth edition, currently in use, to 2,692. The Decimal Classification Division is even now at work on the nineteenth, which is expected to be 5 to 10 percent larger and which will be published in 1979. In this issue of the Quarterly Journal John P. Comaromi, associate professor at the School of Librarianship of Western Michigan University, discusses the decimal classification and its ebullient creator. David Batty, formerly professor at the Graduate School of Library Science of McGill University in Montreal and now at the College of Library and Information Services at the University of Maryland, describes some of the conflicts and compromises encountered in the application of the Dewey system around the world, from Great Britain to Japan.
For the Library of Congress, the Bicentennial of the American Revolution cannot be limited to a single day. Materials relating to the Revolution and the winning of the nation's independence began to appear on LC publications lists as early as 1968, and one of the most ambitious undertakings, the Letters of Delegates to Congress, 1774-1789, is expected to run to approximately twenty-five volumes and to be completed in 1992. It was while working on these letters that the project editor made the discoveries that he describes in the lead article in this issue. The time of day when the delegates to the Continental Congress approved the Declaration of Independence and the temperature in Philadelphia on that July 4 are examples of historical truths discovered long after the event by tireless scholars in their endless study of records of the past. Julian Boyd, editor of The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, wrote of the contributions such scholars make in a letter to Dr. Smith:

Your discovery is an important one and adds one more proof to the growing accumulation that documentary editing can make contributions to knowledge that cannot be made by other means. This of course does not come about merely because of the assemblage of large masses of records about a man or an institution. It results from the obligation placed upon the editor to do something that a camera or a computer cannot do: to read, to understand, to probe for the context, and to make all of the necessary correlations.

Another study of the Declaration, The John Dunlap Broadsidewas published by the Library of Congress in September. It is Frederick R. Goff's report of his examination of the twenty-one extant copies of the first printing of the Declaration of Independence, which was done by John Dunlap under the eye of the author. For this study seventeen of the extant copies of the Dunlap broadside were brought together at the Library of Congress last year for the first time since they were printed. Dr. Goff later examined the other four copies, one in Philadelphia, one in Chicago, and two in London. Through his examinations, which were aided by such present-day bibliographic tools as beta radiography and the Hinman collator, Dr. Goff not only identified the printer's proof sheet but also established that there were two states of the printing and that the paper was of Dutch origin.

So much for past anniversaries. The Publications Office has completed the annual catalog of greeting cards, notepaper, and books, and the staff is looking forward to Christmas.
Philadelphia, July 4th, 1776,

GENTLEMEN,

The Congress this morning directed us to confer with the Committees of Safety and Inspection, and the Field Officers now in town, about the proper mode of collecting the militia of this province, in order to form a flying camp, to cover Pennsylvania and New-Jersey, from the attacks of the enemy, who have landed on Staten-Island, and will probably direct their march this way, if they should imagine the attempt on New-York too hazardous. Necessity obliges us to dispense with forms, and to avail ourselves of the advantage, which we may reasonably hope from your being assembled: We, therefore, most earnestly request you immediately to collect the forces of your several counties, and march them down to Brunswick, where the Congress will furnish them with provisions, and allow them Continental pay.

Men who have the safety of their country at heart, need no other incentive to the greatest exertions, than such as arise from its dangers, for which reason, we have thought it necessary barely to inform you of the fact; with this addition, that the militia of New-Jersey are already, for the most part, in New-York, so that that province will be defenceless without your timely aid.

We are Gentlemen, your most obedient humble servants,

B. Franklin; R. R. Livingston; J. Dickinson

To the Committee of Associates, at Lancaster.

GENTLEMEN,

We beg your most serious attention to the contents of the within letter, and by the desire of the Committee of Congress, signify to you our approbation thereof, and that it is our opinion only the four thousand five hundred men are meant by the Committee. It is hoped those volunteers who have engaged to serve in the flying camp, will march immediately the nearest way to Brunswick, in New-Jersey, and that regular muster-rolls will be kept by the colonels of the several battalions. As soon as a company is formed, it is expected it will march without waiting for the battalion. As there is to be a conference between the delegates of New-York, New-Jersey, and Pennsylvania; and the Committee of Safety, with this Committee, and the Field-Officers of the five Battalions of this city and the liberties, to-morrow morning, at the State-House, at seven o'clock, we will let you know the result of their consultation.

Signed by Order of the Committee,

THOMAS M'KEAN, Chairman.

Philadelphia, Committee-Chamber, July 4th, 1776:

To the Convention of Associates, of the Province of Pennsylvania, at Lancaster.
Time and Temperature: Philadelphia, July 4, 1776

by Paul H. Smith

Few historical subjects engage the attention of Americans more persistently than the Declaration of Independence, and in our Bicentennial year this enduring interest has reached an unprecedented pitch. It seems appropriate, therefore, to call attention to a few bits of new information on the subject that have been uncovered recently in the course of research undertaken by the editors while preparing documents for the Library's forthcoming edition of Letters of Delegates to Congress, 1774-1789, the first volume of which is expected off the press in a few weeks. The work contains newly available information on a wide variety of subjects. These range from the momentous to the commonplace and will be of varying degrees of interest to students of the American Revolution operating at nearly every level of expertise. Because the events of July 1776 will not be covered until volume four, scheduled for publication nearly two years from now, an important July 4 letter from the Library's collections, clarifying the issue of when the Declaration was brought to a vote and adopted, is presented in this issue of the Quarterly Journal.

Nearly all traditional accounts of the adoption of the Declaration rest heavily upon the notes of Thomas Jefferson, which have been known to the public since he published his autobiography in the 1820s. Thus, in recounting the drama of July 4, nearly all of his biographers bring the debate on the Declaration to a climax in the afternoon or evening, at which time, we are told, the document was approved after a long, hot day of wrangling over words. The justification for these accounts is clear enough—a key passage in Jefferson's notes describes the event in the following words: “The debates having taken up the greater parts of the 2d. 3d. & 4th. days of July were, in the evening of the last closed. The declaration was reported by the commee., agreed to by the house, and signed by every member present except Mr. Dickinson.”

Jefferson's notes have long puzzled many historians since it is known that the Declaration was signed, only after an engrossed copy had been prepared, on August 2. Still, most other statements contained in his notes have generally been accepted as accurate, and in the absence

A July 4, 1776, letter from a congressional committee to militiamen in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, accompanied by a letter of recommendation from the Philadelphia Committee of Safety, was printed and distributed as the broadside illustrated here. Congress appointed the committee to consider the defense of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The letter states that the committee received its direction from Congress during the morning of July 4.

Paul H. Smith is editor of Letters of Delegates to Congress, 1774-1789.
of convincing evidence to the contrary historians have avoided challenging the assumption that the Declaration was debated most of the day and approved in the afternoon or evening of the fourth.¹

That is not to say that scholars have not been uneasy about this version of the day's events, for it is clear enough that Jefferson's account does not fit easily with the evidence available in the official journal of Congress. There one reads that Congress convened at approximately 9:00 a.m., disposed of one minor matter that probably took only a few minutes, and then "resolved itself into a committee of the whole, to take into their farther consideration, the declaration." ² Subsequently the chairman of the committee reported "that the committee of the whole Congress have agreed to a Declaration," which was submitted and approved in the form it has come down to us, and appropriate steps were taken to have it printed, distributed, and "proclaimed in each of the United States, and at the head of the army."

Unfortunately for those who wish to reconcile Secretary Charles Thomson's entries in the journals with Jefferson's notes, the delegates failed to adjourn soon after making these momentous decisions. Thus we find that Congress next came to a decision on a ship employed in the Continental navy, listened to the reading of an important three-page letter from General Washington, and then appointed a committee consisting of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania delegates to confer on the defense of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Thereafter Congress instructed the Secret Committee to ship flints from Rhode Island to New York for Washington's use; authorized sending a man to Orange County, New York, to evaluate native flint stone; appointed two commissioners for Indian affairs; ordered Benjamin Franklin and James Wilson to send new instructions to the commissioners; resolved to add members to the committee for Indian affairs; empowered President Hancock to appoint another private secretary; authorized the Board of War to issue orders for stimulating the manufacture of flints in the states; approved payment for an express from Trenton; appointed a committee "to bring in a device for a seal for the United States of America"; and authorized the Secret Committee to sell some powder to North Carolina. Only then did it adjourn to nine o'clock the following morning.

The sequence of the events of July 4 recently became a matter of special interest to the editors of the Letters as they prepared notes for the letter written that day by the committee appointed to confer on the defense of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The particular significance of the document lies in the fact that the committee was appointed as the third item of business after the Declaration was approved, yet their letter begins: "Gentlemen, The Congress this morning directed us to confer. . . ." Examination of all available evidence provides no reason to doubt that the committee had indeed been appointed the morning of July 4, and since considerable time undoubtedly elapsed between adoption of the Declaration and the appointment of the committee, one is forced to the conclusion that the vote on the Declaration was probably taken sometime before 11:00 a.m.

In addition to the broadside printed here containing the committee's letter, the original draft of the letter written by committee member Robert R. Livingston of New York provides independent confirmation of the authenticity of the document and its date.³ Another July 4 delegate letter, written by Abraham Clark of New Jersey to Elias Dayton, also contains a significant passage supporting the conclusion suggested above. Clark, obviously writing early in the morning, explained Congress's recent work on the Declaration in the following terms: "...Our Congress Resolved [i.e., on July 2] to Declare the United Colonies Free and independent States. A Declaration for this Purpose, I expect, will this day pass Congress. It is nearly gone through, after which it will be Proclaimed with all the State and Solemnity circumstances will admit. It is gone so far that we must now be a free independent State, or a Conquered Country." ⁴ Clark's statement that "It is nearly gone through" is, of course, the passage that takes on special meaning in the light of the evidence found in the letter of the committee directed "this morning" to confer on the defense of New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Starting then with the journals of Congress,
and adding the evidence of both Clark's letter and Livingston's (i.e., the committee's), it seems clear enough that when the delegates convened at approximately 9:00 A.M. on July 4, very little work remained to be done on the Declaration, that it was completed in perhaps less than two hours without much additional controversy, and that Congress then proceeded to the rest of the day's work—mundane by today's standards but typical daily fare for men who had long been immersed in the details of preparing a successful defense against the great military force Britain was bringing to bear against them.

Opposed to the impressive evidence reviewed here stand only Jefferson's notes, which, having long been known to be in error on the point of the signing of the Declaration on July 4, must now also be called into question in regard to when the debate on the document came to a conclusion. Although the editors of the Letters were originally hesitant to question the accuracy of Jefferson's recollections, they became less reluctant to do so when they discovered additional questionable statements on other subjects covered in his summary of the independence debate. These are well beyond the scope of the present article but bear upon the date when Jefferson composed his account and will be explained in volume four of the Letters, where the notes will be printed in full.

At this point it is sufficient to point out that Jefferson's summary, although generally an excellent account of the independence debate in Congress, is not literally accurate in a few significant details and must be used with care when attempting to reconstruct precisely the fateful steps taken by the American delegates in Congress in the summer of 1776. For specialists interested in the matter of when Jefferson's notes were composed, the evidence of this accumulation of misstatements will argue in favor of the conclusion that, although based upon other notes made at the time of the events described, they were put in their present form several years later, and therefore that he relied upon his memory when composing significant sections of his account.

**The Weather on July 4, 1776**

Another matter bearing upon the work of the delegates early in July 1776—incidental to our understanding of Congress and far less significant than Jefferson's notes, but perhaps of no less interest to many American Revolution buffs—can also be noted here. Colorful background details have often been added to stories of the fourth of July, and of these a staple has been the weather. Hot July weather, typical of Philadelphia summers, we are frequently told, plagued the delegates as they deliberated on the Declaration. Despite heightening the drama of the occasion, however, such claims rest upon no contemporary evidence and stand simply as undocumented assertions which generally escape direct challenge because they are peripheral to the central event being described.

In contrast to this somewhat traditional rendition of the July 4 story, one occasionally finds a version suggesting that the Declaration was actually adopted on a day that was "quite comfortable," one that might even be called "relatively cool." And it is interesting to learn that the evidence for these accounts comes from the pen of the author of the Declaration himself. Jefferson, it turns out, had a passion for maintaining meteorological records, and his records for that memorable day have indeed survived the ravages of time and chance. Thus it may seem surprising that so little use has been made of Jefferson's personal record for a matter that, although minor, relates to what must be considered the most memorable day in his life. The limited interest scholars have exhibited in Jefferson's meteorological register for July is difficult to understand, but it may well be related to the fact that the temperature readings found there seem to be strikingly low, perhaps leading them to suspect that Jefferson's thermometer was not properly calibrated or that it had been placed in an unusual location, and therefore to opt for a more acceptable commonsense interpretation.

Fortunately Jefferson was not the only participant in the independence debate who left contemporary observations on Philadelphia's weather during those crucial days. On this subject we can now also consult the manuscript diary of Robert Treat Paine, delegate from Massachusetts, who almost daily made a weather observation in it, failing to do so only twice for the entire months of June and July 1776.
then, do we find in this little-used source? Confirmation of a traditionally hot fourth of July? Quite the contrary.

To place the topic in perspective, we ought to note in passing Paine's comments on Philadelphia's weather the preceding month or two, a purpose for which his diary is especially suited. Paine often punctuated his entries with a monthly summary of the weather, and his conclusion for May 1776 was that "This Month has been as Cold as N. England & very Wett." Subsequently the weather remained "cool" during the first week of June, followed by a few "fair" days until June 12, when Paine noted the first of several "hott" days. Indeed, the heat wave lasted out the month, nearly every entry containing the words "hott" or "very hott." Only on June 28 did he attempt a more specific observation, and there we find added: "Ther[mometer] 95°."

But on July 1 Philadelphians experienced a break in the weather, and Paine wrote for that day's entry: "Fine Showers. Genl. Howe's Army arrived at Sandy Hook." The new month had brought relief—and the redcoats. July 2? "Rain'd hard. Cool'd the air much." July 3? "Cool Day." July 4? "Cool. The Independence of the States Voted & Declared." According to Paine, then, the final debate on the Declaration was held during a somewhat cool spell that briefly punctuated a summer heat wave, one that apparently returned almost immediately, for his next several weather observations record hot or very hot days, although more showers and even cooler weather were briefly experienced before the month was out.

Of course it adds little to our understanding of the meaning of the Declaration of Independence to know that it was adopted in the morning of a relatively cool fourth of July. But it is salutary for Americans to know upon what evidence our beliefs rest, and more than merely useful to stop occasionally to examine the nature of those sources. As custodian of many of America's richest treasures from the past, the Library of Congress is dedicated to the preservation and presentation of this legacy, and its new edition of Letters of Delegates to Congress, 1774-1789 will soon become one of the most important and accessible sources for the serious study of the nation's origins.

NOTES

1. Actually Jefferson has traditionally been attacked not only for claiming that the Declaration was signed on July 4 but also for asserting that John Dickinson of Pennsylvania was present that day. It has long been assumed, on the authority of Thomas McKean, that Dickinson and Robert Morris, both opponents of independence, did not attend Congress on July 4, deliberately absenting themselves so that Pennsylvania's vote could be cast in favor of independence. As McKean long afterward explained: "The State of Pennsylvania on the 4th. of July (there being only five members present, Messrs. Dickinson and Morris, who had in the committee of the whole voted against Independence were absent) voted for it; three to two, Messrs. Willing and Humphries in the negative. Unanimity in the thirteen States, an all important point on so great an occasion, was thus obtained; the dissention of a single State might have produced very dangerous consequences." See Edmund C. Burnett, ed., Letters of Members of the Continental Congress, 8 vols. (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1921-36), 1:534-35.

Despite McKean's precise explanation of the behavior of the Pennsylvania delegates, there is good reason to believe that his memory failed him on this point, and that Dickinson and Morris may have actually been in Congress on July 4. It should be noted, at any rate, that Dickinson's name appears as a member of the committee whose letter is printed here and that Morris was explicitly ordered by Congress this day to inquire into a matter related to a vessel employed by the Continental navy. It is of course possible that both these actions involving the two men could have been taken in their temporary absence, but it seems more likely that McKean's account of Pennsylvania's vote on independence pertains to the vote of July 2 on Richard Henry Lee's resolution rather than the vote on the Declaration on July 4. McKean related his version of this vote twice, in 1796 and in 1813, the first account of which is known to be in error on the subject of the weather. McKean wrote "On the 4th (which was a rainy day) Messrs. Dickinson and Morris were absent," but it is clear beyond doubt that although it rained for several hours in Philadelphia on July 2, July 4 was a clear day.

If, therefore, McKean is wrong about Dickinson's presence on July 4, it would be a great irony that Jefferson's credibility was long questioned because of this particular passage from his notes, but escaped challenge on other points analyzed in this article, such as the time of day the Declaration was adopted, now believed to be in error. See particularly note 5 below.

3. Livingston’s draft, which differs only slightly from the version approved and printed by the committee, can be consulted in the Sol Feinstone Collection of the American Revolution, item 823, Library of Congress microfilm. It will be quoted in full with the text of the committee’s broadside in volume four of the Letters of Delegates to Congress, 1774-1789.


5. Specialists may be interested to know that these passages are found in Jefferson’s account of the debates that took place on June 8 and 10, and specifically in the section where he explained the arguments “urged by J. Adams, Lee, Wythe and others.” First, it seems unlikely that at this time the Delaware delegates could have “declared their constituents ready to join” in supporting independence since the decision of their assembly to do so was not reached until June 15. Second, it is questionable to assert that Delaware’s action left only the Pennsylvania and Maryland delegates “absolutely tied up” (i.e., restrained from supporting independence), because the restriction on the Pennsylvania delegates had already been lifted by their assembly on June 8, an action that then left the delegates of New York and Maryland—rather than Pennsylvania and Maryland—still “tied up.” And third, news of George III’s response to the petition of the city of London, which Jefferson explicitly states “had come to hand four days ago,” reached Philadelphia on June 2 or 3.


6. The quotations are from a comparatively recent and well-known scholarly work, Dumas Malone’s Jefferson the Virginian (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1948), p. 229, and an older, somewhat obscure, general investigation, Alexander McAdie’s “A Colonial Weather Service,” Popular Science Monthly 45 (July 1894): 334. Both rest upon the same document, a 1776 Philadelphia almanac in which Jefferson jotted down his meteorological notes while he attended Congress that summer. When McAdie consulted the volume it was still “in the possession of the family at Edge Hill, Va.,” but it was subsequently acquired by the Massachusetts Historical Society. A photostatic copy of that volume may be consulted at the Library of Congress. Jefferson apparently recopied these notes into another booklet, eventually spanning the years 1776–1820, which is now a part of the Library’s collection of Jefferson’s papers.

7. The persistence of accounts that ignore Jefferson’s data can only be laid to hastily conducted research. As long ago as 1858 one of Jefferson’s biographers printed without comment Jefferson’s “meteorological register” for July 1–4, and those entries were printed again in 1906 in the fullest study of the Declaration to date, Henry S. Randall, The Life of Thomas Jefferson, 3 vols. (New York: Derby & Jackson, 1858), 1:179n; and John H. Hazelton, The Declaration of Independence (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1906), pp. 156, 165, 168-69. In addition, Hazelton provides further information on the weather from the diary of Philadelphian Christopher Marshall, whose entries argue against the accounts portraying July 4 as a hot day. Significantly, Hazelton obtained his information on Marshall from the manuscript diary at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, rather than from William Duane, ed., Extracts from the Diary of Christopher Marshall, kept in Philadelphia and Lancaster, during the American Revolution, 1774–1781 (Albany: Joel Munsell, 1877), which omits Marshall’s observations on the weather.

8. Paine’s diary is in the basic collection of his papers at the Massachusetts Historical Society.
DEWEY ABROAD

The International Use of the Dewey

To the aspirations of librarianship in 1876, Melvil Dewey was apposite to the point of caricature. Indeed, like many men of strong character and ambition, less eager to gain personal power than to further a cause greater than themselves, Dewey's actions and declarations frequently courted ridicule—the safety valve of a public puzzled or even frightened by his ability to comprehend the smallest detail along with the broadest principle, and by his single-mindedness in wishing to argue equally about both. Only in his sense of purpose, however, could Melvil Dewey be called single-minded; in everything else he was universally minded in an age already concerned with general education, political franchise, and the brotherhood of man.

This is not the place for a detailed recital of all of Dewey's accomplishments, but in considering any one of them, it is important to remember that he saw a world waking up to a sense of the richness and true importance of knowledge, and from his college days dedicated himself to education in the very broadest sense, expressed for him most often and most particularly in librarianship. Dewey's greatest contribution may, in time, be found to be simply his boundless enthusiasm and energy in helping to identify and promote the necessary principles and institutions of his profession. And even in his best known single achievement, the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), we can see beyond a strong and simple system for organizing knowledge on the
Decimal Classification

by David Batty

shelves and in the catalogs of a single library, to the creation of a kind of universal language which would provide communication among libraries. This was indeed one of Dewey’s intentions for the scheme; it very soon earned practical application in what became the Universal Decimal Classification (UDC) and is now a part of the international system for the exchange of bibliographical information using Machine-Readable Cataloging (MARC) tapes. This international acceptance, marked by significant increases in the numbers of libraries outside the United States using DDC, has been accompanied by frequent and lively criticism of the scheme; whereas in the United States, where the authority of Melvil Dewey and his scheme has never

Title pages from the Dewey Decimal Classification in Hebrew, Spanish, Thai, Norwegian, French, and Turkish (Courtesy of Forest Press, Lake Placid Education Foundation); and from the Nippon Decimal Classification in Japanese (Courtesy of the Japan Library Association).

David Batty is a professor at the College of Library and Information Services of the University of Maryland and the author of An Introduction to the Dewey Decimal Classification and An Introduction to Colon Classification. He has been in the field of library education in England, Canada, and the United States.
seemed much in question, the use of DDC in the last twenty years has suffered a decline at times so sharp as to be called "the flight from Dewey." I should like to explore the extent to which the DDC is used outside the United States in the light of the criticism so often leveled against it in the very countries where it is most used.

After the second edition of 1885, DDC was adopted by a rapidly increasing number of libraries, as evidenced by the rate of development of the scheme; the sixth edition appeared in 1899, only fourteen years after the second. A survey by Berwick Sayers in 1910 revealed that well over half of the British libraries that were classified at that time used DDC (139 out of 232). And its adoption was not limited to English-speaking countries; by the 1890s it was being used by the French Association for the Advancement of Science, by several French revues, for special bibliographies (such as Sociologica, Philosophica, and Astronomica), by the Institute of Medical Bibliography in Paris, and in Herbert H. Field's Concilium bibliographicum, produced in Zurich.

It was this interest on the continent of Europe, particularly among the French-speaking nations, that prompted Paul Otlet to ask Melvil Dewey in 1895 if the DDC might be used by the newly founded Office international de bibliographie, later the Institut international de bibliographie (IIB) and later still the Fédération internationale de documentation (FID). The complicated and troubled negotiations that followed over the next thirty years are an object lesson in the attitude of Melvil Dewey and his staff toward DDC itself and its place in the world, and particularly toward the application of DDC outside the United States.

Otlet first suggested that DDC be used as it stood, but translated into French. Dewey did not reply, though he jotted notes of approval on Otlet's letter. Otlet's second letter mentioned the need for some changes and expansions and for translations into German and Italian as well as French; he also offered Dewey the presidency of the U.S. committee of the IIB. Dewey believed in the importance of bibliography and in internationalism and agreed to the translation of DDC; in return he was made an honorary member of IIB. But from that point on there was little harmony between DDC and IIB. Dewey himself had already declared his intention to prevent librarians from printing unauthorized modifications of DDC, if necessary by prosecuting them under the copyright laws. Otlet had already indicated the need for the development of physical geography, the need for expansion and correction in European countries, and the need to indicate subjects with two aspects. Otlet also proposed new notational devices to be used in a special bibliographical edition to be published by IIB, and even went so far as to suggest that DDC hold back new editions until the relationship between the two schemes could be clarified. On the grounds that these notational devices were for the bibliographical expansion, Dewey not only approved but even included a description on them in the preface to the seventh edition of DDC. But the Classification décimale (CD), from its first publication in 1907, sought more and more changes and expansions. In 1923 Otlet and Godfrey Dewey, who was as internationalist as his father, suggested a three-level structure: abridged DDC, full DDC, and the bibliographic UDC. But the editorial office, mostly in the person of Dorkas Fellows, could not easily stomach the proposals. Miss Fellows's devotion to Melvil Dewey, and even more to his original design of DDC, inhibited fruitful discussion. Partly because of the work involved in bringing out DDC 12 in 1927 and partly because of an aversion to any modification of the scheme, she delayed negotiation so long that IIB was forced to bring out its independently revised scheme as the four-volume Classification décimale universelle (CDU). In 1930 the DDC office was delighted to learn of a request to translate DDC into German, but nothing came of the suggestion. And then in 1933 the British Society for International Bibliography sought approval from DDC to translate the CD into English. Up to this point a language boundary existed since there was no French translation of DDC, and it was still natural to acknowledge the DDC office as the authority for decimal classification; but now there were to be two decimal classifications in the same language.

There were few other episodes in the involvement of DDC abroad as long or complex as this one, but it is not atypical. DDC was intended by Dewey to be used in all libraries (and Dewey himself was an in-

William Charles Berwick Sayers, an English librarian who was involved with the study and use of classification systems in Great Britain. Courtesy of the Library Association.
ternationalist who was proud of IIB's request to use DDC; the scheme was sound enough in its general outline to make it satisfactory for users in other countries; the scheme lacked detail in certain areas, and it suffered from imbalance in others, at least from the point of view of its intending foreign users; the intending users thus proposed necessary expansions and revisions; and the DDC office regarded all such proposals with extreme suspicion.

That the IIB broke off relations with DDC and developed UDC independently was certainly partly due to the recalcitrance of the DDC office at the time, but it was also due to the need of the IIB to develop a scheme for bibliographic control. At the time DDC did not look far beyond the classification of books or even (despite Melvil Dewey's original intentions) much beyond shelf classification. The DDC office staff, for all their fierce partisanship and loyalty, never seemed to realize the very real popularity and acceptance of the scheme. Even Melvil Dewey himself often spoke as a devoted parent, ever ambitious for a talented child, forgetting that the child actually has played at Carnegie Hall. The only other episode similar to the passage with IIB involved the British National Bibliography (BNB) during the 1960s and produced somewhat happier results.

During the 1920s and 1930s libraries all over the world began to adopt DDC, mainly in the English-speaking countries or countries where English was the second major language. In 1931 Melvil Dewey claimed that DDC had been "carried to 14,000 users in 20 nations." In 1964 Sarah Vann estimated that it was used in 100 countries, including Afghanistan, Argentina, Ceylon, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, India, Iran, Israel, Japan, Liberia, Mexico, the Philippines, Poland, Thailand, and Zambia, as well as in present and former British Commonwealth nations, such as Australia, Canada, England, India, New Zealand, and Pakistan. Especially in the last category of countries, DDC is the major scheme in use, not only in public libraries, where even its critics would expect to see it, but also in academic libraries.

DDC is the organizing principle for the bibliographies of several nations: Australia, Britain, Canada, Ceylon, India, South Africa, and Turkey. It is also used in the Greek Bibliography compiled within the Ministry to the Prime Minister's Office, General Direction of Press, Research and Cultural Relations Division, Greece; in the Monthly List of Chinese Books of Taiwan's National Central Library; and in the Fichero bibliografico hispano-americano published by the Bowker Company as a record of Spanish-language books published in the Americas. Translations exist, of full or of abridged editions, in Afrikaans, Arabic, French, Hebrew, Indonesian, Korean, Malay, Sinhala, Spanish, Thai, Turkish, and Vietnamese. In addition, there are major adaptations like the Korean Decimal Classification and the Nippon Decimal Classification.

This recital of the worldwide interest in DDC supports the first of the general conclusions drawn from the IIB experience. In countries like Britain, Australia, and New Zealand there is no doubt whatever of DDC's popularity. Keith Davison's report on a survey of over 1,100 British libraries in 1964 showed that of 717 responding libraries, 542 (75.6 percent) used DDC. The major group of users was public libraries; of 383 public libraries responding, 369 used DDC (94.25 percent). But college libraries were also a major group; of 173 college libraries, 117 used DDC (67.63 percent). University and special libraries provided much lower figures, although the number of special libraries using UDC was high: 57 out of 89 responding (64.04 percent). The more recent survey by Russell Sweeney on behalf of BNB has confirmed the pattern and revealed a few changes. Out of 940 responding libraries (a 92.52 percent return of the 1,016 libraries polled), 744 use DDC (79.14 percent). The public library group shows an even greater use than before; 441 out of 447 libraries responding (98.65 percent), an increase explained by the reclassification into DDC of those collections previously organized by schemes like the Cheltenham Classification of E. S. Fegan and M. Cant or the Subject Classification of James Duff Brown. The college library group shows an increase; now 265 of 311 responding libraries use DDC (85.2 percent). This increase has not been explained, but it may represent a "flight from Bliss" in some colleges, or more likely a reclassification from UDC, as is the case in two university libraries, Bradford and City University, London, in order to make better use of MARC data. The impact of BNB and UK/MARC will be discussed below.

A similar use in Australia is revealed by a survey in 1972 of 112 libraries. Of the ninety-eight responding libraries, eighty-seven used DDC (87.77 percent). All public libraries and all state catalog-
ing agencies for schools used DDC; of sixteen university libraries, thirteen used DDC (81.25 percent), though two were reported to be contemplating reclassification by the Library of Congress classification (LC); and of eight college libraries, six used DDC in various editions, and one used UDC.

A study of 247 New Zealand libraries in 1973 showed that here too all public libraries use DDC, but the proportion of all libraries using DDC was much less (54.51 percent). Further examination of the survey results suggests that there are many more special libraries in New Zealand using special schemes, e.g., the National Library of Medicine Classification (nine libraries), the Oxford decimal classification for forestry (four libraries), the Construction Industries/Samarbetskomitén für Byggnadsfrågor, CI/SfB (three libraries), and nearly a score of libraries with a special classification scheme not used elsewhere in New Zealand. As in Britain and Australia, a high proportion of college libraries use DDC (52.94 percent) or UDC (29.41 percent); and somewhat unexpectedly, the representation of government libraries is similar (52.31 percent and 41.54 percent for DDC and UDC, respectively).

All of the surveys referred to show details of which editions are used. In Britain and New Zealand, although DDC 16 is still the most used edition, the balance has already shifted away from DDC 17 in favor of DDC 18, and the indication is that DDC 18 will overtake DDC 16 shortly. The Australian survey was conducted too early for any but two libraries to state that they had even begun reclassification by DDC 18. The abridged editions of DDC are used for school libraries.

Although detailed figures are not available, the popularity of DDC in other countries seems similar to the picture given above. India’s use of DDC began long ago with the work of Asa Don Dickinson and continues to this day:

So far as our country is concerned the larger libraries have now been adopting the D.C. in general and the scientific libraries have been in favour of U.D.C. This is striking testimony in view of the existence of S. R. Ranganathan’s Colon Classification, a much more modern and flexible scheme, with specific details on Indian philosophy, religion, geography, history, and fine arts. However:

Within the country, curiously enough no[t] much interest is evinced perhaps because of the indifferent scientific aptitude of most of the librarians of our country who prefer to follow the more easy and commonly accepted scheme such as the D.C.

This is not an isolated comment:

The Colon Classification provides adequately for these needs of India, but it has been rejected by many libraries in India, because of its complex nature, unwieldy structure, and complicated scheme of long numbers. The Dewey Decimal Classification is the scheme most widely used in India because of its simplicity. . .

Pakistan reports that all five responding university libraries of ten polled used DDC, albeit with modification; and elsewhere the same confident acceptance is expressed.

African librarians are less ready to accept the applicability of DDC (or any other scheme) to Africana, but even after several pages of severe criticism, E. O. Oddoye of the Ghana Library Board recommended DDC for its systematic nature, its constant revision, its synthetic devices, its hospitality to new subjects, its alternative placings for literature, geography, and history, and its internationalism.

However, just as Otlet and the IIB very early expressed unhappiness with a lack of detail in some areas, and an overly American orientation, so also have many criticisms been directed at DDC from abroad about specific inapplicability in special areas. Not too surprisingly, these concern the classes that have to do with religion, and sometimes philosophy (200), language (400), literature (800), and geography and history (900). The most obvious and frequent concern is for greater detail and more appropriate organization in geography and history. Local proposals have been made in the last decade for revisions in this class for Australia, New Zealand, India, Africa, and Britain. Sometimes these are the contribution of an individual, as in the case of S. K. Mookerjee for Indian subjects, though Mookerjee’s revision ranges far beyond geography and history; sometimes they are the contribution of a national library association, as in the case of the New Zealand revisions; and sometimes they originate in a national bibliographic agency, as with Ross Trotter’s recent revision of the area tables for Great Britain on behalf of the Dewey Decimal Classification Subcommittee of the Library Association.

Most of these revisions are adopted in their own areas, whether or not they are incorporated into
DDC or even are given some authority by DDC—and usually they are not. The revision of the area tables for Great Britain is a rare case of DDC inviting an external contribution, though possibly also a hopeful sign for the future. The reluctance of DDC to include local revisions is understandable. Relative to an IIB suggestion, Dorkas Fellows had objected in 1928 that

Japan looks z tho cyclone hd struck it: begins w Nippon (probabli bc largest island) then goes south, then north, then south again.26

The compelling and obvious reasons in New Zealand to have a specific number for the Coromandel peninsula may not be quite as strong in Washington, D.C., or Albany, and local views on collocation may not fit the global view of the Decimal Classification Division. The New Zealand proposal of 1963 differed little from the 993.1 class of DDC (later—931 of the area tables), concentrating mainly on some rationalization and extension of the available notation and on very full scope notes to ascertain the location of specific places. Some proposed revisions are more radical. Meena Krishnaswami has suggested exchanging the notational areas normally allocated to the United States and the local region, on the grounds that in the local region the proportion of material will be reversed. He would therefore have 973–979 for India and 954 for the United States. The logic is politically satisfying, but the dislocation in the scheme is forbidding, involving not mere translation of term and notation from one main class to another, but a complete reorganization and reallocation of notation.

Complete revision of the area tables for Britain was necessary after the reorganization of local county boundaries. In this case the DDC staff themselves asked BNB to suggest revisions, and the result has not only brought DDC up to date with the new divisions of Britain but has also allowed the correction of some anomalies long embedded in the scheme, not least of all the confusion of Great Britain with England at 42. Even this final admission of reality has met with criticism from some of the professional community who would deny the political fact for the sake of notational consistency in their catalogs.22

Literature, language, and religion are also favorites for local revisions. The most frequent complaint about literature and language is the lack of detail. Oddoye simply comments that the divisions of African literature reflect the insufficient provision for African languages in 460; Krishnaswami recommends redressing the balance by using all of 800 for Indian literature, leaving English literature at 820 to include American literature, and transferring all other literatures to 890—revision with a vengeance! But Oddoye reveals a more serious problem, one never satisfactorily resolved in DDC and common in applications abroad because of the prevalence of DDC in countries where English is a major second language. Literature by native authors written in or translated into English may be placed either with English or with the native literature—echoes of William Beckford or Samuel Beckett. This is more a problem of classification theory, and specific decisions will have to be made for cases like this one no matter how the classification scheme is organized.

Religion presents a more serious difficulty for local librarians. DDC has always been markedly Anglo-Saxon Protestant, an orientation that IIB commented on and tried to correct, though the IIB recommendations had something of the counter-reformation about them. Even Protestant Christianity suffers in DDC. In their confident assumption of its universality, Melvil Dewey and May Seymour could assign what they saw as minor religions, like Judaism, Buddhism, and Islam, to single numbers in 290, but they neglected to give Christianity a unique notation. It is not only the lack of detail, however, which embarrasses local needs; Oddoye's revisions of 298 and 299 refer to K. O. Dike's comments that while African religions have been regarded in the past as primitive fetishism, they have been largely misunderstood and are "more subtle and complex in their answers to human problems than the so-called major religions of the world."23 Fundamental concepts can be very different in non-Christian religions, and the provision of complete alternative schedules has often seemed to be the only answer.

Like the majority of suggestions for local revision of geography and history, proposals for new or alternative schedules for African or Indian language, literature, religion, or philosophy remain proposals for local adoption. Mookerjee's extensive revision of philosophy, religion, language and literature, music,
and history has been used in many Indian research institutes and urban libraries, including the Bengal Literary Society and the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture in Calcutta. Once more, as in the IIB episode, local need prevails; DDC may be the major scheme in use, but too little or too late adaptation or approval by the DDC editors is met with a fait accompli.

The IIB not only made the first major revision of and break with DDC, it also learned from the experience. UDC is maintained and developed with the help and knowledge of its users. National and international committees submit problems, complaints, and suggestions for revision to the FID Secretariat in The Hague, which in turn issues them through the Central Classification Committee in the form of notes for proposed revision. Opportunity is thus afforded all users to scrutinize and even further amend all developments. This version is more likely to be acceptable to users than one developed by a single office on the basis of a single collection, however large. Dorkas Fellows herself, at the time of the IIB episode, exclaimed to one of her critics:

It is a comparatively easy matter to take the books which a single library contains on a subject and work out a classification which will fit those books. It is quite another matter to take the subject in its broad relations and lay out a scheme which will be even reasonably satisfactory for the use of public, university and special libraries, and not only in a special locality but all over the world. . . .

Recent editors of DDC have complained of a lack of feedback on what they present to their users, but it must be admitted that the evidence for foreign needs has been fairly ample. At least a part of DDC's difficulty has been its inability to consider major revisions except as worked out by the editorial staff. British librarians have had the most to say over the years, but it was well known that the then Dewey Decimal Classification Revision Subcommittee of the Library Association had almost no effect on the design of DDC 16. Perhaps this occurred because of their promulgation of the principles of faceted classification which were proposed by Ranganathan, developed in England by the Classification Research Group, and largely unacceptable to American librarians. After a break, a reconstituted committee did establish friendlier relations with DDC and the Forest Press, and recent editions have benefited from an exchange of views.

The British experience merits separate treatment, partly because it has been fuller than that of others, and partly because it may well point the way to the future.

British libraries began to use DDC early in its history. By 1911 well over half of Britain's classified libraries were classified by DDC. The movement in England toward open-access libraries promoted the classified catalog rather than the dictionary catalog and thus further supported DDC as a systematic scheme whose notation was expressive of the hierarchies of subjects in a simple way. The use of DDC 14 by the BNB from its foundation in 1949 confirmed the popularity of a classified catalog, and especially one that used DDC.

But like the IIB, the BNB began to find DDC inadequate for use in a national bibliography. Using the principles of faceted classification which ironically had their origin in the synthetic devices of the Classification décimale, BNB began to modify DDC. It established, revised, and enlarged general subdivisions for form, time, and place; extensions to add detail to subject classes; and signs of relation. A lowercase letter notation was used to distinguish the BNB Supplementary Schedules from original DDC, and a retranslation table was included in the publication for librarians to translate BNB's extended numbers to pure DDC notations. As always, the progression toward division was an acknowledgment of the value of DDC and the need for greater detail in some classes and improving the order in others. This time, however, the need to improve order was based not on parochial understanding of a subject area but on a belief in the utility of a philosophy of classification. Inevitably, the BNB staff and the Classification Research Group worked hand in hand—indeed, they were often the same people. By 1960 BNB was exerting pressure on the DDC staff to base DDC more firmly on faceted principles, and DDC was expressing the fear that such a theoretical base might not always be consistent with Dewey's original "practical usefulness." The DCC staff was also apprehensive that in BNB there was potentially another IIB; if no accommodation could be found, BNB might in its turn break away with an independent decimal classification.

However serious that danger might have been before 1967, at least it was lessened by the MARC I pilot project; the prospect of international biblio-
graphical exchange made both BNB and the Library of Congress eager for compatibility. The editor and the executive director of Forest Press visited England in 1969 to talk to both BNB and the newly reconstituted Dewey Decimal Classification Subcommittee (the sensitive word “revision” had wisely been dropped); the then head of research and development at BNB worked for compatibility of the bibliographic record formats; the chairman of the Dewey Decimal Classification Subcommittee, who also happened to be assistant editor of the BNB, was invited to join DDC's Editorial Policy Committee; and working staff members were exchanged between BNB and the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress. Against this groundswell of international amity, DDC began to introduce both principles and some details worked out in England, particularly in BNB, and BNB accepted pure DDC 18 numbers as replacements for its own modifications. DDC 17 had already shown some changes of this kind, rather awkwardly in places, but DDC 18 was an altogether improved scheme. This is not to say that BNB's influence is the only or even the major one; the Decimal Classification Division is still the major force by far, but the exchange of ideas with a major DDC user in a country where classification is the oxygen of the professional atmosphere has had undeniable benefits.

The advent of MARC and the beginnings of real international cooperation in bibliographic services must inevitably emphasize those problems likely to arise in the use of DDC, or any other standard code, in libraries abroad. Widespread and easy access to MARC data encourages its acceptance by libraries that previously would have cataloged locally; those libraries will be forced to accept centralized decisions and practice unless they wish to incur the extra cost and effort of local changes. The BNB revision of the area tables for Britain is a firm indication of DDC's present willingness to respond to just the problem that was apparent in the IIB episode and was exemplified in almost every later discussion of DDC outside the United States: the need for local expertise to advise or work on expansion and revision for local demand. Indeed, DDC has taken a further and bolder step by inviting Russell Sweeney of the Leeds Library School in England to work on a revision of 780 (music) under the guidance of the British committee.

Such a tendency can only be to the benefit of DDC. Melvil Dewey himself was very conscious of the publication figures of DDC as an index of its effective use in libraries. J. C. Downing has pointed out that with 35 percent of sales now going to countries outside the United States and 26 percent to an area considered to be subject to British influence, DDC would do well to remove too strong a North American impression and to cooperate actively with national bibliographic agencies. Britain, Canada, and Australia are already actively involved with DDC as part of the MARC system, and it is likely that Germany and France will follow suit, especially as there is now, at last, a French translation of DDC.

Whatever the feelings of the editorial office in the early days of DDC, the scheme has been accepted internationally from the beginning; even Melvil Dewey himself did not always seem to have realized just how much or how readily. Also, despite editorial sensitivity, adaptations and extensions have rarely harmed DDC and have sometimes been beneficial. The suspicion with which early and even recent editors have viewed the principles and practice of synthetic classification sit oddly with Dewey's own fundamental pattern in DDC of assembling entities and the problems or operations involving them—sometimes by "precoordination," but at other times in an openly synthetic manner. Perhaps the scar tissue of the IIB episode reduced flexibility. Yet DDC is a robust and widely traveled scheme. It has shown a remarkable capacity to survive and adapt, particularly in foreign climes. If it has suffered, it is from too single a view at the center, in one office in one library. The international exchange of machine-readable bibliographic information should provide exactly the setting for DDC to thrive, since it emphasizes some fundamental characteristics which Dewey gave his creation: simplicity of use, the capacity for articulation, and the reflection of a conviction that not all the world is contained in one library.
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KNOWLEDGE ORGANIZED IS KNOWLEDGE KEPT

*The Dewey Decimal Classification, 1873-1976*

by John P. Comaromi

Unencumbered by much experience, Melville Louis Kossuth Dewey set out at twenty-one to arrive at the best means for organizing and conducting the business of a library. In the early 1870s the primary, indeed almost the only, approach to the materials in a library was through its catalog. Library collections were usually closed, and if students or faculty members, unassisted by advice from the knowledgeable, wished to find a work upon a subject, they had to consult the catalog, which was normally in the alphabetico-classed style. The call number would be listed at the main entry for a work and it usually consisted of one or more letters and numerals signaling the field of study and the location of the item. For instance, *On the Origin of Species* might have been marked *J*429, where *J* indicated biology, 4 the fourth tier in the alcove, 2 the second shelf, and 9 the ninth book. When a library moved or grew beyond its physical limits, the collection often required renumbering. The terms used in the alphabetico-classed portion of the catalog did not change, of course, but the location marks did. Consequently, the printed catalog had to be redone, or many catalog cards had to be renumbered.

Dewey set his mind to the task of determining a less wasteful practice by asking himself, What would be the most efficient means for arranging the collection? Is there a way to number books so that when a collection grows beyond its bounds the locational notation on the work and on its surrogate (the catalog entry) will not have to be changed? At the same time he was searching for a method for arranging the classified catalog. A string of words,

John P. Comaromi is an associate professor at the School of Librarianship of Western Michigan University, the author of *The Eighteen Editions of the Dewey Decimal Classification*, and chairman of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee.
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each element subordinate to the previous one, could be used to designate the content of each work, much like the structure of the subject headings used by the Library of Congress. But such a method had serious defects, and so Dewey was seeking a better way here also.

While at compulsory Sunday service, as he pondered what that better way might be, it struck him:

For months I dreamed night and day that there must be somewhere a satisfactory solution. In the future were thousands of libraries, most of them in charge of those with little skill or training. The first essential of the solution must be the greatest possible simplicity. The proverb said “simple as a, b, c,” but still simpler than that was 1, 2, 3. After months of study, one Sunday during a long sermon by Pres. Stearns, while my mind was absorbed in the vital problem, the solution flashed over me so that I leaped in my seat and came very near shouting “Eureka!”

It was to get the absolute simplicity by using the simplest known symbols, the arabic numerals as decimals, with the ordinary significance of nought, to number a classification of all human knowledge in print; this supplemented by the next simplest known symbols, a, b, c, indexing all heads of the tables, so that it would be easier to use a classification with 1000 heads so keyed than to use the ordinary 30 or 40 heads which one had to study carefully before using.

Perhaps it happened that way, but events are richer in the remembering than in their occurrence; consequently, one must regard recollection with circumspection, especially when it recounts an event a half century distant. There was, for instance, no mention of an index in the early sources, though he probably thought of one not too long after the decimal conception.

Having conceived his notation and the means of subdivision, on May 8, 1873, Dewey submitted to the Library Committee of Amherst College his plan for arranging the library’s collection and its catalog.

LIBRARY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Select the main classes, not to exceed nine and represent each class by one of the nine significant figures (ten digits). Subdivide each of these main heads into not more than nine subordinate classes, and represent each subclass by a digit in the first, or ten’s, decimal place. Subclassify each, or any, of these eighty one (hundred) classes, into not more than nine subclasses; and assign to each, one of the digits in the second decimal place. Thus the subclasses may be increased in any part of the library without limit; each additional decimal place increasing the minuteness of classification ten-fold. Arrange the classes numerically; (omitting the decimal point but arranging as if it were written after the first figure) and the books of each class alphabetically by authors under that class—the books standing in the same order on the shelves as the titles of the same in the catalogue. Enter in each volume in place of the number of the shelf as usually entered, its class number as far as assigned. For convenience of runners, enter, in the usual place of “number on shelf,” the authors name (if anonymous the letters or words as in the catalogue) spelt as it should be in the catalogue. Readers will call for books thus located by their “class number” (instead of “shell”) and author’s name as printed in the catalogue (instead of “number on shelf”). When the number of volumes in any alphabet increase enough to warrant, select from it all of a like character and give them a place together (alphabetically of course) e.g., If the class were 47 (see top page) add to each volume selected for the new subclass a digit making the class number 4.71. The next subclass picked out would be 4.72 thus allowing ten new subclasses instead of the original class 4.7. Books of a general character, embracing more than one topic or subject would remain in the general class e.g. A Dictionary of Science would receive no subclassification but remain simply

with main class number. If it were a work treating of the subject 4.7 generally; not limited to any of its subclasses it would take 4.7 only as its alphabet number. Large sets, pub doc serials, periodicals, etc should be given a distinct no for each set, then the alphabet word may be omitted & simply the class no & vol. attached to each book. Of course the subdivision of the class should be carried far enough to entitle the set to a distinct number. The cipher has its regular zero power i.e., indicates no classification e.g., 0 would be the class no of a general cyclopedia which covers all the nine classes. 470 would indicate that the work embraced several or all of the subheads 471.2 & hence 0 indicates no further classification.

It is desirable to fill out the scheme fully when an additional class is made since there would be danger of confusion if only 471 (e.g.) were chosen without knowing what 472.3, etc. were to be. If convenient nine subheads will be desirable because of symmetry—but the system is not at all affected if only a part of the nine figures are employed, e.g. if seven classes were made, 478 & 479 would not appear in the scheme.

The plan was accepted. Dewey was to produce 50 copies of his scheme for editorial proofs, 150 for use by students and faculty.
Before proceeding with the development of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), let us first examine the question that scholars have raised regarding the source of Dewey’s idea of numbering a scheme of knowledge with arabic numerals used decimally. Dewey himself acknowledged that:

In his varied reading, correspondence, and conversation on the subject, the author doubtless received suggestions and gained ideas which it is now impossible for him to acknowledge. Perhaps the most fruitful source of ideas was the Nuovo Sistema de Catalogo Bibliografico Generale of Natale Battezzati of Milan. Certainly he is indebted to this system adopted by the Italian publishers in 1871, though he has copied nothing from it.

The passage is remarkable. The first sentence is reasonable; the second and third are not. Moreover, they are downright misleading. How can one be certainly influenced by a system adopted by a group, but only perhaps influenced by the system itself before the group adopted it? And “perhaps” means perhaps not as well. Nor did Dewey say what he was indebted for. Have the times made me more cynical or paranoid than nature intended? Perhaps. Be that as it may, I have examined Natale Battezzati’s Sistema and the system adopted by the Italian publishers in 1871 and found nothing suggesting Dewey’s decimal idea. I conclude that Dewey was probably not indebted for anything related to the DDC, which is not to say that he was not indebted to Battezzati.

Battezzati’s main classes, which were pure Jacques Charles Brunet, were indicated by roman numerals and his subclasses by arabic numerals used serially. Superscript lowercase letters were used for further subdivision, apparently. For instance, V11* represented the first section of bibliography, which was the eleventh category of history, which was the fifth class. It is conceivable that Dewey drew from here the idea of numbering classes by arabic numerals, but that would require assuming that he had not seen such a practice before. This is unlikely; for he was in the midst of a thorough study of library practice, and as locational notation was one practice that he had studied, numerals used to indicate the contents of books was a practice with which he would have been familiar.

What Dewey did draw from Battezzati was the idea of title slips, the first instance in America of cataloging in publication. Battezzati had suggested that several index cards accompany a work to the bookseller’s shop. The cards were to be used in the shop’s stock control, in author and title catalogs, and in the subject catalog, the latter being a sort of Subject Guide to Books in Print on color-coded cards. The colors appear to have been chosen for their associations: white for theology, yellow for law, green for sciences and arts, red for belles lettres, and blue for history. The most likely role that Battezzati played with regard to the DDC was that of a red herring.

Immediately after his misleading acknowledgment to Battezzati, Dewey wrote the following:

The plan of the St. Louis School Library, and that of the Apprentices’ Library of New York, which in some respects resemble his own, were not seen till all the essential features were decided upon, though not given to the public.

We will probably never be certain upon this point, but I suspect that Dewey did draw upon the notation of William T. Harris’s scheme, or Jacob Schwartz’s, or both, despite what he acknowledged. The two ideas that Dewey brought together in his conception—the use of arabic numerals for class marks and the use of decimal division to achieve subordination—had been used before him, by Harris in the first instance, by Schwartz in the second. Harris—whose classification, which formed the structure of Dewey, will be discussed below—used arabic numerals to indicate his classes. He described his notation thus:

Instead of the inconvenient method of marking the classification of books by indicating all the grades (e.g. Hygiene=Sci. X. 5. d), it is better to have the classes numbered from 1 to 100, so as to have only two figures for most classes, and to add letters for subclasses as they arise. In this way the general numbering need not change, although new subclasses may be made frequently. The books on the shelves should be alphabetically arranged within the subclasses (e.g. those of Hygiene numbered “57.d” should be alphabetically arranged) according to the name of the chief author (i.e. the most distinguished name, when there are several authors’ or editors’ names in the title). This name and the subclass number should be written plainly on the book-label, so that the dullest library-boy can put any book into its exact place on the shelves, or find it instantly when he has obtained its classification from the catalogue. This system of numbering is one of the most practical and valuable features of the system here described.

Harris’s notation was not hierarchical. For instance, 79 was history, 93 British history; nor was he using decimal subdivision. Nevertheless, Dewey used both arabic numerals for classes and alphabetical arrangement within a class by means of indicating in
full the surname of the author. And the tone, style, and some of the substance of Dewey’s proposal are echoes of those same characteristics in Harris’s description.

I assume that Dewey knew of Schwartz’s use of arabic numerals to indicate subordination within a class. If he did, surely here was the most fruitful source of his idea. Schwartz believed that his method inspired Dewey’s idea, as we shall see a decade hence when he raked the DDC with critical broadsides. Schwartz used letters to indicate his main classes, arabic numerals to indicate the first level of subdivision, then several arabic numerals to indicate a further subdivision and the alphabetical position of the author’s surname. Class M, medicine, was subdivided in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBCLASSES</th>
<th>DIVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 General Works</td>
<td>A History B Genl. Works C Encyclo. D Phil. of Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Anat. and Physiol.</td>
<td>Genl. Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disease and Pathology</td>
<td>Bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Forensic Medicine</td>
<td>Musc. Nerv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table was to be used in conjunction with an alphabetical table of author numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALPHA</th>
<th>DIVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B 273 C 573 D 873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>274 574 874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>275 575 875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>276 576 876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A work entitled, for example, Maxwell’s *Anatomy of the Human Nervous System* would have been numbered M1574. It was ingenious, as much of Schwartz’s work was, albeit a bit complex.

By giving first place in influence to a scheme (Battezzati’s) that few would know and that had not influenced him, and then giving no place to the two schemes that most would know and that had influenced him, Dewey vitiated any claims to originality that Harris or Schwartz could have made, thus protecting his copyright, upon which, by the way, the very idea of uniformity of classification meaning depended. It appears to me that that is what Dewey was up to in his acknowledgments paragraph.

Recently another source of the decimal idea has been proposed. As it is a plausible rival hypothesis, it deserves scrutiny. While conducting research for *The Glorious Enterprise*, his work upon the Centennial Exhibition of 1876, John Maass stumbled upon a remarkable coincidence. The 30,864 exhibits of the exhibition had been arranged by a decimal system, conceived and developed by William Phipps Blake, a nineteenth-century American scholar of no little repute. Maass, being familiar with the DDC, wondered whether there might be some connection between the systems. When he discovered that the DDC had been published in 1876—a “suggestive date” to Maass—he investigated Dewey’s career further. The question was inevitable: How was Dewey’s idea conceived? His conclusion is reported in the article “Who Invented Dewey’s Classification?”

After delineating the career and character of Blake, Maass set forth the relevant portions of Blake’s proposal and notation:

At a meeting of the Centennial Commission in Philadelphia on May 25th, 1872, Blake submitted an outline of his Classification, and it was adopted after some discussion:

*We propose ten comprehensive divisions, to be named Departments. . . . We propose to subdivide each of these Departments into ten Groups, and each Group into ten Classes. . . . The notation will be better understood upon examining the annexed table.*

Note that Blake’s notation was not decimal in the sense that we have come to use the decimal concept in librarianship. Departments I, II, and X all had groups beginning with the digit I.
Maass continued with a plausible explanation of the means by which Dewey came to know of Blake's scheme, and then he drew several parallels between the schemes. As I have not seen the notation applied to the numbering of the exhibits, I can neither deny nor affirm his thesis. If only the arabic numerals for the classes were used, and if Dewey had seen the scheme, then Blake's notation system could have been a forerunner of Dewey's. Maass's thesis that Dewey drew his idea from Blake merits pondering. While his evidence seems solid, I found it inconclusive. Quite simply, the means of division was not that of arabic numerals being used decimally, which, after all, is the essence of Dewey's idea.

There is another possibility that should not be overlooked. Dewey conceived the decimal idea on his own.

No sooner did Amherst College's library committee accept Dewey's plan than he turned to finding a system of knowledge that best fitted his arabic numerals. In fact, he had already seen the scheme he thought would prove best. The day after his plan was accepted, he wrote to William T. Harris asking for a copy of the St. Louis Public School Library catalog, which he had seen described in the Journal of Speculative Philosophy. Harris apparently told Dewey that the ideas in the catalog were at the latter's disposal. At any rate, he used them, and acknowledged their use. "In filling the nine classes of the scheme the inverted Baconian arrangement of the St. Louis Library has been followed."

Dewey does not seem to have been concerned with the philosophical foundation of the structure of knowledge that he adopted. He probably never knew what it was. He was by nature more concerned with the application of ideas than with the organizing theory behind them. It is, nevertheless, necessary for us to scrutinize the DDC's philosophical foundation, as it is this that has contributed no small part to the long-lasting success of the DDC.

Leo LaMontagne in his excellent American Library Classification delineates the apparent philosophical antecedents of the DDC. Francis Bacon properly receives credit for providing the structure of several generations of library classification schemes. The success of one of these, that of Edward Johnston of the St. Louis Mercantile Library, led directly to Harris's partial emulation of it in his St. Louis Public School Library scheme. I say "partial emulation," for Harris used neither Johnston's structure nor his structure's rationale; though LaMontagne, and several scholars before and since his book, thought Harris did. What Harris did do was to applaud Johnston's success, examine his classification's structure, find it wanting philosophically, and propound a new rationale, based upon the ideas of G. W. F. Hegel, for an inverted form of Johnston's system's structure. Let Harris speak for himself on the major points:

I should not omit this opportunity to refer to the Catalogue of that excellent collection, the St. Louis Mercantile Library, which is based on the Baconian system. In fact, it was the eminent practical success of that system of classification—considering both its usefulness to the reader and its convenience to the librarians—that led to this attempt at a Classified Catalogue of the Public School Library. The form of the Baconian system adopted in the Catalogue of the Mercantile Library is substantially that of D'Alembert [Encyclopédie Methodique, 1767]; but it has numerous modifications introduced by the fertile mind of the librarian, Edward Wm. Johnston, Esq. . . .

. . . In the classification based upon the three faculties—Memory, Imagination, Reason—whence we have History, Poetry, and Philosophy, the distinction according to form makes its appearance, and is of some use in the classification of books. Lord Bacon, however, did not have in view any such use of his distinction, nor did he develop it in a proper shape to be of such use. . . .

. . . The general unfitness of this system [Bacon's] for the classification of books is apparent; it was not intended for it. But its principle of division is of great value. To be applied to the use of a library, it is necessary to seize and not lose sight of its spirit, in the details which Bacon gives. It will be found that in minor divisions and sections the content exercises a predominating influence on the classification, while in the principal divisions the form is the guiding principle. . . .

It appears that Harris was building upon the past, as so many had done in classification. Actually he had conceived a new intellectual structure: mode of expression was now the major determinant of fundamental division.

Harris was the leading American exponent of the ideas of Hegel. As his view of the world provides the skeleton of Dewey's scheme, it will be summarized here. There are three modes of dealing with a subject: the scientific, in which conscious system prevails; the artistic, in which unconscious system prevails; and the historical, which system, if any can be said to exist, results from a juncture of time and place. Within the three modes, the contents of books—their subject matter—determine the
structure of the classification. The three modes unfold in the following way to produce the total Hegelian view.\textsuperscript{11}

Science unfolds into philosophy, the source of system for all other fields and the most general field of study. Theology, the science of the absolute, and the ultimate field of study of philosophy, comes next. Religion, which is not scientific but is tributary to theology, is included in theology. As man achieves his most spiritual role within his society and in relation to the state, the social and political sciences are logically the next fields of study. The political sciences are jurisprudence, in which society puts constraints upon the individual; and politics, in which the individual reacts against the constraints of law, thereby perhaps producing an instance for an alteration of the practical will. The social sciences are economic, whereby in combination man gains ascendancy over nature and uses it for his ends, and education, by which man is initiated into the society's modus operandi. Placed at the end of the social and political sciences is philosophy, as it is the result of self-conscious thought, a society's best record of itself, and the connecting link between the spiritual and the natural. The natural sciences now follow, and these are followed by the useful arts. The first unfold the laws of nature; the next apply them to social uses. The point of transition between them is medicine, which is part science and part art. This brings to an end the subjects whose major mode of treatment is the scientific.

The second major mode is the artistic. Art unfolds into the fine arts: architecture, sculpture, drawing and painting, engraving, lithography, photography, collections of pictures, and music. These are followed by poetry, prose fiction, and the last of the artistic forms, literary miscellany. The last mode is the historical. History comprises geography and travels, civil history, and biography and correspondence; heraldry and genealogy fall here. There you have it all. Harris did append to his catalog a class for works which treat of subjects falling into several classes. Within this appendix, which is what he called it, Harris placed collections, cyclopedias, and periodicals—several of the subjects that fell into Dewey's own generalia class. It is not difficult to perceive the structure of the DDC falling within Harris's world view; one can even perceive the reasons for Dewey's apparent idiosyncracies—the social sciences being placed so far from history, language so far from literature.

One now thought and wrote about a subject in scientific, artistic, or historical modes. Take, for instance, the Library of Congress. One could write about it scientifically: explain its present and future role in intelligence gathering, estimate the date upon which it will be filled from top to bottom, delineate its effect upon the artistic life of America, describe the richer life of those who benefit from its program of talking books, and so on. One may say that these are not all scientific subjects. The assertion is uncontestable, and inappropriate. It is the mode of discussion that is scientific, not the subject. One could write about the Library historically: examine its past role in intelligence gathering, investigate how long it took to build the Library of Congress Thomas Jefferson Building, list who worked upon its construction, explain the source of the stone that makes up its walls, and so on. And, lastly, one could write about the Library artistically: devise a novel in which a descriptive cataloger spends his days in remembrance of things past, and is subsequently fired; or pen a poem in which the following lines are found:

\begin{quotation}
Hail to thee, O green-roofed beauty!
Long may you perceive your duty.
May you aye in volumes grow,
And from cataloging flow.
Thus with budget ever-growing,
Grow we as a nation knowing.
\end{quotation}

The quality of the poetry is not important, though I must admit I am partial to its sentiment and expression. What is important to note is that the Library of Congress's nature has been discussed—better, written about—artistically.

There you have the three modes and, in my estimation, there you have one of the primary reasons why the DDC has been so successful for so long a period.

After much effort, the first edition was created. Comprising a preface of eight pages, tables of twelve pages, and an index of eighteen pages, it appeared in 1876. Dewey set the number of copies at 1,000—a far cry from the 200 that he had been allowed to produce. The figure, however, is not inaccurate. Dewey had run an extra edition beyond what he had been allowed. The first edition beyond the Amherst edition was published by Ginn and Heath.
AMHERST COLLEGE LIBRARY,

AMHERST, MASS., Mar. 22, 1876.

Sirs: I wish to enter for copyright a little work I am publishing, the press with the title

"A classification & subject index with directions for their use"
Amherst College Library
Amherst, Mass.
1876.

I enclose 10¢ for copyright which I believe covers that amount.
Having had no experience in these matters I am not at all sure that I have made application in proper form. If not please advise me.

Your truly
Mehdi Dwyer.
There were standard subdivisions at the general numbers for the classes. *Divide-like* was used for geographical subdivisions, though the process was not yet called that. The index was called the **Subject Index** and was to terms in the tables and often to subjects outside the tables. For instance, North Carolina appeared in the index, though not in the tables. Though not called *relative*, the index was already behaving in the manner that was to add to the success of the DDC. For instance, one found moths at 595 and 646; maternity at 136 and 618; tobacco at 615, 178, and 633—yet not one of these terms appeared anywhere in the tables. Dewey said of the index in his preface, “Most names of countries, towns, animals, plants, minerals, diseases &c., have been omitted, the aim being to furnish an Index of Subjects on which books are written, and not a Gazetteer or a Dictionary of all the nouns in the language.” From that day on the index was on a collision course with that time when it would no longer be possible to provide an “index of subjects on which books are written” because there would be too many subjects.

In addition to its intellectual cohesion, simple notation, stability, and helpful index, there were other conditions and events that contributed substantially to the DDC’s success in the next decade: It was elaborately described in the U.S. Bureau of Education’s *Public Libraries in the United States of America,* and discussed at the 1876 Philadelphia Conference of Librarians. It was one of the few systems available to the public and the only one advertised in the Library Journal. As one of the editors of the *Library Journal* and because of his increasingly important position in American librarianship, Dewey was able to further the progress of the DDC—witness, for example, the putting of DDC numbers on the title slips mentioned above. Lastly, though not the last of all the reasons, Dewey had the opportunity to expand the DDC.

Melvil Dewey’s letter to the register of copyrights dated March 22, 1876, reads: “Sir: I wish to enter for copyright a little work just passing thru’ the press with the title. *A classification & Subject index with directions for their use* Amherst College Library, Amherst, Mass. 1876. I enclose 1.00 for copyright which I believe costs that amount. Having had no experience in these matters I am not at all sure that I have made application in proper form. If not please advise me. Very truly Melvil Dewey. LCMS–29074–5

During the years preceding the publication of the second edition, Dewey developed his scheme first at Wellesley College and then at Columbia College with the assistance of Walter Stanley Biscoe, his lieutenant from their days at Amherst until Dewey’s death in 1931 and the theoretician of the DDC for most of this period. The second edition appeared in 1885. Its introduction was much fuller, having gone from eight to twenty-four pages, with thirty or so more pages of explanations through which Dewey defended his practices. There were a great many relocations, a subject being sent to another number, and much reusing of numbers. To prevent the suspicion that succeeding editions would contain equally unsettling numbers of changes, Dewey wrote, “Librarians making the necessary changes for the revised edition need not fear that a series of editions have begun each of which will call for such changes . . . .” He kept his word. Though in the years ahead there would be great expansion upon the numbers of the second edition, there would be very few changes that would result
in changed meanings of numbers. This policy is called integrity of numbers or stability of numbers. It was to be the guiding principle of the DDC for three-quarters of a century.

Regarding the second edition: standard subdivisions, then called form divisions, were now applied to subdivisions of classes. Divide-like had become a standard procedure and part of the classifier’s language. (In a divide-like situation a subject that was not itself subdivided could be subdivided like a subject at some other part of the classification, thus enabling the classification to be much more detailed than it appeared to be.) The Relativ Index was named this for the first time and so spelled—no final e. A relative index referred to a subject’s class number rather than to the pages at which it was found. Simplified spelling began in this edition and was to grow steadily worse as subsequent editors increased its use in the mistaken assumption that it was what Dewey desired. In fact, Dewey did desire it, but he also desired international use of the DDC, and the increasingly atrocious simplified spelling was a decided impediment to this.

Notes were many and useful. The decimal point appeared. It had not been used in the first edition. A period had been used above the base line to indicate that the next digit indicated either size or accession number within that class or both. For instance, 973·4·18 would represent the eighteenth work on the quarto shelf for American history. There were now geographical and period subdivisions. At the end of the volume were special tables, what we now call auxiliary tables, on the numbers of the various languages, subjects divided geographically, and the subject subdivisions of languages. The index had grown from 2,000 to 10,000 entries. Dewey wrote of the index, “This Subject Index is the most important part of the system.”

To be sure, librarians inexpert in a field could place a book reasonably well with the assistance of the index. It was a godsend to the librarian who did not know everything.

The first edition had been promising. The second edition was the promise fulfilled and probably the most prominent landmark in the development of American library classification.

The early success of the DDC did not escape the notice of hostile critics. In 1885, the year of the appearance of the second edition, Jacob Schwartz and Frederic Perkins, a major figure in late nineteenth-century American librarianship, attacked Dewey and the DDC unmercifully. Dewey had said that any three arabic numerals in a row meant exclusively the particular subject assigned by Dewey for use in the DDC. The Duet, which is what Schwartz and Perkins called themselves, took exception to the claim, especially since Schwartz believed that he was the first to use decimal subdivision consistently throughout a library classification. His belief was well founded. He did not, as seen above, use arabic numerals throughout for class marks and final digits indicated size as well as subject. That Dewey would brandish his copyright against anyone contemplating using arabic numerals for class marks in his own scheme, which Dewey did, had merely rubbed salt in the wounds of at least one member of the Duet.
In two lengthy articles in *Library Journal* the Duet made many charges of improper, inadequate, misguided, or superfluous classification, which Dewey responded to in two lengthy articles of his own in the same journal. The Duet attacked the idea of close classification, which Dewey naturally espoused and which may be defined as the practice of indicating with full notation the subject of a work no matter how particular the subject. The contentions against close classification are cited here, as each still possesses its original force. First, books on the same subject could not be kept together since such specific collections as oversized books, reference works, and browsing collections inevitably worked against this. Next, a work treating several subjects could be placed with only one of them. Third, it separated parts from wholes. Fourth, it demanded particularity far beyond practical demand. Fifth, many books had to be classed by form. Last, certain items would always be missing from the shelf due to being misshelved, or checked out, or at the bindery, or what have you.

The Duet went on to criticize specific aspects of the DDC, of which only a few will be mentioned: a lack of proportion in the distribution of numbers—important subjects, such as history and literature, had far too few numbers allotted to them, thus giving rise to long numbers; philology (400) falling between sociology (300) and natural science (500) made no sense; too many useless subjects were included while many useful ones were included while many useful ones were not.

In his reply Dewey did not adequately refute the Duet's charges, but he did not have to. The DDC was making its own way in the English-speaking world and did not need the defense of its maker. By virtue of its being available, easily understood and used, and obviously superior to any other contemporary scheme, within a few years the DDC would be used in at least a third of all American libraries, a figure that was to increase to nine-tenths by the 1950s. The older, larger American libraries (often eastern) were not readily won by the DDC's charms. They usually retained their own schemes. It was the smaller, newer libraries that came into existence in great numbers during this period that began with or switched to the DDC. For the most part it is these that have remained DDC users. British libraries were at least equally receptive to the DDC, perhaps even more so. By 1910 about 60 percent of British libraries used the DDC. By 1950 over 90 percent of all libraries used the DDC. (One of the major influences behind its widespread use in Great Britain is the fact that the British National Bibliography (BNB) is arranged by the DDC.)

As the DDC came to be accepted, new editions were produced. Dewey brought out the third edition in 1888 while he was still at Columbia. The fourth edition, however, was produced in Albany at the New York State Library. Dewey had left Columbia for the directorship of the state library in 1888. It is often suggested that he was forced from all-male Columbia for admitting women to the library school he founded there. This is probably not the case. The new position at Albany enabled him to deal with libraries on a broader, more popular front, and this was nearer to his heart than adminis-
tering a college library and library school. It was also a far more important position.

At this point a table is provided which cites the editions of the DDC, the date of publication of each, its number of pages, copies sold, and editor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDITION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PAGES</th>
<th>COPIES</th>
<th>EDITOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Melvil Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Melvil Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Melvil Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>May Seymour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>May Seymour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>May Seymour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>May Seymour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>May Seymour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>May Seymour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>May Seymour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>May Seymour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>9,340</td>
<td>Dorkas Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>Dorkas Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>15,632</td>
<td>Constantin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>Milton J. Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>11,045</td>
<td>Godfrey Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2,439</td>
<td>31,011</td>
<td>Benjamin A. Custer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>38,677</td>
<td>Benjamin A. Custer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth edition was edited by May Seymour, editor for thirty years, a length of time not surpassed by any subsequent editor, nor likely to be. When she died in 1921 the DDC had trebled its size under her direction. Her achievement stands as one of the most monumental in all American librarianship. She was called the specialist in omniscience at the Lake Placid Club (where the DDC was to move in 1906) and behaved in that manner which marks each responsible DDC editor: she was thoroughgoing and a thoroughgoing procrastinator. Biscoe was likewise afflicted by the slow thoroughs. The pair drove Dewey to distraction with their snail's pace. Yet one cannot help but appreciate their hesitance to assign the location of a subject. If wrong, the damage their decision wrought would last for a long, long time.

How the DDC grew under May Seymour's guidance is worth noting. The DDC is not like a creature of nature that grows equally or proportionally in all parts. No, it is an artificial creature whose parts expand as expansions become available or as the need for expansion grows greater than the conservative that freezes past practice in place. That is to say, if someone came along with a new development on viticulture or sewage disposal or Spanish literature or library science, the expansion was incorporated. If someone, or several someones, complained about the inadequacy of the schedules for botany or mathematics or psychology or engineering, then their complaints, if loud and long enough, would bring about some sort of rectification, eventually.

The growth of an international branch from the American trunk of the DDC began in 1896. At that time Paul Otlet conceived a plan to compile a universal bibliography to be arranged by a decimal system, preferably a somewhat modified DDC. He asked for and gained Dewey's permission to translate the DDC into French, making a few changes in religion, the social sciences, and technology. This was the beginning of an occasionally fruitful but usually frustrating relationship between the DDC and the family of decimal classifications fathered by Dewey but adopted and fostered by Otlet. The major members of the family have been the Classification décimale (CD) and the Universal Decimal Classification (UDC), an English translation of the French translation, which began in 1931. The UDC is discussed elsewhere in this issue of the Quarterly Journal.

At about the same time as Otlet began his work, an important event did not take place. In 1899 Charles Martel of the Library of Congress approached Dewey and asked whether the DDC could be revised within a year so that it could be used as the classification of the Library of Congress. The necessary revising included updating the science and technology classes, and moving the social sciences nearer to history and language nearer to literature. J. C. M. Hanson, then head of the Processing Department of the Library, had just come from the University of Wisconsin where Charles Ammi Cutter's Expansive Classification was used, and he wanted a classification with a structure like Cutter's. Dewey's promise, of little change in the meaning of the numbers, that he had made in the second edition, his agreeing to the French translation of the DDC, and, more importantly, Martel's demand for great change in too short a period—one year—made it impossible for Dewey to satisfy the Library's request. It appears that he was forced to say no. Thus transpired one of the more unfortunate
events in the history of American librarianship. The DDC could have been the national standard. It is a great pity that this did not come to be. This is not to denigrate the Library of Congress Classification, which works well for library giants. It is only to say that uniform practice has virtues difficult to disregard.

Through the early part of the twentieth century the DDC continued to swell. Its structure was not altered; it simply expanded upon the old one. This was to continue until 1951. In 1921 May Seymour died. Replacing her was Dorkas Fellows—christened Jennie Dorcas Fellows, but altered to the preferred form by taste and Dewey's desire for simplified spelling—the most pugnacious of all DDC editors, and one of the best. Miss Fellows was known as a "walking encyclopedia" and had all the charm of such a book. As difficult as it is to believe, Dorkas Fellows's achievements surpassed May Seymour's in every respect. In her sixteen years of editorship she more than doubled the size of the DDC. I am not trying to provide an example of the American penchant for size. Anyone who has ever devised or expanded a classification, however, will understand the magnitude of her achievement. Anyone familiar with the fourteenth edition, her last, will appreciate the quality of the achievement. She produced one of the best sets of cataloging rules ever done by an individual, second only to Charles Cutter's and perhaps technically superior to his. For long periods she successfully directed several major departments of the New York State Library. She was, on the other hand, as great a procrastinator as May Seymour, and she did not mind telling people what she thought.

Dorkas Fellows's view of what an editor is about in the development of the DDC was expressed in an unsent letter that was to have been a response to a fairly favorable review of the eleventh edition. It is given here as the best expression of the goal of a general library classification in general and of the DDC in particular.

It is a comparatively easy matter to take the books which a single library contains on a subject and work out a classification which will fit those books. It is quite another matter to take the subject in its broad relations and lay out a scheme which will be even reasonably satisfactory for the use of public, university and special libraries, and not only in a special locality but all over the world. Whatever the reader's estimation may be of Miss
Fellows's success in achieving the goal, his estimation of the attempt must be that it was admirable.

The DDC editorial office left Albany for the Lake Placid Club in 1906. Dewey, having found the Adirondack air salutary for his hay fever, had gathered a group of congenial souls together to found the Lake Placid Company, from which stemmed the Lake Placid Club. The club did indeed exclude consumptives and Jews and what it considered other undesirable classes. In 1906 Dewey had been on the losing end of a political struggle with a powerful opponent who had used the anti-Semitism of the club as a pretext for Dewey's dismissal from the state library. Though he was never far from library affairs until his death, after his dismissal Dewey was never again the force that he had been for the three previous decades. May Seymour rued the loss of an at-hand collection of a great library. As the development of knowledge was marked during the first quarter of the twentieth century, the effect of the move upon the DDC was decidedly pernicious. Fortunately, the editorial office was to move to the Library of Congress in the mid-1920s so that it could benefit by the experience of the Library's classifiers and the existence of an at-hand collection of considerable scope.

Shortly thereafter, from 1930 to 1934, a long-desired condition was achieved: DDC numbers were put on virtually all LC cards. The Library had begun distributing its cards at the turn of the century. All libraries had benefited from the service, but before 1930 libraries using the Library of Congress Classification—the numbers of which were on LC cards—had benefited a good deal more than libraries using the DDC—the numbers of which were not on LC cards at that time. Although in the 1920s more than 80 percent of the customers subscribing to the card service were DDC libraries, the Library refused, for three decades, to put DDC numbers on the cards. Dewey described the feelings of librarians at the absence of the numbers to Herbert Putnam, then Librarian of Congress: "100s of libraries weep and wail because DC numbers are not on yur printed cards." Note Dewey's simplified spelling. Of course, weeping and wailing are out of place in a cataloging department; nevertheless, the same title was classed thousands of times in the DDC libraries of America, and such an economic imposition did not give rise to broad smiles. The first to be in charge of the DC section was David Haykin, who was to be the DDC editor a quarter century hence.

By Dewey's death in 1931 the DDC had reached what many deemed to be bloated proportions in many of its classes; in others it was underdeveloped. For example, here is a segment of the classification for library science, 020, one of the instances of extreme analysis which precipitated the decision to cut back in the fifteenth edition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>022</th>
<th>Library buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>022.9</td>
<td>Fixtures, furniture, fittings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022.92</td>
<td>Public conveniences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022.921</td>
<td>Hatracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022.922</td>
<td>Umbrella stands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022.923</td>
<td>Clocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022.924</td>
<td>Bulletin boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was the number for umbrella stands that critics found most obnoxious. Many libraries, especially the smaller ones, resented having to pay for more DDC than they wanted and having to puzzle through an increasingly complex classification. They wanted a brief DDC with short numbers, but not one so brief as the abridged edition which Dewey had begun publishing at the turn of the century for smaller libraries and library school students. This new brief edition was to be the standard edition envisioned generally by David Haykin:

The limit should be based on the needs of the fairly large general library. The minute expansions found in the 12th edition should be cut down to skeleton form within the limits set up and future expansions included in future editions only in skeleton form. Eventually the result would be a standard edition with all parts equally developed to meet the needs of all but the very large general libraries."

And envisioned specifically by Ruth McCollough of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh:

My idea of a "Standard Edition" has always been that the schedules should be more or less uniformly developed. That i.e numbers should be carried out not more than three places beyond the decimal point except in a few cases. That all material included within the covers of the book be essential to its use. The size and price would then be moderate.

I believe that the detailed schedules should be published as separates and made available to those libraries having special collections for which detailed classification is needed."

During her final years Dorkas Fellows was to work upon arriving at the uniform development that Ruth McCollough called for. This meant expansion in all parts not previously expanded, which was almost achieved in the fourteenth edition. Many believed that, with 1,927 pages, the fourteenth edition had
gone too far no matter what the motive for expansion. The next editor was to cut back the expansions to achieve the standard edition in the fifteenth edition.

Before relating the vicissitudes of the standard edition, it is necessary to discuss the various corporate bodies that came to be associated with the DDC as it grew and as it began to drift after Dewey's death. One of the earliest was the American Library Association-related Decimal Classification Advisory Committee that was convoked in 1916 to give assistance to May Seymour if she desired it and to make the wishes and the needs of DDC users known to the makers of the DDC. It was disbanded in the early 1920s, unheeded and unnoticed.

Upon May Seymour's death in 1921, and suspecting that his own was imminent, Dewey formed the Lake Placid Club Education Foundation and turned over to it all DDC copyrights. One of its responsibilities was to see that the DDC continue to be developed and to be the "international labor-saver" that Dewey considered it to be. In the early 1930s the foundation established Forest Press to oversee the publishing of the DDC; it has continued to do so. A few years before this the foundation formed the Decimal Classification Committee, which was to oversee the development of the classification. It was headed by Emily Dewey, Melvil's second wife. Since she knew little about classification matters, the committee was actually guided by Dorkas Fellows. Even though Miss Fellows had considerable input regarding the direction of the development of the DDC, what was still lacking was the input of the libraries actually using the DDC. Without such input, the committee was bound to wander off into the slough of misdirection.

In order to rescue the DDC and to make the needs of its users known to its owners, another American Library Association advisory committee was instituted, this one with the unwieldy title American Library Association Committee on Cooperation with the Lake Placid Club Education Foundation Committee on the Decimal Classification. This committee did what it could, but it too drifted into the slough of misdirection. In 1937 Godfrey Dewey, the only child of Melvil and, although unmentioned to this point, nevertheless a major figure in the relations with the Institut international de bibliographie (IIB) to be discussed below. He also contributed to the development of the DDC; inter-
a claim to having influenced the DDC, I should bring the reader's attention to the then Institut international de bibliographie, now the Fédération internationale de documentation (FID). When Otlet secured permission, in 1896, to translate the DDC into French, he did so under the auspices of the IIB. He promised Dewey that the French translation would not diverge greatly from the numbers of its parent. World War I and the inherent differences between American and European cultures made it inevitable that such a divergence would occur. It had become so great by the 1920s, in fact, that Dewey directed Dorkas Fellows to arrive at concordance with the IIB on the first three digits of either classification. Miss Fellows, who viewed herself as the mother-protector of American libraries, effectively subverted concordance. It appears that the DDC and the UDC, which the FID's classification is now called and which is in partial translation in many tongues, are irreparably out of concordance. This is a pity as worldwide library standards have now become achievable.

The influence of the IIB upon the DDC was not made apparent in the above paragraph. For the first three decades of the century the parties exchanged expansions, and these, along with the attempt at concordance, substantially affected the development of the DDC during the period. It was, by the way, one of the objectives of the Committee on Cooperation to see that the IIB did not have much influence upon the DDC. By 1933, when the committee was established, there was no danger of that, however.

The influence of the IIB upon the DDC was not made apparent in the above paragraph. For the first three decades of the century the parties exchanged expansions, and these, along with the attempt at concordance, substantially affected the development of the DDC during the period. It was, by the way, one of the objectives of the Committee on Cooperation to see that the IIB did not have much influence upon the DDC. By 1933, when the committee was established, there was no danger of that, however.

To return to the standard edition—Dorkas Fellows died in 1938 and was eulogized by her assistant, Myron Warren Getchell:

> Loyal and approachable, uncompromisingly accurate, and thorough[!], self-sacrificingly and self-effacingly devoted, sincere and steadfast in her adherence to principle, forthright and unflinching in the defense of her convictions, to which she brought a direct and penetrating pungency of style which left her meaning unmistakable, she gave all to the work that lay before her. Truly she has won for herself a place among the immortals of world librarianship.\(^\text{19}\)

This is an accurate summary of Dorkas Fellows's character. As for an honored niche among the immortals of librarianship it is safe to say that she earned such a place. In the long history of the DDC none served Dewey or his memory so well.

Through the latter half of Dorkas Fellows's editorship a search for her replacement was carried out half-heartedly. Though the foundation realized that the editor's role was important, it declined to offer a salary commensurate with the importance of the position. In short, it was cheap. Her choice, Myron Warren Getchell, her assistant, was not acceptable to the foundation. And as no one else could be found, upon Miss Fellows's death the editor's chair became vacant. Someone had to be found, and quickly. Margaret Mann, a member of the Decimal Classification Committee and a woman whose achievements are known to librarians, recommended one of her Michigan students for the position, Constantin Mazney, then a cataloger at the University of Michigan, whose native tongue was not English. Mann was also something of a nemesis for the DDC. Mazney received the appointment. He and Getchell set out to produce the fourteenth edition based upon the work that Dorkas Fellows had already done.

The fourteenth edition appeared in 1942. To this day it is considered by some classifiers as being the premier classification in American library history. Some libraries, both large and small, still use it. At 1,927 pages, it was a behemoth of a classification; for the most part it was a giant second edition. Just after it was published, Mazney was fired for a variety of reasons, inefficiency being a sufficient one. Getchell, considered by those who appointed the editor to be timid and ineffectual, was passed over for a second time. He then resigned. Apostolic succession had been broken. There was no longer anyone at the editorial level who knew the old ways, or the reasons for them.

The Decimal Classification Committee knew that it wanted a standard edition, and it knew, more or less, what that edition was supposed to be like. It now had to find an editor to bring the standard edition to its public. This was actually no easy matter. The foundation's unwillingness to pay a reasonable wage restricted the number of worthwhile candidates considerably. In fact, it effectively discouraged any of this sort. But someone had to be found to guide the development of so important an edition as the standard. What appeared then to be an appropriate course of action was taken: a director of the editorial office was appointed—Esther Potter of the Brooklyn Public Library and a close friend of Milton Ferguson, chairman of the Decimal Classification Committee. Her experience was not in classification, and consequently it was not believed that she had
The first page of the subject index and the social welfare classes from the fifteenth or "standard" edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification. Courtesy of Forest Press, Lake Placid Education Foundation.

360 SOCIAL WELFARE

360-362 ORGANIZED ACTIVITIES PRIMARILY CONCERNED WITH CONSERVATION, PROTECTION, IMPROVEMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

For Sociology, see 301; For Social work, see 362; 2, p. lv; 9 is not used, see instead, 362.9

361 SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL AGENCIES

Art of adjusting personal relationships and organizing social groups Includes administration of social work

361-361.5 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE WELFARE

For Service to sick, see 362.1; For Social work, see specific type or need of client or, e.g. Medical social work, 362.1; Psychiatric social work, 362.2; Family-planning work, 362.3; Industrial social work, 362.4; For Social welfare planning, see 361.3

3 Social Welfare Planning

Preparation of integrated schemes of common action in field of assistance concerned with social problems for use by groups of social agencies or government Includes council of social agencies

3 Social Case Work

Development of capacity of individuals to organize their own normal social activities in any environment

For Social work, see 362; For Children's work, see 362.1; For Mental health work, 362.2; For Child care work, 362.3; For Family case work, 362.4

4 Social Group Work

Social adjustment of individuals promoted by participation in voluntary groups and with assistance of group leader

For Adult education, see 374
use up a good deal of what money and goodwill were left.

In order to understand the extent to which the numbers were cut back, let me cite the same classes in the different editions. Diseases of women and children, 618, had sixty-seven entries in the fourteenth edition. In the fifteenth edition it was labeled gynecology and obstetrics and had only two subdivisions—618.9 pediatrics and 618.97 gerontology. Such attrition caused agitation to even the most confirmed bachelor.

Did any good come from the fifteenth edition? Well, even the Nile’s flooding has its good side. The simplified spelling, that had grown increasingly atrocious, was almost shed. (Simplified spelling requires elaboration. As early as his first interest in librarianship, Dewey evinced an interest in simplified spelling. As the reader has seen, he used it in his communications and in the DDC.) The format, done by Kingsport Press, was elegant for the first time. A great deal of deadwood had been eliminated, *umbrella stands* contributing its share to the pile. And a few areas, such as sociology, had been improved. But this good did not begin to compensate for the evil done. The worst effect was probably that Forest Press could not finance the sixteenth edition, although the defections to the Library of Congress Classification and loss of belief in the usefulness of the DDC for shelf arrangement may have been equally bad effects.

At this crucial point in the history of the DDC the Library of Congress was approached through the American Library Association in the hopes that the Library would assist in financing the next edition, for without substantial assistance the DDC would founder well before the sixteenth edition could be prepared. The Library agreed to help. The arrangement which was made to produce the sixteenth edition, in which costs were shared by the Library and Forest Press, began in January 1954 and has continued to this day. In the bargain that was struck the Library gained the power to appoint the editor, although Forest Press retained the power to veto appointments. The Library’s first appointee, on a half-time basis, was David Haykin, the first person to direct the assigning of DDC numbers to LC cards, who was a subject heading specialist at the Library.

At this time another American Library Association committee, the Special Advisory Committee on the Decimal Classification, was constituted to assist the editor and the Editorial Policy Committee on matters of application of the DDC in libraries. At all times a majority of the advisory committee’s members was of the integrity-of-numbers camp, also called stability-of-numbers. This group desired a return to the line of development of the first fourteen editions and to the meanings of the numbers of the fourteenth edition, from which the fifteenth edition had often strayed. They feared the shambles that would occur in the shelves with radical change. On the other hand, David Haykin was of the keeping-pace-with-knowledge camp, as was a minority—often large—of the advisory committee. This camp desired to have the structure of the DDC reflect the current view of knowledge. They feared the disrepute that is attached to the obsolete and the archaic. Whereas the conservative integrity-of-numbers camp would have new subjects placed in the old structure, the progressive keeping-pace-with-knowledge camp would redo the old structure and provide a new one better fit to accommodate new and old subjects. Haykin assumed that the progressive steps taken in the fifteenth edition were to continue. The advisory committee assumed that the line of the first fourteen editions was to continue. If the views of the advisory committee were taken seriously, a showdown between it and Haykin would be inevitable. The quality of the committee’s appointees and, more importantly, the sheer force of its chairman, Janet Dickson, gave its opinions the weight necessary for an honest hearing. Its opinion was that Haykin was changing too much and that he had to stop, or be stopped. The showdown occurred in early 1956. When the smoke cleared, Haykin had resigned to return to another post in the Library of Congress. Thus it was assured that the sixteenth edition would be primarily a return to the line of development of the first fourteen editions. To replace Haykin the Library appointed Benjamin A. Custer, head of technical processing of the Detroit Public Library, who in his career had shown the requisite general ability and who possessed a conciliatory ability in the degree necessary to bring the sixteenth edition to a successful conclusion. This he and Julia Pressey, head of the section that assigned DDC numbers to LC cards, did supremely well.

The sixteenth edition came out in 1958 and it vies with the fourteenth and the eighteenth in being
generally successful and widely respected. It was, in fact, a phenomenal success, and much closer to the idea of the standard edition than any other version. Though physically larger than the fourteenth edition, it had about half the number of entries. It was attractive, easy to use, and as Frances Hinton, immediate past chairman of the Editorial Policy Committee, said of it, it fit like an old slipper. Moreover, the fifteenth edition would be no competition, the fourteenth was no longer available, and librarianship was riding upon an ascending spoke of the wheel of fortune. Custer did manage, however, to insert a good deal of new material in the sixteenth edition, and he did some restructuring as well in chemistry at 546 and 547, the sort of thing that had not been allowed in the first fourteen editions. To be sure, the sixteenth has more of the past than the present in it, but it should be looked upon as the last of the old DDC line and the first of the new modern line. At the time, of course, it was perceived as being a return to what was known and accepted. When it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change. This view of the conservative librarian had prevailed, and such librarians were happy that the various subjects of their collections were not dispersed by a new view of knowledge.

By the time the seventeenth edition was published in 1965, a stunning reversal of fundamental policy had taken place. No longer was integrity of numbers the guiding principle, though it still was a principle. Keeping pace with knowledge was now the order of the day. Custer was by nature a progressive. It would have been folly, however, for him to do anything other than what he was instructed to do for the sixteenth edition, which was to follow the conservative line. The success of the sixteenth edition now added the dimension of success to his stature, and he convinced the Editorial Policy Committee that parts of the past belonged in the past and that the DDC's structure should change when reason sees the need for change. This policy has continued up to the present; the phoenix schedules (classes which have been totally redone upon the old numbers for the class) and the new index are a result of it.

The seventeenth edition was not, predictably, a success. There was too much change, and librarians who had applauded the sixteenth edition were bitterly disappointed. The idea of classing by discipline, in which a subject is classed by the discipline in which it is used, was conceptually sound but caused no little difficulty in classing. The new index, a radical departure from previous practice, received a hostile reception. In previous editions wherever a subject occurred in the schedules the user was referred to the number, but in the seventeenth edition the user was more often referred to the class that includes a subject, which is an enriching practice at the same time that it is an unfamiliar one. It was like a pair of magic shoes that carried the classifier farther than a normal pair of shoes but which pinched every step of the way. It proved so unac-
ceptable, in fact, that at great cost to Forest Press a revised index modeled on the old lines was prepared and distributed free to purchasers of the original index. In fairness it should be said that not enough time was spent on the original index to the seventeenth edition and that the index to the eighteenth edition is a better example of what the new style index can do. On the positive side, the seventeenth edition had many good internal improvements; the development of auxiliary tables which made synthesis on a much wider scale possible, as well as considerably easier; and the continued—now more obvious—movement toward making the DDC a modern library classification. All these features worked together to make the seventeenth a successful edition, even though not a popular one.

The eighteenth edition (1971) has continued the tradition of successful even-numbered editions—second, fourteenth, sixteenth. It contains two new phoenixes: the first had been in the sixteenth edition at 546–547 in chemistry; the next in the seventeenth edition at 150 psychology; the third and fourth in the eighteenth edition at 510 mathematics and 340 law. In the nineteenth edition 301–308 sociology will be the primary phoenix. Its most impressive new quality, however, was the abundant concern for making clear to the classifier how the system works and what is meant at those points where meanings may be vague.

The DDC is now a library tool whose application transcends the boundaries of its native America. It is vital and responsive to the needs of its users. Forest Press, for instance, has recently funded an extensive survey of the use of the DDC in the United States and Canada. A decade ago it funded a survey of the use of the DDC in the Eastern Hemisphere, excluding northern and western Europe and the Communist bloc. The press, under the guidance of the Forest Press Committee and under the direction of Richard B. Sealock, has become, in addition to its role as publisher, a library education agency of international scope. Under the direction of Benjamin A. Custer, the editor of second longest tenure (only May Seymour surpasses him) and the individual primarily responsible for the modernization of the DDC, and with the assistance of Margaret Warren and other capable coworkers, the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress has continued to develop, modernize, and apply the DDC. At the present time, approximately 100,000 of the items passing through the Library are assigned DDC numbers.

The Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee has continued to advise the press and the division as to the most appropriate direction the DDC should take. Though many fine individuals have been members of the committee—Verner Clapp, Margaret Mann, Lucile Morsch, and Freemont Rider, to name only a few—space permits that only the current members be named.

The standing members include: from the Library of Congress, Joseph H. Howard; from Forest Press, John A. Humphry, assistant commissioner of education for libraries of the state of New York; and from the American Library Association, Clare E. Ryan, head of technical processing of the state library of New Hampshire.

The appointive members are: Frances Hinton, chief of the Processing Division, Free Library of Philadelphia; Margaret E. Cockshutt of the Faculty of Library Science of the University of Toronto; Lois M. Chan of the College of Library Science of the University of Kentucky; Betty M. E. Croft, catalog librarian of the University of Illinois Library; Marietta D. Shepard, chief of the Library Development Program of the Organization of American States; Joel C. Downing, director of copyright and English language services of the British Library; and John P. Comaromi of the School of Librarianship of Western Michigan University.

It is probably unnecessary to justify to the readers of this journal the spending of all or a part of one’s life in the production or study of a classification. Nevertheless, I shall attempt to do so in five words, knowing that the value of classification must be stated occasionally, and in as few words as possible: Knowledge organized is knowledge kept.

NOTES

2. Original idea, submitted by Melvil Dewey to the Library Committee of Amherst College on May 8, 1873.
4. Ibid.
6. Leo E. LaMontagne, American Library Classification; with Special Reference to the Library of Congress (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press, 1961), pp. 189-91. Only a portion of Jacob Schwartz's tables have been used here.
7. John Maass, “Who Invented Dewey’s Classification?” Wilson Library Bulletin 47 (December 1972): 335-42. The discussion that follows is based upon this article.
12. Dewey, Classification and Subject Index, p. 6.
15. Ibid., p. 32.
20. McCollough’s comments are found in a document that was probably produced for the Decimal Classification Committee.
Recent Acquisitions of the Manuscript Division

BY THE STAFF OF THE DIVISION

One usually looks in vain for a common theme or subject in a diverse group of manuscript collections. Without too much distortion, however, one can discover such a theme in the acquisitions of the Manuscript Division in 1975. In the past year the division received the papers of numerous individuals, some obscure and some renowned, whose lives were lived on the frontier of human civilization, whether political, geographical, technological, or aesthetic.

In human terms, the narratives of Micajah McGeehee and N. Byron Smith described below are the most compelling evidence of young America's commitment to ventures into the unknown, whether the impenetrable mountain barriers to westward exploration of the North American continent or the harsh and unpredictable oceans from which Americans have long sought livelihood and economic advantage. The papers of Thomas Riggs document the taming of one of the last frontiers, Alaska, and its integration into American political and economic life.

The advance of science is exemplified by the epoch-making discoveries and inventions of Alexander Graham Bell and by aeronautical progress, in which Marjorie Stinson was a pioneer participant.

In a Bicentennial year attention is naturally drawn to the historic past and to the roots of national life and its institutions. The Shippen Family Papers described below will henceforward be considered a basic source for understanding the political initiatives of the revolutionary generation. As if to indicate the human cost of political division, the Lovering-Taylor Papers document the penalties exacted from Loyalist families and businesses in the eighteenth century. The augmented Tumulty Papers are indispensable for understanding political initiatives of the twentieth century, which their proponents designated "the New Freedom."

In American literary history two innovative voices were those of Walt Whitman in the nineteenth century and M. B. Tolson in the twentieth. Understanding of the better-known poet, Whitman, and the principles by which he revolutionized American poetry will be advanced by close study of the Horace and Anne Montgomery Traubel Papers, described below. The lesser-known Tolson was among the first Afro-American poets for whom the aesthetic, not the social content, was the domi-
nant element in poetry, though he was not by any means blind to literature as a social force.

If one man in American history exemplifies the willingness and the capacity to live on the cutting edge of political, intellectual, and cultural life, it is Thomas Jefferson. It is therefore gratifying to conclude this brief preview of last year’s manuscript acquisitions with a reference to Jefferson, patron saint of the Library of Congress. In 1975 the Library was able to acquire a hitherto unknown group of Jefferson letters, adding them to the Jefferson Papers on the eve of the Bicentennial, the keystone of which has been celebration of the issuance of Jefferson’s most noble utterance, the Declaration of Independence.

Presidential Papers

Nearly a year after Thomas Jefferson retired from the presidency to Monticello, he wrote: “I enjoy a repose to which I have long been a stranger . . . my mornings are devoted to correspondence. From breakfast to dinner I am among my shops, my garden, or on horseback among my farms; from dinner to dark I give to society and recreation. . . .”

Last year the Library purchased twenty-four letters, 1810–17, between Jefferson and the firm of Gibson & Jefferson, his commercial agents in Richmond, describing details of his agricultural and domestic pursuits and his financial problems. The letters deal with issues at Monticello and Poplar Forest, Jefferson’s farm near Bedford, such as taxes, the condition of highly prized imported ewes, the treachery of weather, the incompetence of employees, the uncertainties of transport, and the accounts with other agents and suppliers, some of which shattered the repose he initially enjoyed.

One of the earliest of the series, on June 11, 1810, from George Jefferson, the junior partner and Jefferson’s cousin, reported the arrival from Philadelphia of a nail rod, the forwarding from New Orleans of a “box said to contain a map,” and the payment of a Jefferson note for $3,800. On October 5, 1810, Jefferson’s quarterly account with the partners showed a balance of $6,024.80 in their favor.

Contributors to this report include John C. Broderick, Juanita Fletcher, Paul T. Heffron, John McDonough, Oliver H. Orr, Paul Sifton, Russell Smith, David Wigdor, and Ronald S. Wilkinson.
In October Jefferson wrote to his cousin, "I now dispatch a cart for the two ewes. . . . The bearer James takes with him provisions for them on their journey. . . . He will be a safe hand to bring the box of silver goblets. . . . As soon as our river gets up I shall have a considerable crop of flour to send to you for sale, from here, and probably Bedford, also. From this place we shall also send a small crop of tobacco, perhaps about 12,000 Ib. . . ." On the sixteenth he asked that the second volume of Pleasants' collection of the laws of Virginia be sent to him. George responded that the ewes were under way in James' cart although possibly infected with scab, that the goblets were aboard the cart, and that the volume of laws was not yet published.

In March 1811 Jefferson wrote that his flour shipment from Poplar Forest had been delayed since the mill dam there had been washed away twice by heavy rains and asked that about $3,000 from sale of his tobacco be applied to reduction of his note due a Richmond bank. In April he was in immediate need of thirty-two yards of cotton damask for tablecloths and asked that it be sent by stage. Despite invitations to Monticello, Jefferson's young cousin found it difficult to visit his distinguished kinsman. In the fall of 1810 he wrote that he had been ill for two months, and his "long promised visit to Monticello" postponed. "If, however, I should be unable to visit you during this month I certainly will before long without regard to the season. . . ." It is not certain that George Jefferson made the visit. In 1811 he was appointed consul to Lisbon. There are no further letters from him and he was reported lost at sea.

There are no letters in the series for the period 1812-14, during the trying years of the War of 1812 and the embargo that stopped Jefferson's shipments abroad of wheat and tobacco and created serious financial stress for him, a condition aggravated by substandard yields and an unsatisfactory overseer at Poplar Forest.

"Your favor of the 18th is received," he wrote to Patrick Gibson on March 24, 1816, "and informs me how much the quality of my tob[acco] falls short of what I had been given to expect. This afflicts me not merely as to the first loss, but also as it injures the reputation of that tob[acco] which has heretofore commanded high prices. . . . This miserable turnout of the last year will barely carry me through the present one extra burthened as it has been with between 900 and 1000 D[ollars] state and Congressional taxes."

Having placed Joel Yancey in charge of Poplar Forest, he was more optimistic about the future, adding: "I willingly look forward to pleasanter assurances of my new manager. . . . We are prone to believe what we wish and to that wish I add that for your health and happiness."

The responsibilities of operating the Poplar Forest plantation required Jefferson's presence there three or four times annually for visits of some three weeks' duration. On September 29, 1815, he wrote to Gibson from the Bedford site, "I have been here since the 20th of last month. . . . During this time no letters addressed to me have been transmitted on account of the slowness and uncertainty of the cross mail. . . ." With the sheriffs of both counties asking for taxes along with other demands, he added, "The season not admitting the grinding of wheat, nor the state of the rivers its being boated down, I must ask the indulgence of the bank for another thousand dollars. . . ."

Despite these trials Jefferson found time in his busy retirement for the joys of intellectual pursuits and the gracious living that the shipments of silver goblets and damask indicate. In June 1816, he wrote: "In July last you were so kind as to remit for me to John Vaughan 550 D. This was for wine and books I ordered from Marseilles, Leghorn & Paris. . . . I should wish these parcels to be sent up by Johnson or Gilmer, and to be trusted to no other person. . . ."

Heretofore in private hands, these letters are now available for study in the Manuscript Division. Jefferson scholars will find them of interest and value for interpreting the retirement years of our third president.

**Manuscript Narratives**

Coincidentally, the Manuscript Division received in 1975 two manuscript narratives or memoirs, both recorded by very young men venturing forth into very different parts of the world in the middle of the nineteenth century. As a form of historical documentation these items are far less common than journals or diaries and usually lack the immediacy of such contemporaneous accounts. Nevertheless, they document history and add the quality of retrospection. In terms of style, of course, they have every opportunity to be superior to a contemporary diary.
Micajah McGehee*  

Ann Landis McLaughlin and Ellen Landis McKee, great-nieces of Micajah McGehee, have presented to the Library of Congress his manuscript narrative of the fourth and fateful expedition to the West made by John Charles Frémont in the years 1848 and 1849. Portions of this 218-page document, which McGehee entitled "Rough Notes of Rough Times in Rough Places," have been published through the agency of members of the McGehee family in the Century Magazine, March 1891, and in Outdoor Life, May 1910. LeRoy R. and Ann W. Hafen utilized these two sources, as well as a manuscript version of the account prepared for Outdoor Life, in publishing "Micajah McGehee's Narrative" in Frémont's Fourth Expedition; a Documentary Account of the Disaster of 1848-1849 [(Glendale, Calif.: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1960), vol. 11 of the Far West and the Rockies Historical Series, 1820-1875, pp. 143-73]. Allan Nevins has indicated that Stark Young, the Mississippi-born author and critic, enabled him to obtain the original of McGehee's journal while writing Frémont, Pathmarker of the West (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1939). Therefore, the existence and importance of the McGehee narrative have long been known, and the abbreviated published versions have been taken into account in making assessments of Frémont, the small band of men who followed him into the frozen and stormy Rocky Mountains in the winter of 1848-49, and the tragedy that befell them there.

However, the youthful, enthusiastic, and courageous Micajah McGehee had much to say concerning the expedition before and after the episodes in the mountains, and his manuscript narrative thereby makes a new and not uninteresting contribution to the story of those phases of the expedition. Moreover, a close collation of the original narrative with the largely uncritical published versions may affect to some degree the understanding of the events in the mountains. Several primary accounts in addition to McGehee's exist, including one in the Manuscript Division by Charles Preuss, the expedition's topographer. Where there are so many possible points of conflict it is useful to have available for examination McGehee's own manuscript, rather than the accounts heretofore attributed to him, with their omissions, transpositions, and corrections.

McGehee's narrative concerns the expedition that assembled in St. Louis in the fall of 1848, inspired by Senator Thomas Hart Benton of Missouri and led by his intrepid and already famous son-in-law, John Charles Frémont. The purpose of the venture was to discover routes across the Rocky Mountains to California, especially a railroad route approximately along the line of the thirty-eighth parallel. Such a "Central Route," promoted by Benton as spokesman for the West, would serve to connect St. Louis with San Francisco. A successful and dramatic expedition would also help offset the effects of a court-martial verdict against Frémont resulting from charges of mutiny and disobedience during the war with Mexico. Micajah McGehee, therefore, happening "in St. Louis, Mo. in the Fall of 1848, and having long entertained an insatiable desire to explore the trackless wilds of the Far West, the Grand Prairies, the Rocky Mountains and California," joined Frémont's party just as it was about to set out. Only twenty-two years old at the time, McGehee was a native of Mississippi, the son of a judge, and fairly well educated. The account of his experiences is frequently presented in the form of a journal, the preparation of which may well have resulted from recourse to "rough notes" kept along the way. In the opinion of the Hafens there is internal evidence that the narrative was prepared within at least ten years of the events described, and it is possible that it was recorded much sooner.

Departing St. Louis on October 3, 1848, the expedition proceeded up the Mississippi and Missouri rivers to Westport, Missouri, and then went overland along the line of the Kansas and Arkansas rivers to Pueblo (in present-day Colorado). Although it was late in the year to be undertaking such a trip, the season was chosen deliberately to determine the feasibility of the route for winter rail traffic. According to McGehee, there were thirty-six men in the group. Two dropped out before the Rockies were reached and the famed mountain man Old Bill Williams (William Sherley Williams) was taken on as a guide in Pueblo. The journey westward across the Great Plains appears to have been altogether enjoyable to the youthful McGehee. Camp life, the sweep of the landscape, the changing weather, the antics of the mules, the encounters with Indian tribes, the prairie fires, and the varied wildlife of the plains all captured his attention. The great herds of buffalo could be relied upon to make a special impression, and in late October, as the expedition approached the Arkansas River, Mc-
Gehee observed: “The buffalo now appeared in immense numbers, the prairie being literally black with them. Countless bands covered the prairies as far as the eye could reach darkening the plains with their numbers. They did not appear in single bands, but in continuous bands, a dense moving mass, continually in sight and at a distance resembling a dark forest. The whole prairie is cut up by their trails.”

Three or four buffalo were killed every day for the expedition and McGehee judged the meat “most excellent,” and, by those accustomed to it, “much preferred to beef.” As far as the “voyageur” was concerned, as long as he was “amongst buffalo and with a plentiful supply of tobacco,” it was a “season of the most perfect enjoyment.”

Pueblo was reached on November 21, and on the twenty-sixth the expedition entered the Rocky Mountains, “which had been for days looming up before us, presenting to view one continued snow storm.” Encountering deep snows, subzero temperatures, and high winds, men and animals struggled on day after day. The further they went, the more obstacles they met. As McGehee remarked, “difficulties beset us so thick on every hand as we advanced, that they seemed threatening to thwart our expedition; but it was determined to continue as long as one chance remained.” Forage for the mules was nonexistent, and they began eating ropes, blankets, and, finally, each other’s tails and manes. Before long, they were dropping on the trail from exhaustion and being left to die; others froze to death in camp at night.

On December 17 it was found that the expedition, high in the San Juan Mountains, could force its way no farther. After it had been immobilized for five days, and with provisions almost gone, the decision was made to head south for the valley of the upper Rio Grande, where it was thought that the main body of the expedition could subsist upon game while a special party sought assistance in the settlements below. The chronology in McGehee’s narrative becomes confused in the interval between Christmas Day, when the first relief party left, and January 11 or 13, when Frémont is reported as having set out with a second relief party. Whatever the date of Frémont’s departure, McGehee recorded a callous remark made by the expedition’s leader to the effect that “if we wished to see him we must be in a hurry as he was going on to California.” Hardship was piled on hardship, however; with the mules dead and abandoned far to the rear and supplies exhausted, all were faced with starvation. Raphael Proue, a veteran of Frémont’s three previous explorations, was the first to die. The remnants of the expedition struggled to the frozen valley of the Rio Grande, where little or no game was found. Of this time McGehee wrote: “Now commenced a train of horrors which it is painful to force the mind to dwell upon, and which memory shrinks from.” Eventually, ten of the men who had entered the mountains died of starvation and exposure. At one point McGehee’s group found the carcass of a wolf which they parcelled out and devoured—hide, hair, and bones—over the course of three days. Cannibalism was suggested by someone (McGehee purposely omits his name from the narrative) but was not resorted to.

Relief finally came on January 25, after more than sixty days had been spent in the mountains. Alexis Godey, in Frémont’s advance group, had come upon some Indians who helped in reaching the nearest settlement. After assembling the few provisions and mules available there, the valorous Godey, accompanied by several Spaniards, made his way back up the course of the frozen Rio Grande, gathered up all the survivors, who were strung out over scores of miles, relieved their distress to the point that they could travel again, and escorted the group to civilization.

Micajah McGehee, who had had less experience in the wilderness than most of the others in Frémont’s party, had somehow managed to survive. Pondering this, he wrote:

It was curious to hear different men tell of the working of their mind when they were starving. Some were constantly dreaming or imagining that they saw before them a bountiful feast, & would make selections of different dishes. Others engaged their minds with other thoughts. For my part, I kept my mind amused by entering continually into all the minutia of farming, or some other systematic business which would keep up a train of thought, or by working a mental solution of mathematical problems, bringing in review the rudiments of some science, or by laying out plans for the future, all having a connexion with home & after life. So, in this way, never allowing myself to think upon the hopelessness of our condition, yet always keeping my eyes open to every...
chance, I kept hope alive & never once suffered myself to despond—and to this course I greatly attribute my support—for there were stronger men who doubtless by worrying themselves, hastened their death.

After recuperating in Taos, New Mexico, and stations along the way, most of the survivors went on to California with Frémont, following the Rio Grande and then the Gila route to the coast. Although McGehee's remaining adventures are naturally anticlimactic, he devoted nearly seventy pages to them. To one who had not been tested as he had been in the mountains, they might have provided memories enough for a lifetime, since they included encountering the seemingly strange ways of Spanish culture and civilization, traversing hostile Apache country (where he was fired upon at close range), and joining the hordes headed for the gold fields of California. McGehee's narrative concludes somewhere west of Tucson. He did reach California, however, and remained there for many years, becoming alcalde of Big Oak Flat and a representative from Tuolumne County in the California legislature. He returned to Mississippi sometime in the early 1870s to be with his aged father, contracted pneumonia there, and predeceased his parent by forty days on August 21, 1880.

N. Byron Smith

Another manuscript narrative, relating to the years 1851-53, bears the imposing title: "History of a three years' whaling voyage. Being a true and authentic narrative of the accidents, incidents and
events which happened during a voyage, taken by
the author, to the Indian and North Pacific Oceans,
in the years 1851, 2 & 3. During which time he
twice visited the Ochotsk [Okhotsk] sea in quest of
whales, the Sandwich, Marquesas, and other islands
of the Pacific; Giving the appearances, manners,
customs, laws &c. of the inhabitants; also, a
description of the islands, their products, climate,
probable origin &c. &c.; together with a complete
description of the process of catching whales, cut-
ting in the blubber, trying out and stowing down
the oil &c. &c. By N. Byron Smith." Remarkably
enough, the title is accurate, for N. Byron Smith,
over the space of 148 numbered folio pages, pro-
vides a Baedecker of the whaling grounds and ports
of call of several seas, as well as a manual of the art
and science of whaling. The manuscript, which is
undated, is the gift of Theodore Brewster of Wash-
ington, D.C.

In August 1851, in gratification of "a longing
desire . . . entertained almost from infancy," Smith
left his native Pennsylvania and went to New York
City, "determined on taking a sea voyage." Such
determination could readily be fulfilled in 1851 and
Smith signed aboard the Nile, a whaling vessel of
400 tons capacity sailing out of Greenport, Long
Island. In exchange for his services he was to
receive 1/190th "lay," his calculated share in the
profits from the oil to be taken. Delighted at the
prospect of adventures to come, Smith wrote that
with him "all went merry as the marriage bell."
The Nile departed on September 1, 1851, and
"struck" its first whale on the fifth day out. It was
a small one, however, and made only twelve to fif-
teen barrels of oil. After stopping at the Azores
early in October to take on additional crew mem-
bers, the Nile sailed south past Tristan da Cunha
and rounded the Cape of Good Hope, passing se-
veral hundred miles to the south of it. Few whales
were taken and one of these, left secured alongside
the Nile overnight, was attacked by scores of sharks
who devoured the carcass "at a terrible rate."

Proceeding across the southern rim of the Indian
Ocean, the Nile crossed whaling grounds that had
once been "quite productive" but in 1852 were
"scarcely noticed by whalemen." The Bay of Is-
lands in New Zealand was reached in mid-Febru-
ary, and Smith went ashore for the first time in
almost six months. The visit there was very brief,
however, for the ultimate destination of the Nile
was the Sea of Okhotsk, the most northwesterly
arm of the Pacific, nearly enclosed by the Kam-
chatka Peninsula and the Kurile Islands. Of this
enormously long and lonely leg of the journey
Smith remarked, "We saw a sail but very seldom,
and a 'spout' no oftener." Yet the capture of a
ninety-foot whale, which proved to be the largest
taken on the voyage, put Smith in a reflective
mood: "How grand and full of stiring emotions is
the thought, that a handful of puny men should
venture out upon the stormy ocean, thousands of
miles from land, in a mere cockle-shell as it were,
to pursue the huge monsters that roam the unfath-
omable depths of ocean—the acknowledged kings
of the whole finny tribe."

The time of arrival was intended to correspond
as nearly as possible with the breakup of the ice
in the Sea of Okhotsk. Yet even late in May the
ship encountered fields of ice covering the sea to
the northward. The weather was intensely cold and
there were no fires aboard. Fog, violent snowstorms,
and frozen decks all had to be contended with as
the Nile tried to keep pace with the slowly reced-
ing ice. As many as two or three thousand whales
were seen in a few days' time, but even in June the
severity of the weather made it impossible to lower
and pursue them. When the weather cleared Smith
went out in a boat for the first time and took part
in a capture that resulted, after the "trying out,"
in approximately one hundred barrels of oil. On
some days as many as fifteen ships could be seen
at a time with "a thick column of black smoke
rising from the deck of each one of them" as they
boiled down blubber.

On the whole, the Nile's prizes were "few and far
between," and tempers grew short. In a fight in the
forecastle the third mate was stabbed, although not
seriously, and his assailant was spread-eagled in
the rigging for several hours and drenched with
buckets of cold water to "cool his temper." Capt-
ain Conklin, before leaving Long Island, had been
placed under bonds to keep the peace, for he had a
reputation for abusing the sailors under his com-
mand. He was, nonetheless, an "excellent seaman
and whaler." As early as August, with the re-
turn of colder weather, the Nile headed south for
the Sandwich Islands. Since she had stowed down
only seven or eight hundred barrels of oil, it ap-
The first page of the heavily corrected rough draft and the final version of Loyalist merchant Joseph Taylor's memorial to the Loyalist claims commissioner in Halifax, April 29, 1786. The memorial recapitulates Taylor's losses appeared that it would be necessary to spend three or even four seasons on the whaling grounds before the ship would be filled.

Honolulu was reached on October 12, 1852, and, with upwards of four hundred whaling vessels visiting the islands, the harbor was a forest of masts. Allowed to go ashore with one dollar in his pocket for a "season of relaxation," Smith examined the town in great detail, from its grog shops, "the general places of resort for seamen in all seaports," to its churches. During the winter months the Nile also visited the Marquesas, but on February 25, 1853, the ship once again "started for the cold, desolate regions of snow and ice, far, far away to the north."

Smith was not assigned to go out in a boat until mid-June, and on that occasion the whale that was being pursued with "a stroke of his tail stove nearly the whole bottom of the boat in, and fairly well raised it out of the water." The entire boat crew was soon rescued but had to sit in wet clothes in a cold downpour throughout the day and on into the night before returning to the Nile.

The summer season of 1853 was a rather successful one, with as many as seven whales taken in a single week. Of these busy days Smith wrote:

Although no very important or particular accident or incident occurred while taking all these whales, yet their...
capture was attended by a number of those which always accompany the exciting and dangerous operations of whaling, such as long, hard, and many times fruitless pulls, "striking" and then have the irons "draw," lines "sounded out," boats upset and sometimes stove, boats being lost in the fog, together with many other of various kinds which go to make up the haps and mishaps of a whaling voyage.

Prospects for returning home had at first been good, but by September 18, when the Nile was forced to pass out of the Sea of Okhotsk, she was still 1,100 barrels short of a full cargo. Upon arrival in Honolulu, which had been ravaged by smallpox, it was announced that the Nile would be returning for a third year on the northern whaling grounds. Discharges were refused, but Smith had had enough. With the help of a friend he slipped aboard the Harriet Hoxie, a merchant ship, and stowed away. His rights to share in the Nile's cargo of oil were, of course, forfeited, but they amounted to only fifty dollars, a "small pittance" for his liberty. On the night of March 12, 1854, the Harriet Hoxie reached New London, Connecticut, where Smith after an absence of two and one-half years, and having circled the globe, once more "set foot upon American soil," a free man.

Political, Military, Diplomatic, and Social History

The Lovering-Taylor Family Papers

The Library has received from Richard S. Lovering, Jr., a group of family papers which depict the American Revolution from the unusual perspective of Loyalist merchants. When Joseph Taylor, a prosperous Boston merchant, was forced to flee in March 1775, he left behind a thriving shipping business and a large inventory. Undaunted, he set up business in British-occupied New York City, where he remained until the British left that metropolis at the end of the hostilities. He thereupon removed to Halifax, Nova Scotia, and was active both as a trader and as a promoter of the Associated Loyalists in that province. The Lovering-Taylor collection documents the fortunes of Taylor and his heirs after the close of the American Revolution up to the 1880s.

In addition to revolutionary items, the Lovering-Taylor Family Papers cover transatlantic commerce, the effects of the quasi-war with France, the lengthy French spoliation claims, and mercantile insurance (from Boston to Europe and to the Orient); a large number of papers pertain to international commerce in the nineteenth century. Because of the far-flung interests of the various Taylor firms, these papers encompass English, Canadian, and American business practices.

Undeniably, the aspect of this collection which will attract the largest amount of scholarly interest in the Bicentennial period will be the Loyalist merchants' perspective on the American rebellion against the British crown. Two parts of Joseph Taylor's career in the collection are of unusual interest. There is a full file on Taylor's dispute with his erstwhile contractual copartner, George Leonard, over payment from the British government for outfitting Rhode Island and other New England Loyalists to interdict rebel shipping off the southern New England coast, 1778–79. Another tantalizing glimpse into Taylor's daily business activities in occupied Manhattan emerges from his letterbook, which covers the period January 1778–July 1779. Although little of Taylor's wartime (outgoing) correspondence is present in the collection, there is compensation in more than 140 letters of his partner in London, Samuel Rogers, covering the period 1778 to 1785.

Although, understandably, much of the Taylor-Rogers correspondence pertains to the vicissitudes of transatlantic trade, the letters also tell us a great deal about subjects of more general interest. Mixed with the seriousness of the mercantile and political situations was the somewhat querulous and abrasive relationship of the two business partners separated by more than three thousand miles of ocean.

Taylor early points out a missed business opportunity to his London counterpart. On January 18, 1778, he wrote from Manhattan to Rogers in London: "Government insure the Vessels against the Enemy, & the Policy of Insurance against the Seas &c; would remain with them as a Security in part—Since you left me I could have made an advantageous Purchase of a Ship, & get her instantly into Service, which in less than 15 Months would have cleared herself, & paid all Charges—"

Two months later, on March 11, 1778, Taylor spelled out in some detail the complexities and difficulties of trade in occupied New York:

Business for these Last two Months Past has been exceeding dull Owing Principally to a Prohibition laid
upon any Dry goods being Carried either to Long Island or Staten Island and as Our Chief Trade was with the Long Island People it must sensibly Affect us we are told when the winter is Over and the Ships can Cruize with Safety the Restriction will be taken off as the Prohibition was Laid On Out of the Quantity of goods Smuggled into New England—for these Several days Past we have had Reports which are currently believed that Lord Howe has given Orders to the Superintendant not to admit to an entry any Vessel from England without Permission from him Or their Having a Special License from the Board of Admiralty [.] if License are Necessary to be Obtain'd you will do your Indeavour to Procure one for the goods you may think best to Send [.] it is the Opinion of many People here that the troops will be withdrawn from Philadelphia & NewPort for my part I cannot believe they will from either Places.

Soon after news was received in London of the signing of the various Franco-American treaties of cooperation (concluded February 2), Samuel Rogers wrote to his partner on March 16, 1778, of the probable effect of that alliance: “The late alteration of measures seems to have abolished the Idea of Conquest, and those who were on the American Side of the question here (and you know who they are) are generally of opinion that the Americans will not accede to the proposals [of the Carlisle Peace Commission], and consequently that there can be but a very small market for Goods.”

The British government’s lack of realism in sending the Carlisle peace commissioners (February to November 1778) was, according to Rogers, only symptomatic of a wider malaise among the British public concerning the American rebellion and the effect of France’s entry on the American side:

... I expect that your next Letter will give a gloomy account of the Prospect your Side. And I am sorry to say that we can write you nothing from this, that is encouraging. The Spirits of People are exceedingly depressed. Apprehensive of an European War, yet having no confidence in the Persons who are at the Head of Affairs and who, as far as yet appears, are still to guide the Nation. Glamour & Discontent is daily increasing and the Ministry are so far from having pleased the Nation by the conciliatory Bills as they are called that they are [more] disdained than ever. It is this day reported that some of the Minority Politicians are to be employed—it is very probable, I believe it is necessary. I was informed two days ago, ... it was the design of Government in case the Commission should fail to relinquish the War by Land. ... However I am clear in this, that if you perceive not a prospect of the Commissioners agreeing with the Congress. It will be necessary to get our affairs into a small Compass immediately, for there will be no hope from the exertions of Government.

By January 6, 1779, however, Rogers was able to put a more positive face on the matter:

With regard to Politics there is a calm occasioned by the recess of Parliament[,] we are however given to understand that fresh Efforts will be made to reduce the Congress to their Senses; as far as I can observe People here are more sanguine in the expectation of what will be done than they have been before, ever since my arrival in England. The Hostilities of the French have in great measure united the nation, should such an union be as perfect as in the last war the Force of this Country will still be found astonishing.

Most of Rogers’s letters for the remainder of the war (1779–81) contain far less military and political discussion; economic and mercantile considerations tended to outweigh more general topics as the tide of war ran in America’s favor. Although many other letters might be selected to illustrate the difficulties of a transatlantic partnership in the postwar period, Rogers’s letter of April 27, 1783, touches upon its risks and personal disagreements. One citation might well stand for the majority of letters from Rogers for the 1782–85 period:

Am I never to have any Money at Command and enabled to appear in a Line of Credit with other merchants? I am certain that if you would repose more confidence in my management of a share of the Property on this side, you would be benefitted by it as well as myself. We all know very well that Trade in general has been very dull at New York for a long time past, and the Attempts to force it must necessarily be attended with Risque and hazard; you have been unwilling to remain without doing a considerable Share, and have therefore set on foot various Speculations, but the Result I fear has not been pleasing; Strangers have been employed and trusted, and some of them, according to Reports brought here have deceived you. Now had I the same Money here to Command I would undertake to make as great a Profit of it in the course of the year, as you could expect from these Speculations, and I should not risque the Principal.

The Lovering-Taylor Family Papers enrich the Library’s resources for the study of American Loyalist activities in this country and in Nova Scotia, of nineteenth-century transatlantic commerce, and of the long controversy over the French spoliation claims (1790s to 1880s). The collection complements material in the Joseph and Grace Galloway Papers, the proceedings of the Loyalist Claims Commissioners, Audit Office 12 and 13 (Loyalist claims filed in the United Kingdom), the Causten-Pickett Papers, the H. Bartholomew Cox Collection, and numerous other reproductions from Canadian, British, and American archives in the Manuscript Division.
The Shippen Family Papers

It is particularly appropriate that in this Bicentennial period the Shippen Family Papers, which had been on deposit in the Library since 1930, have been converted into a gift to the nation by Edward and William B. Shippen. At the outbreak of the American Revolution, two members of the prominent Pennsylvania family were already among that province's most distinguished citizens. Edward Shippen (1728/29-1806) served in a number of important posts, including the provincial council and the various provincial and state courts, and rose successively through several judgeships until he was named chief justice of Pennsylvania (1799-1805). His cousin, William Shippen, Jr. (1736-1808), a physician and pioneer teacher of anatomy and midwifery in the American colonies, had taken his degrees in London and Edinburgh. While in London in 1760, he married Alice Lee, sister of Francis Lightfoot, William, Richard Henry, and Arthur Lee. On April 11, 1777, Dr. Shippen was appointed chief physician and director-general of the Continental Army hospital by the Continental Congress. Shippen's military career was a stormy one, but he was acquitted by a court-martial of charges of financial irregularity in his department. His postwar medical career was unusually distinguished, culminating in his appointment as professor of anatomy, surgery, and midwifery at the University of Pennsylvania.

Because of the political, judicial, and medical connections of Edward and William Shippen, Jr., the Shippen Family Papers contain letters of a number of prominent correspondents including Thomas Jefferson, Francis Scott Key, Lord Lansdowne, Henry Brockholst Livingston, Speaker of the House of Representatives Nathaniel Macon, Secretary of State Richard Rush, and the young American diplomat William Vans Murray. As might be expected, the collection is unusually rich in the letters of the Lee and Shippen families: Arthur Lee is represented by 34 items, Richard Henry Lee by 61 items, Chief Justice Edward Shippen by 13 items, and Dr. William Shippen, Jr., by 148 items. Other correspondents include Edmund Burke, Albert Gallatin, Jared Ingersoll, Luther Martin, James Madison, Rembrandt Peale, Caesar Augustus Rodney, John Rutledge, William Short, Judge Bushrod Washington, and George Washington.

The Dictionary of American Biography notes that although Dr. William Shippen, Jr., had attained the prestigious professorship mentioned above in 1791, "after the death of his only son, a young man of great promise, in 1798 he seems to have lost his interest in life. His health gradually declined, his practice fell off, and he seldom lectured." In this connection, it is particularly interesting to turn to the papers of his son, Thomas Lee Shippen, which are very well represented in the collection. The son of a prominent physician, and a nephew of the President of the Continental Congress Richard Henry Lee, Thomas Lee Shippen arrived in Europe in 1786. His travel diaries, journals, letters, accounts, and memorandum books reveal a very perceptive young man with entrée into the best circles of London and Paris society.

Soon after his arrival in Paris in January 1788, Thomas Lee Shippen was taken in hand by the American minister to France, Thomas Jefferson. It is the connection between the perceptive young Pennsylvanian and the older and far more renowned Virginian that offers the scholar material for judging Jefferson's effect upon his contemporaries. Since Thomas Lee wrote frequent and copious letters to his father, we can trace Jefferson's effect on the younger man with some accuracy.  

On February 19, 1788, Jefferson had arranged for young Shippen to be presented to the Court of Versailles:

Yesterday was the finest day I ever saw, the brightest Sun, the clearest air, the most delightful temperature. I improved it by going with my best friend Mr. Jefferson to Versailles. He had made choice of that day to present me to the Court, and he introduced me as nephew to the President of Congress. The etiquette of Versailles requires that all persons who are presented at Court shall have some pretensions to that honor from rank, and it has established, that in case of Republics where there are no hereditary distinctions, those of office shall be substituted. Those therefore who have held high offices in Republics, or they who are nearly related to them, and those only are allowed to make their bow to the French Court. It seems to me a most unnecessary & absurd regulation, as a man who possesses the confidence of his Country in a sufficient degree to be entrusted with her affairs abroad, must be supposed adequate to the task of making choice of persons fit to be presented at ye Court where he resides. . . . The ceremony is rather tedious, but carries through the whole of it so much novelty to a Stranger, and so much of Oriental splendor & magnificence, that it is certainly well worth seeing once.

After a description of the lengthy, tedious, and complex preliminaries to a royal audience, young
Shippen, in a prophetic passage, muses on the real cost of Versailles to the French nation:

The situation of this superb building is worthy of its grandeur, and both well suited to the Court of a great Nation. Lewis the 14th seems in this as in all his other works to have consulted nothing but the grandeur and glory which ought to shroud his person & adorn his reign. He did not once consider when he expended here 50,000,000 of Louis d'Or, how many thousands of his subjects were doomed to want & wretchedness, nor did he discover until exhausted nature had left him on his death bed, that the greatest glory of a Monarch consists in the happiness of his people. In his last moments he is Said to have enjoined the Dauphin to protect & comfort his people, and to do what he had never been able to do himself, in making them happy—The fact was that he had never made that his object, until it was in his power no longer to pursue it.

The conclusion of the February 20, 1778, letter from young Shippen to his father contains a particularly telling comparison between the American minister, Jefferson, and the courtiers who surrounded him at Versailles:

I observed that although Mr. Jefferson was the plainest man in the room, and the most destitute of ribbands crosses or other insignia of rank that he was the most courted and most attended to (even by the Courtiers themselves) of the whole Diplomatic corps—The King is bound up by etiquette to distribute his monosyllables among those of Ambassadorial rank—consequently he was an exception. This proved to me that substantial sense, extensive acquirements & unimpeached integrity command even among those who cannot boast of their possession, respect, veneration & applause, and that they are preferred by all to empty ornament and unmeaning grandeur, when they give themselves time to weigh the intrinsic properties of each, and coolly to form the result. I observed too in the midst of all their splendor an uneasiness and ennui in their faces which did not bespeak content or happiness: And this conspired with every thing I had seen before, to convince me that a certain degree of equality is essential to human bliss. Happy above all Countries is our Country where that equality is found, without destroying ye necessary subordination.

That Thomas Lee Shippen greatly valued his friendship with Jefferson can be clearly seen in passages from his March 25 and 26, 1778, letters to his father:

Mr. Jefferson is in my opinion without exception the wisest & most amiable man I have seen in Europe . . .

If you will write a letter of thanks to Mr. Jefferson I will thank you. He has supplied to me the want of you better than I thought it could have been supplied, and if anyone but yourself were the father, the son could not lose by the substitution.

Bearing a seventeen-page booklet of travel advice, written entirely in Jefferson's own hand, Thomas Lee Shippen and his friend John Rutledge set out in April 1788 on a trip which included Belgium, Flanders, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and France. The Shippen Family Papers contain Shippen's travel journals for these countries, as well as for the United Kingdom and Ireland, and his later correspondence with his young wife and family up to the period of his untimely death in 1798. Space does not permit an extended description of the many interesting nineteenth- and twentieth-century papers of the later Shippens. This valuable family archive provides an extremely rich and detailed glimpse into American and European society at the close of the eighteenth century and demonstrates the continuing
prominence of the Shippen descendants in the following century. The Shippen Family Papers form a fitting complement in the Library's Manuscript Division to the papers of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and several other seminal figures in the establishment of the American Republic.

Robert W. Bingham Papers

Among the many Americans who have represented the United States as ambassador to Great Britain, none was more popular than Robert Worth Bingham (1871–1937), who held that post from 1933 to 1937. The record of his successful diplomacy is illustrated through the correspondence, diaries, and newspaper clippings in his papers, but more visible public tributes came in the form of honorary degrees from Oxford, Cambridge, London, and St. Andrews. At the time of these awards, he was the only American ambassador to have received degrees from both Oxford and Cambridge and the only non-British citizen to have been so honored by the University of London.
Robert Worth Bingham was born in Orange County, North Carolina, in 1871. He graduated from the Bingham School in Asheville, founded by his great-grandfather, and attended the universities of North Carolina and Virginia before receiving a law degree from the University of Louisville Law School in 1897. Bingham established a practice in Louisville and became active in local affairs, serving as county attorney of Jefferson County, Kentucky, mayor of Louisville, and chancellor of the Jefferson County Circuit Court. In 1918 he acquired the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times and began a career as one of the South's major independent publishers.

The Courier-Journal and Times had achieved a national reputation and had enjoyed a profound regional influence under the editorial leadership of Henry Watterson, Bingham's predecessor, but the new publisher moved the papers steadily into the vanguard of reform politics. The persistent editorial support of the League of Nations and woman suffrage reflected Bingham's advanced progressivism, a social philosophy that he may have inherited from his father, who advocated free public education for blacks during the Reconstruction era. The Bingham Papers contain evidence of his careful attention to the editorial policy and management of the Courier-Journal and Times, and there are extensive exchanges of correspondence and memoranda between Bingham and his editors and reporters. He attracted able journalists such as Herbert Agar and Ulrich Bell to his newspapers. Bell, his Washington correspondent, served as an effective liaison officer during Bingham's tenure as ambassador.

Bingham's stature as a publisher was an important element in his success as ambassador, for it provided points of departure with which to establish useful relationships with the principal figures in British journalism. His experience in business and finance was also valuable for his role in international politics, for many of the most salient features of Anglo-American diplomacy between the wars involved monetary stabilization, war debts, and trade. Bingham had developed an understanding of the domestic sources of these international economic problems during the 1920s, when he had devoted considerable energy to developing cooperative marketing associations for American tobacco growers. Correspondence, unpublished reports, transactions of proceedings, and newspaper clippings in the collection provide important sources for his work with the Dark Tobacco Growers' Cooperative Association, the National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Marketing Associations, and the Business Men's Commission on Agriculture.

Although the Bingham papers span the period from 1918 to 1937 and document his family, business, political, and philanthropic interests, the bulk of the collection, numbering approximately 10,500 items, is concentrated in the years 1933 through 1937, the period of his service at the Court of St. James. He had a long-standing interest in American foreign policy; Franklin D. Roosevelt considered appointing him to the cabinet as Secretary of State, but the post went to Bingham's old friend and political associate Cordell Hull. The prospect of representing the United States in Great Britain, however, was an inviting one, for Bingham had visited there often and enjoyed a wide circle of acquaintances. The Bingham family traced its origins to John de Byngham of Nottingham, a knight during the reign of Henry I, and the ancestral home, Bingham's Melcombe, one of the most charming manors in Dorsetshire, was held by the family from the thirteenth century until the early twentieth century. Rev. Charles William Bingham, who had an important career in the nineteenth-century West Country, was immortalized as Parson Tringham in Thomas Hardy's Tess of the D'Urbervilles.

Although Bingham observed on the eve of his ambassadorship that "there was a more wide-spread feeling of hostility towards the U.S. than I had seen here in all the years I had visited Great Britain," he became a major architect of Anglo-American understanding. Historians will find the collection particularly useful for study of the London Economic Conference, the question of war debts, the movement for a reciprocal trade agreement and international monetary stabilization, and the endless disarmament negotiations. There are provocative glimpses in the papers of the debate within the Roosevelt administration on foreign policy. Bingham wrote from London, the principal listening post for world politics, of "the sufferings of the Jews in Germany," agricultural production in the Soviet Union, and Japanese ambitions in the South Pacific.
Though his fondness for Great Britain was widely recognized and occasionally criticized, Bingham was a firm advocate of national interest as the touchstone of effective diplomacy. With regard to naval disarmament, he told Norman Davis, who led the American delegation to the London Naval Conference, that “the only way to deal with the British was to notify them definitely that we were finished, and let them stew in their own juice . . . ,” and in an era of moralism in international affairs, he argued that “sanctions through mere moral force alone cannot be imposed upon powerful and warlike brigands.” Throughout his years in Great Britain, however, he combined affairs of state and society with characteristic discreetness and delicacy:

At six o'clock I went to call on Lady Airlie, who was going away for a short time, and I took occasion to talk to her about the community of interests between the British and ourselves on the naval situation with relation to the Japanese. I did this not only on account of her high intelligence and because she is a wholly trustworthy friend, but also because I thought she would probably tell the King about it.

Robert Worth Bingham died in 1937 shortly after he resigned his diplomatic post. These papers, the gift of Barry Bingham, Sr., constitute an important record of his creative role in journalism, politics, and diplomacy. Other collections in the Library that they complement are the papers of Henry Watterson, the Reid family, William Allen White, Josephus Daniels, Joseph Pulitzer 2d, Cordell Hull, Charles Bohlen, Joseph E. Davies, Breckinridge Long, and Laurence A. Steinhardt. The Filson Club in Louisville, Kentucky, has a collection of Bingham papers concerning the years 1879–1917.

Thomas Riggs Papers

Born on a Maryland estate established by his family in the eighteenth century, Thomas Riggs (1873–1945) embarked upon a long and vital life that spanned not only seven decades but the North American continent as well. Following his student days at Princeton in the early 1890s, Riggs pursued careers in business, engineering, and government service, and he played an active role in Democratic party politics from the Progressive era to the New Deal. He was a lumberman in Alaska and in the western states, and, after a year of prospecting during the Klondike gold rush, he served as chief of party on the Canadian Boundary Survey (1903–5) and on the Alaska Boundary Survey (1906–13). Riggs supervised the construction of government railroads in Alaska before his appointment in 1918 as territorial governor, an office he held until 1921. His subsequent career in business and public service included the vice presidency of the Macassa Mines and terms of office with the United States-Canadian International Boundary Commission and the Alaska International Highway Commission. He maintained an interest in Democratic politics throughout his life, attended national conventions, and campaigned vigorously for candidates. In the election of 1936, he urged voters to hold fast to the Jeffersonian principle “that the few could only be prosperous through prosperity of the masses.” “Let us not experiment with Landon,” he implored, “but go forward with Roosevelt.”

The Thomas Riggs Papers consist of approximately seven thousand items and contain materials that are unusually suggestive for the many phases of his varied career. Correspondence, diaries, manuscripts and galleys of books and articles, newspaper clippings, unpublished reports, and photographs illuminate his family, business, professional, political, and literary interests. The papers span the period from 1892 to 1944, with the bulk of the material concentrated in the years 1900 through 1920. Riggs was an inveterate diarist, and his notations, although frequently sketchy, extend from his college years at Princeton until 1944 and include remarks upon the daily events of his multifaceted experience. His correspondence contains exchanges with Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Franklin K. Lane, Key Pittman, Gifford Pinchot, and Josephus Daniels.

Abundant materials exist in the collection on the political, economic, and cultural development of Alaska from the last decade of the nineteenth century through the conclusion of Riggs’s tenure as territorial governor in 1921. The papers amply document his search for gold in the Klondike, his survey activities relating to the international boundary, and his sensitivity to the unsettled currents that characterized territorial Alaska in the Progressive era. The record of his efforts as governor to preserve the integrity of the Eskimo culture, to win the confidence of a nascent labor movement, to chart a steady course in the transition from terri-
tory to statehood, and to maintain sound political relationships with Washington and the "lower 48" adds new insight to our understanding of this critical era in Alaskan history. Riggs's involvement in Alaskan life continued after his governorship and his departure from the territory. A member of the Alaskan delegation to the Democratic national convention in 1928, he loyally remained at the steamy hall to cast the delegation's vote for Al Smith while his colleagues pursued more alluring prospects in Houston. His interest in Alaskan politics and culture frequently converged in later years, as reflected by the dying Woodrow Wilson in a gracious acknowledgment of a gift on July 19, 1923:

The work of the Eskimo artist on the mastodon ivory which you were kind enough to send me interests me very much indeed. It seems to me very cleverly done, and I should like in some way to have my appreciation made known to the artist himself. . . . It distresses me that conditions so favorable to Alaska which maintained during your governorship should have been disturbed, and I hope that some day we may have an opportunity of giving Alaska once more the kind of government she deserves.

A fondness for the strenuous life that Riggs developed as a young man persisted throughout his life, and at the age of seventy-one he recorded the following incident from a Canadian fishing trip in his diary: "I caught 4 nice bass. We had quite a meal. 3 breed guides. They cooked fish for delicious lunch. Mme slipped on rocks and broke both bones in left leg. Improvised litter to hospital at Parry Sound." At moments like this in the twilight of his life, Riggs may have recalled similar experiences from his youth in Alaska, such as the incident noted in his diary on February 18, 1899:

Mack went down in #2 today. As we are going to work on #2 tomorrow we didn't strain ourselves extra hard although we managed to keep busy. After we cleaned out the first fire M went up for a load of wood & I started to cut out a new bucket. Louie went up to 27 to help Fritz get the cabin in order & then C & I took down about two buckets to 4 & rocked them out getting $7.00. M & I put in another fire & just then a cry was heard from the creek—"Tom Riggs. Oh Tom Riggs come here." I came & there was A. dead drunk & not able to get up the hill and A.M. also drunk but not so drunk. I helped them up the hill & escorted them up to 4 & came home when ______ came down on the rush because Aileen had gone off into a fit of some kind. Mack & I went up & I rubbed her spine until Mack had given her a shot of heart stimulant & she had come around. We then waited until she went to sleep & then came home & went to bed.

The Thomas Riggs Papers, a gift from Dr. John Beverley Riggs, complement other collections in the Library, such as those of the Riggs family, Henry T. Allen, Eilihu Root, Key Pittman, and William Mitchell, as well as the records of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America, Diocese of Alaska, and the many collections relating to the Progressive movement.

Joseph P. Tumulty Papers

For many years scholars have found the collections of the Manuscript Division indispensable for studies of the Woodrow Wilson era. One of the most frequently consulted collections for this period has been the papers of Joseph P. Tumulty (1879-1954), private secretary to Wilson during his governorship of New Jersey (1911-12) and his eight years in the White House. The first installment of the Tumulty Papers came to the Library in 1960 as a gift of Joseph P. Tumulty, Jr. This original installment, moderate in size (about twenty-three hundred items), has been significantly augmented over the past ten years through the further generosity of the Tumulty family. Large additions have come as the gifts of Joseph P. Tumulty, Jr., and of Dr. and Mrs. Philip Caulfield.

The Tumulty Papers now number approximately fifty thousand items and predominantly extend in time from 1913 to the early 1940s. They thus form one of the division's major groups of papers, not only for the Wilson period but for Democratic party politics from the end of World War I to the beginning of the Second World War. With the exception of their use while in family hands by John Blum in the preparation of his book Joe Tumulty and the Wilson Era (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951), researchers in general have not had access to the entire collection. Now fully organized with an accompanying finding aid, all of the papers may be examined with advance permission.

The contingencies of New Jersey political life in the first decade of the twentieth century brought
Joseph Tumulty and Woodrow Wilson together. The association of the scholarly, intense Presbyterian president of Princeton, unschooled in practical politics, and the genial Irish Catholic state legislator from Jersey City's Fifth Ward was an unlikely one. It began in 1910 with Tumulty's opposition to Wilson's nomination for governor. Thrown together during the campaign, however, Tumulty changed his opinion of Wilson and worked diligently for his election. Thereafter, upon the advice of James Kerney, editor of the Trenton Evening News, Wilson appointed Tumulty his private secretary. Two years later Tumulty, at the age of thirty-three, went to Washington with the newly elected president, for whom he worked in the same capacity until March 4, 1921.

Tumulty arrived at his position from modest beginnings. Born in Jersey City on May 5, 1879, Tumulty received his early education in the parochial schools. From there he went to St. Peter's College, earning his degree in 1899. After studying law in a Jersey City law office, he was admitted to the bar in 1902. Four years later Tumulty was elected to the state assembly, serving until his appointment as the governor's secretary. In reviewing Blum's biography, Henry Steele Commager characterized Tumulty as a man whom Wilson needed, not only for his political acumen and loyalty but for his personal qualities of humor and simplicity.

The White House staff had not assumed its latter-day proportions when Tumulty assumed his duties in the executive office. Consequently he had to fill a variety of roles and perform a multitude of tasks. He drafted letters and speeches, screened congressional visitors, managed the patronage, dispensed political intelligence to the president on the basis of his wide reading of the nation's newspapers, and dealt personally with the reporters. For this period of his life, clearly the high point of his career, the Tumulty Papers provide very full documentation.

Several segments of the papers are essential for tracing the presidential years. The first is a series of chronologically arranged letterbooks in sixteen volumes (1913–21) containing copies of Tumulty's outgoing correspondence. Although a considerable portion of the material concerns routine matters, a careful reading reveals much about his role in patronage, as well as his overall direction of the myriad details of the Wilson administration. The researcher will wish to supplement the letterbooks with the special and general correspondence series. For information on Tumulty's continued interest in New Jersey politics, attention should be given to his exchanges with James Kerney. For his influence on domestic policies and foreign affairs, the correspondence, memorandums, and dispatches to the president are basic and of greatest value. All of this material, of course, should be used in conjunction with Wilson's own papers for a complete picture of the relationship between the two men and the development of administration policies. Other important Tumulty correspondence for this period was with Ray Stannard Baker, William G. McAdoo, Newton D. Baker, Albert S. Burleson, Thomas Gregory, William J. Bryan, Robert Lansing, and Gilbert Hitchcock. Fortunately, for purposes of comparative study and as supplements, the researcher will find collections for all of these prominent Wilsonians in the Manuscript Division.

The papers also contain important material for the months of Wilson's physical incapacity (1919–20). Included are memos from Tumulty to Mrs. Wilson bringing urgent matters of state to the attention of the stricken president, all tending to confirm the vital role of the president's wife during this critical period. Worthy of special mention too are Tumulty's communications with the president while the latter was in Europe and his memorandums at the time of the treaty fight in the Senate. One other item for the White House years should be singled out: Tumulty's so-called Black Book. This loose-leaf volume consists of a state-by-state analysis of the condition of the Democratic party, assessments of the political leaders in each state, and recommendations for federal positions. The Black Book will be of foremost interest to students of state political history; herein they will find frank and astute contemporary appraisals of key Democratic politicians throughout the then forty-eight states. This document will likewise provide helpful material for case studies of the patronage system in Wilson's administration.

For the years after he left the White House the Tumulty Papers will be of most use to those interested in the fortunes of the Democratic party during the period of Republican ascendency and, to a lesser degree, for the earlier years of the New Deal. Tumulty himself, declining appointments to the Customs Court of Appeals and the Canadian-
American Joint Commission, began practicing law in Washington. He maintained a high interest, however, if not influence, in Democratic party politics. His law office and luncheon table at the old Shoreham Hotel were the scenes of regular gatherings of political friends. He also carried on a wide correspondence with prominent Democrats throughout the country about the future of the party. Governor James M. Cox, Ohio publisher and Democratic nominee in 1920 for president, was an intimate friend, and the papers contain extensive files of his letters. James Kerney's correspondence continued, and letters relating to party matters were exchanged frequently with such persons as Bernard Baruch, Cordell Hull, Newton D. Baker, Carter Glass, and Joseph E. Davies. Tumulty was an ardent supporter of Alfred E. Smith in 1924 and again in 1928, and there are several files of correspondence with the New York governor. Though he supported Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932, their relationship does not appear to have been particularly close. He was a good personal friend of James A. Farley, but there is no evidence of influence on New Deal policies in the correspondence.

Other files for the post-presidential years document in some detail the extent and nature of Tumulty's law practice, his business affairs, his family life, and his personal and social interests. The dominant theme in Tumulty's life running through the papers was his abiding faith in the political principles of Woodrow Wilson. As he expressed himself to Jim Kerney on his next-to-last full day in office: "As I saw the President yesterday pass my window upon the conclusion of the Cabinet meeting, trudging wearily along, groping his way back to the White House, I felt that in this man, our great leader to the end, there was the real hope of the world."

Cultural History

Horace and Anne Montgomerie Traubel Papers

In 1975, as for the past twenty years, Gertrude Traubel of Philadelphia and Charles E. Feinberg of Detroit augmented the Horace and Anne Montgomerie Traubel Papers with gifts of significant additional material. The collection as now constituted includes correspondence, manuscripts of Horace Traubel's books and articles, tear sheets of the latter, notebooks, scrapbooks, and miscellaneous material. A collection of more than fifteen hundred cartoons received with the papers was transferred to the Library's Prints and Photographs Division several years ago. Some of the later correspondence in the collection is that of Anne Montgomerie and Gertrude Traubel.

Horace Traubel (1858-1919) was a native of Camden, New Jersey. Self-educated after the age of twelve, he was employed as a young man in various printing and journalistic trades, often with his father, a printer, engraver, and lithographer. When Walt Whitman moved to Camden in 1873 following a paralytic stroke, the Traubels befriended him, and Horace grew to become the poet's close friend, literary executor, and "Boswell." From 1890 until his death Traubel edited the Conservator, whose pages were filled with articles of information about and interpretation of Whitman. Traubel became in the twentieth century a spokesman for American socialism and, though he took no active part in politics, a supporter of Eugene V. Debs. In 1891 Traubel married Anne Montgomerie of Philadelphia, who was his partner in intellectual enterprises and who survived him. The collection of Traubel Papers has been preserved through the years by their daughter, Gertrude, one of the two principal donors of the Library's collection.

There is a good deal of correspondence in the papers from Traubel's fellow workers for American socialist causes, such as George D. Herron and Debs. A number of writers are also represented, including Charles W. Chesnutt, Hamlin Garland, and George S. Viereck. Most of the correspondence, however, like most of Traubel's life, is concerned in one way or another with Walt Whitman, his achievement and his reputation. There is, accordingly, correspondence with other officers of the Walt Whitman Fellowship, such as Gustave Wiksell and Dr. Isaac Hull Platt, with other members of Whitman's circle, such as Nellie O'Connor, Thomas B. Harned, and John Burroughs, and with a growing number of writers interested in Whitman's life and work. A good example of the latter was the French biographer Leon Bazalgette. A series of about forty letters and postal cards from Bazalgette over a fifteen-year period are in the Traubel Papers, starting with one of July 29, 1903, which begins: "I take the liberty of writing to you, as I trust my having been a most faithful reader and a strong admirer of Walt
Whitman for about ten years will sufficiently introduce me to you."

Bazalgette called Traubel's attention to deficiencies in earlier listings of French books and articles on Whitman, supplied a preliminary list, and announced his plan ("the most endeared of my literary schemes") to write a book on Whitman ("it will be a labour of love to me"). Over the next few years Traubel supplied Bazalgette with information about Whitman. "I cannot say otherwise: you spoil me," Bazalgette wrote Traubel on January 20, 1904, "Such a warm and true friendship I never met with." Bazalgette's work on Whitman appeared in 1908, followed by his two-volume translation of Leaves of Grass. The correspondence continued, however, though much interrupted because of World War I. In one letter, August 5, 1917, Bazalgette noted: "(I enclose a wild poppy plucked on a battlefield.)" Toward Bazalgette, as toward all Whitman enthusiasts, Traubel played a sympathetic and supporting role. His service to Whitman studies cannot be measured merely by his own publications.

Traubel carried on an extensive correspondence with William F. Gable, owner of Gable's department store in Altoona, Pennsylvania, and a highly successful merchant who, remarkably, espoused the causes of pacifism and socialism. Gable (1856-1921) was a notable collector of English and American literary books and manuscripts and historical autographs and imprints. He was described as "Big of Body, Broad of Mind and Great of Heart." William R. Hotchkiss said of him: "I never knew a man who so definitely possessed the bold and manly characteristics of Walt Whitman as did William Gable." Perhaps it was the resemblance to Whitman that endeared Gable to Traubel. However that may be, scores of American literary figures made Altoona a stopping place during Gable's lifetime.

The extensive Gable collection of books and manuscripts was sold at the American Art Association in New York in eight parts, beginning November 5-6, 1923, and ending April 16, 1925. Among the several thousand items were about two hundred pertaining to Abraham Lincoln. There were also numerous and valuable manuscripts of Swinburne, Thoreau, and Whitman, among others, but the highlight of the sale was undoubtedly Robert Burns's famous letter (signed "Johnie Faa") to Charles Sharpe, April 22, 1791, which brought $2,460 at the initial sale November 5, 1923.

Gable's legendary generosity expressed itself in financial contributions to Traubel and the Conservator. Traubel reciprocated with regular letters (not in the collection) which kept Gable in touch with the worlds of art, intellect, and socialist causes. There are hundreds of Gable's letters in the Traubel Papers. The following excerpt from a letter of July 31, 1907, characterizes Gable as a person and partially explains the nature of his admiration of Traubel. It was obviously written in reply to Traubel's objections to his financial generosity:

"Dear friend & Comrade, and all round big, broad and generous Man, I got a good Traubel letter that time—it was part of yourself, and you showed me your heart as never before, and you ring true and sound. You said some big, true, and grand things in that letter—why that letter's worth more, than all the banknotes you object to! I admire you immensely for feeling as you do—only wish I was up the hill far enough, to enjoy the Horizon you see and enjoy. You are big, broad, brave, independent and Magnificent enough to spit on Money! That's right—I'll spit with you, but take any that comes from a fellow spitter, and use it as a weapon to help on the Cause.

Another letter begins: "You're all right! True blue, all through! You're a Man, made of a mighty good grade of Mud!"

Despite his editorial career, his own literary output, and the numerous compilations of Whitman's writing which he oversaw in his capacity as literary executor, Traubel's most famous publication was With Walt Whitman in Camden, a record of his conversations with the poet from 1888 on. He was able to publish only three volumes during his own lifetime. Two additional volumes have been published, the fourth in 1953, edited by Scully Bradley, and the fifth in 1964, edited by Traubel's daughter, Gertrude, in whose custody are manuscripts for additional volumes, one of which is in active preparation. The volumes are one of the principal sources of information on Whitman's opinions. In addition, many letters and documents were printed therein for the first time.

The Library's Traubel Papers contain autograph manuscripts, typescripts, and some galley proofs for the five published volumes. In the preface

Horace Traubel in his printing shop at 1631 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, from which he published the Conservator. Photograph by Allen Drew Cook, 1912. LC-USZ62-55925
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The weather seems to be improving. It is getting warmer. I hope it will continue so.

I have not heard from the office today. I expect to hear from them soon.
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I have not heard from the office today. I expect to hear from them soon.

I am afraid we are not going to have a good crop this year.

I hope it will be better next year.

I have not seen Mr. Smith for a long time. I expect to see him soon.

I am going to visit the city tomorrow.
to the first volume, Traubel wrote: "My story is left as it was originally written. I have made no attempt to improve it. I have taken nothing off and put nothing on. . . . Here is the record as it virgially came from my hands in the quick of the struggle it describes. . . . I trust in the spontaneity of their first inspirations." Anne Montgomerye Traubel gave Sculley Bradley the following account of her husband’s methods:

The notes of the visits to Whitman were written on small bits of paper to fit into the pocket of his jacket, and were written in what he called "condensed longhand," in the dim light of Whitman’s room. Within the hour of the words spoken, the material was put into the complete form with which you are familiar in the three published volumes. There was no vacuum of time or emotion, thus preserving the vitality of the original conversation.

The manuscript evidence in the Traubel Papers does not permit full acceptance of these accounts of Traubel’s methods of writing *With Walt Whitman at Camden*. There are no “small bits of paper” in the collection. The earliest stage of composition is probably that represented by the manuscript of volume 5. It is 73⁄4-by-12½-inch ledger paper folded to make four writing surfaces per individual sheet. On each surface Traubel has written his account in a narrow three-column format. That this version is nearly contemporary with the conversations it records is suggested by the existence, for example, of an additional sheet for May 12, 1889, written on the inside of an opened envelope addressed to Traubel and bearing a postmark of May 7, 1889. (In this practice Traubel was imitating Whitman, many of whose manuscript jottings are on opened envelopes or the backs of incoming letters.)

The existing autograph manuscript for volume 1, however, was written more than ten years after the 1888 conversations which it records. It is written in part on the back of undated Contemporary Club stationery and on the memoranda forms of the club’s treasurer. It is also written on the back of Walt Whitman Fellowship stationery, some carrying the date 1897–98 and some, 1902–3. The manuscript for volume 2 is also on undated Contempo-
Melvin Beaunorus Tolson Papers

"I seem to get the best results when I’m writing both prose and poetry—that is, going from one to the other, one stimulating the other, one recuperating the other." So confided Melvin B. Tolson in one of the moments of introspection revealed by his many jottings of half-thoughts and by the snatches of poetry and bits of prose sprinkled here and there in notebook and journal. The papers of Melvin Beaunorus Tolson (1900–1966), poet, professor, poet laureate of Liberia, and mayor of Langston, Oklahoma, were the gift of his wife, Ruth Southall Tolson, to the Library of Congress in 1975. They consist of about thirty-five hundred items, mainly literary manuscripts and correspondence concerned with literary matters. The collection is rich in the purely personal, however, and in opportunities to observe the poet’s art in process, for although no original papers relate to early Tolson or his family, his oftentimes bright and sometimes poignant accounts of his memories make his early years and his relationship with his family leap to life. In his notes and ruminations one can catch flashes of the future power of a poem and watch as he captures a fragment of a thought and bothers it until it has relevance and meaning and rhythm and song.

About his childhood in Moberly, Missouri, where he was born in 1900, Melvin Tolson comments with wry amusement on the leveling influence of poverty: "In my school we were Irish, German, Polish, Negro, Italian, Jewish, and Mexican. But we were all together and the same. We were poor." And he summons the spirit of New Years past with:

Of Irish, French, Indian, and African bloods, the members of the clan gathered on New Year’s Eve, the Christians sipping eggnog, the sinners guzzling hard liquor. The young listened, wild-eyed and hush-mouthed, as elders spun Homeric tales, dipped snuff, smoked clay pipes, and belly-laughed at inferiors, white and black. I was puzzled by the fact that Justice and God were invariably on the side of the clan . . . .

Melvin Tolson was the son of an itinerant, self-educated Methodist minister, who had a penchant
for learning Latin, Greek, and Hebrew and for taking correspondence courses, and a gentle Negro-Indian mother, who had a lovely singing voice, invented amusing rhymes, and introduced music to her four children while they were infants. Indeed the Tolsons had their own musical ensemble in which they performed vigorously on occasion for the entertainment of their friends, but most often they played and sang from the sheer joy of engaging in music together. The experience on Tolson was indelible. Music abounds throughout his poetry, in cadence, rhythm, terminology, and sound. And in his finest moments, his lyrics sing. Music also pervades his prose, whether in one of his novels, plays, lectures, or speeches.

Tolson's fascination with music is apparent among the several drafts of his works in the Tolson Papers, as he worked musical terms into his titles or tried out various rhythms and sounds. One of his novels, *Dark Symphony*, for example, is orchestrated into divisions subtitled "Allegro Moderato," "Andante Sostenuto," and "Lento Grave." He literally set his ode *Libretto for the Republic of Liberia*, a work commissioned by the Liberian government for its centennial celebration, to a diatonic scale, naming each section a note, making the first and eighth sections "Do" tonic, and the fifth section "Sol" dominant. Sometimes his rhythms become the intricate, full-throated strum of a classical guitar, as in this excerpt from the *Libretto*:

Lia! Lia! The river Wagdu, the river Bagana,  
Became dusty metaphors where white ants ate canoes,  
And the locust Portuguese raped the maiden crops,  
And the sirocco Spaniard razed the city-states,  
And the leopard Saracen bolted his scimitar into  
The jugular vein of Timbuktu. Dieu seul est grand!

Sometimes he combined rhythm and meaning into a finger-popping beat, as in *Harlem Gallery: Book I, The Curator*:

Old Satchmo's  
gravelly voice and tapping foot and crazy notes  
set my soul on fire.  
If I climbed  
the seventy-seven steps to the Seventh  
Heaven, Satchmo's high C would carry me higher!  
Are you hip to this, Harlem? Are you hip?  
On Judgment Day Gabriel will say  
after he blows his horn:  
"I'd be the greatest trumpeter in the Universe  
If Old Satchmo had never been born!"

In the *Libretto*, he "kept the faith" with his "S-  
Trinity of Parnassus," as he called it, and synchronized sight, sound, and sense, using the hissing sound of serpents to achieve a sinister musical effect describing the fall of an African empire:

And now the hyenas whine among the barren bones  
Of the seventeen sun sultans of Songhai,  
And hooded cobras, hoodless mambas, hiss  
In the gold caverns of Faleme and Bambuk  
And puff adders, hook scorpions, whisper  
In the weedy corridors of Sankore. Lia! Lia!

Chronologically, Melvin Tolson belongs to the period of the Harlem Renaissance—that heady, self-assertive, literary phenomenon among "New Negro" artists which began during the early 1920s and ended with the depression in the mid-1930s. Tolson was actually one to three years older than Renaissance poets Langston Hughes, Sterling Brown, and Countee Cullen. Yet his papers bear out what has often been remarked about him: at the height of the Renaissance, Tolson was on the outside looking in. His first book of poetry, *Rendezvous with America*, was not published until 1944. Even then, recognition of his talent as a poet was sluggish and short-lived.

But the Tolson Papers show that during those beginning years of the Harlem Renaissance he was busy becoming a dynamic, creative, influential college teacher, and that as early as high school in Kansas City, Missouri, he was developing diverse interests, a characteristic energy in accomplishments, and an enthusiasm for people which were to remain with him throughout his life.

In 1918 Tolson entered Lincoln University in Oxford, Pennsylvania, where he won undergraduate awards and honors in debate, drama, oratory, and classical literature and served as an exceptionally effective editor of the college newspaper. He graduated four years later, worked briefly but memorably as a meat packer in a Kansas City plant, and then accepted an appointment as instructor in English at Wiley College, a private Methodist institution in Marshall, Texas. Meanwhile, he received a fellowship in literature from the Rockefeller Foundation and enrolled at Columbia University, where he wrote his master's thesis on the Harlem Renaissance, a study even now considered to be authoritative. He also met and married Ruth Southall, to whom he often paid tribute for her loyalty and loving generosity.

Within the next several years the Tolson family increased to include three sons, Melvin B., Jr., Ar-
thur Lincoln, and Wiley Wilson, and one daughter, Ruth Marie. All three sons, much to their father’s pride, earned Ph. D. degrees. Two became college professors, and the third, a biochemist. His daughter, a librarian, was writing her dissertation for the doctorate when she died in 1976.

Tolson was a remarkable teacher. Letters from former students, news articles, several of his lectures, a folder of biographical material including a vivid, lucid sketch by Jack Bickham, editor of the Oklahoma Courier, and an expertly written, sensitive account of Tolson’s life by Joy Flasch, one of his colleagues, all attest that during the twenty-six years he spent at Wiley and the eighteen at Langston University he was, as Langston Hughes characterized him in the April 5, 1945, Chicago Defender, “a great teacher of the kind . . . which any college might be proud.” Hughes observed further: “It is not just English he teaches, but character, and manhood, and womanhood, and love, and courage, and pride. And the likes of him is found nowhere else but in the great state of Texas—because there is only one Tolson!”

In addition to teaching, Tolson founded and for several years directed a group of thespians, The Dust Bowl Players. He wrote plays and novels and, as debate coach, toured the South and Southwest with his enthusiastic team, leading them to national recognition. They participated in what were probably the first interracial debates (for that region, at any rate). In those days of lynchings and rumors of lynchings, the socially secure black debaters, who were questioning social institutions usually regarded as sacrosanct, aroused the suspicions and hostility of white townsfolk. Tolson himself was a scrappy, outspoken lecturer who advocated such incendiary messages as the need for equal social and political opportunities for black American citizens, the virtues of belonging to the NAACP, and the necessity of ensuring economic justice for white and black sharecroppers. He narrowly escaped with his life on at least two occasions. Joy Flasch quotes a college president as predicting, “Tolson, I won’t be surprised to hear some morning that you’ve been strung up a tree.” After one particularly harrowing incident, Tolson began carrying a revolver for protection.

But of Tolson the poet during many of those years there was mainly silence from the world of letters. Tolson felt it, yet in his typically sensitive way he understood its deeper meaning. On one of his work-sheets is scrawled, “If I had not failed, I would not have succeeded. (My life as a poet.)”

Lack of recognition did not still the poet’s pen. Tolson’s worksheets and drafts, covered with figures of speech and mathematical computations of rhythm and balance, are evidence that Tolson the technician was hard at work. The folders titled “Metaphors and Similes” contain murmurings in Greek, Bantu, French, Swahili, and English. They induce fantasies by little phrases such as “It takes a trinity/To have a lynching bee,” which tantalize the reader into looking, quite in vain, for hidden meaning; or, one is treated to a bit of humanistic wisdom, “When a man loses contact with his fellowman/He contacts God.” He neatly noted in passing “the conspiracy of silence concerning the Negro in American history,” then pressed on to consider “a frost flower in the subsoil of the mind.” Side by side with the tragicomic statement that the “bleaching power of her will left him colorless,” he wrote the rhythmic observation that “any kind of fruit was an apple to the Romans.” The inelegant imagery of “lips, soft and spongy as a marshmellow,” is contrasted with, “a book that leaves stone-bruises on the brain.”

Tolson’s worksheets and notebooks also contain the seeds of his greatest works. Among many examples is the evolution of the pepper bird. Although the continuity was often interrupted by intervening remnants of other topics, Tolson made a study of the life and habits of the African pepper bird, whose main characteristic is that it lives along the African coastline and is wont to split the silence of dawn with its wild, raucous screeches and screams. The bird changed but survived several drafts of Harlem Gallery, emerging in the final version as: “The Harlem Gallery, an Afric pepper-bird,/awakes me at a people’s dusk of dawn.”

Tolson’s attention to poetic design as well as his use of classical allusion and stylized language, which he adamantly refused to simplify in order

One of Tolson’s worksheets for Harlem Gallery, illustrating an early stage in the metamorphosis of the work. The worksheets show that the poet made drastic changes in the poem as he worked toward its final version, which begins:

The Harlem Gallery, an Afric pepper-bird,
awakes me at a people’s dusk of dawn.
The age alters its image, a dog’s hind leg,
and hazards the moment of truth in pawn.

From the Tolson Papers. LCMS–55798–2
Afric's

The Harlem Gallery, like a Pepper Bird,
Awake me at October's dusk of dawn
With the rickrack of ins

Without Sir Henry's havelock,
Always the outsider inside; in my brain,
Always "To ti?" ticks and Australia's clock
Bird's jackass laughs
At daybreak and nightfall, in sun or rain.
Always tick "To ti?" and Australia's clock
Bird's jackass laughs
At daybreak and nightfall in my brain.
Bird with its jackass laughs
At dawn and dusk, in my brain.

No knight of Camelot,
Much have I traveled the Occident's up and down,
Sometimes the sage,
Sometimes the clown;
Always without Sir Henry's havelock,
Always the outsider inside; in my brain,
Always "To ti?" ticks and Australia's clock
Bird's jackass laughs
At daybreak and nightfall, in sun or rain.
Always tick "To ti?" and Australia's clock
Bird's jackass laughs
At daybreak and nightfall in my brain.
Bird with its jackass laughs
At dawn and dusk, in my brain.
to attract a wider audience, are now recognized as creative genius by literary critics. Earlier, however, both the form and language of his poetry drew criticism that the poet was obscure and used a pseudolanguage. When *Libretto for the Republic of Liberia* was published in 1953, Allen Tate remarked in the preface to the book:

... there is a great gift of language, a profound historical sense, and a first-rate intelligence at work in this poem from first to last. On the first page I received a shock, in that region where bored scepticism awaits the new manuscript from a poet not clearly identified, when I saw Liberia invoked as

'... the quicksilver sparrow that slips
The eagle's claw!'

From that passage to the end I read the poem with increasing attention and admiration.

In the introduction to *Harlem Gallery*, Karl Shapiro declares that Tolson “shocks the learned into a recognition of their own ignorance.” Shapiro also stated that despite his use of classical imagery, “Tolson writes in Negro.” Many critics disagreed, and Tolson, seeing himself as a Negro poet concerned not only with race but with people, declared that he spoke Tolson. To charges that his writing was filled with black propaganda Tolson quipped, with characteristic humor, “When a man is standing on your corns, you’re more apt, you know, to think propagandistically than artistically.”

Much has been written of Tolson’s use of metaphor, and his papers give evidence of how he worked to achieve his spectacular success with it. For instance, he toyed with and teased information concerning the torture tactics of the Apache Indians before using it so effectively in “The Battle of the Rattlesnake” to describe the pathos of the sharecropper:

The desert holds
In its frying pan
The bones of a snake
And the bones of a man.
And many a thing
With a rock on its tail
Kills the nearest thing
And dies by the trail.

When *Harlem Gallery* was published in 1965, Karl Shapiro announced in the first sentence of its introduction: “A great poet has been living in our midst for decades and is almost totally unknown, even by the literati, even by poets.” The advent of the book initiated a chronology of events which indicated that at long last Melvin B. Tolson the poet was receiving the recognition he deserved. He retired from Langston University in 1965 to accept the prestigious Avalon chair of Humanities at Tuskegee; he read from his poetry for the president at the White House; he read at the Library of Congress; he received the Annual Poetry Award from the American Academy of Arts and Letters.

In 1965, on the occasion of his retirement from Langston, Tolson, recuperating from an operation for cancer and experiencing the start of the fabulous success of *Harlem Gallery*, told his friends and admirers, “They say I’m retiring, but my work is just beginning.” Then, bravely, he quoted from Frost:

The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep—
And miles to go before I sleep.

But Tolson was not to keep his promises. *Harlem Gallery* was supposed to be only the beginning of a greater work. It was to have been an odyssey of the American Negro and the prologue to Tolson’s greatest effort. Tolson died in Dallas, Texas, on August 28, 1966.

The Tolson Papers are a notable addition to the national manuscript collection. They provide material for studies of cultural and social history, of the contributions of black Americans to the nation, and of classical poetry. Among the correspondents in the collection are Horace Mann Bond, William K. Flowers, Langston Hughes, Gwendolyn Brooks, Karl Shapiro, Jacob Steinburg, and Ida Frances Wilson. Also in the collection are drafts of Tolson’s novels and plays, all rich in folklore and aspects of black American culture. There is also a manuscript of a highly analytical critique of Tolson’s works by Roy P. Basler. The Tolson Papers provide an attractive supplement to the Library’s holdings of Afro-American writers.

**Scientific History**

**Alexander Graham Bell Family Papers**

One hundred years ago in a small laboratory in Boston a young teacher of the deaf made some final adjustments to a device which, he believed, would be able to transmit the human voice through a wire as Samuel F.B. Morse had been able to do with less
complicated sounds. Alexander Graham Bell then spoke through the mouthpiece of his invention to his assistant, Thomas A. Watson, in the next room. The result of the experiment is recorded in an 1876 laboratory notebook in the Alexander Graham Bell Family Papers, donated to the Library by Bell’s heirs in 1975: “I then shouted into M [the mouthpiece] the following sentence: ‘Mr. Watson—come here—I want to see you.’ To my delight he came and declared that he had heard and understood what I said. . . . We then changed places and I listened at S while Mr. Watson read a few passages from a book into the mouthpiece M. . . .”

The first successful demonstration of the telephone was made on March 10, 1876, and on that very day Bell wrote a letter to his parents which contained a prophetic assessment: “I feel that I have at last struck a solution of a great problem—and the day is coming when telegraph wires will be laid on to houses just like water or gas—and friends converse with each other without leaving home.”

Bell’s success had not been attained without a good deal of trial and error. His earliest surviving scientific notebook, dated 1865 (when he was still in his teens), demonstrates that he was already experimenting with phenomena of sound; a sample entry reads “take a bottle, with a pretty wide mouth, and blow into it—a sound is produced . . . in which pitch is clearly audible. Now if you take your hands and, (still blowing into the bottle) gradually close the opening, the pitch descends.” His father, Alexander Melville Bell, was a noted teacher of elocution who had brought his family from Scotland to Canada.

A. G. Bell left his family and immigrated to the United States shortly before he began the series of experiments which led to the telephone. While a professor of “vocal physiology” at Boston University, he spent his spare hours attempting to perfect his “multiple telegraph,” an improvement upon Morse’s device. By the spring of 1875 he was devoting most of his time to this effort, writing to his parents that he was “now beginning to realize the cares and anxieties of being an inventor.” On June 2 he and his assistant Watson made the key observation which enabled the development of the telephone: an apparatus that could reproduce the tone
and overtones of a steel spring could do the same with the human voice. Within less than a year he succeeded in producing an instrument which would convey a one-way vocal message.

Bell's new device was rapidly improved during his adopted country's centennial year. On October 10 he reported to his parents that "yesterday was the proudest day of my life—as marking the successful completion of Telephony." He had succeeded in a long-distance two-way conversation with Watson between Boston and Cambridgeport, Massachusetts, using "a private telegraph line." Bell received a medal for his telephone at the Centennial Exposition but was in reality far from "successful completion." At the end of the year he wrote to his future wife, Mabel Hubbard: "When will this thing be finished! I am sick and tired of the multiple nature of my work—and the little profit that arises from it. Other men work their five or six hours a day—and have their thousands a year—while I slave from morning till night . . . and accomplish nothing but wear myself out." His efforts were not in vain, for he became one of the most famous and honored men in his generation.

Throughout his life Bell felt that his highest calling was as a teacher of the deaf, but the development and success of the telephone helped him to engage in a wide range of activities in science and technology. His many-faceted life is well documented in the large collection of papers (over 120,000 items) donated to the Library, with a group of related photographs, by his heirs in 1975. Hundreds of volumes of laboratory notebooks record the innovative activities which occupied most of his time. Bell kept two distinct series of these memoranda, his "home notes" and "lab notes," which follow his daily work to a remarkable degree. Few scientists have preserved such fertile data for the historian. The volumes contain entries by Bell and his assistants, as well as many drawings. (A separate 1975 gift to the Library is an item of special import, inscribed by Bell: "As far as I can remember these are the first drawings made of my Telephone—or instrument for the transmission of vocal utterance by telegraph." The sketches were presented by one of the donors of the Bell Papers, the inventor's grandson, Dr. Melville Bell Grosvenor.)

For those who would study a classic example of the history of an innovative technological development, the Bell Papers have ample data, from the inventor's first theories (recorded in correspondence and notes), through the experiments that led to the construction of the first working telephone, its demonstration, and the many-faceted activities following that historic day a century ago. The device had to be perfected so that it could be made commercially available and used with ease and facility. One of Bell's drawings depicts the basic necessities of a telephone switchboard or exchange; another, dated January 21, 1879, is a device "intended as a call bell to be placed in private houses—so that one house may be rung up without disturbing the others on the circuit. Each house is to have a bell that will respond only to a certain number of impulses per second . . . Any house can call the central office by pushing a knob which opens the circuit." Information so familiar to us now had to be conveyed to the first curious "subscribers" to the new invention. An early circular assures the user that with "no battery (unless a loud call-bell is required), and no moving machinery, the Telephone is perfectly clean, and always ready, in any office or household where instantaneous communication with any other point is desired . . . NO SKILL is required by the users, except to speak plainly and listen attentively . . . It transmits names, figures, foreign words, or plain English, with equal facility, and as fast as the person speaking would ordinarily converse with one in the same room."

Though the Bell Papers amply document the marketing activities and involved patent disputes which followed, the majority of the items do not trace the history of the device for which Bell is best known. They throw much light on the other aspects of a very productive life. Bell's career as teacher of the deaf is well traced, as are his varied scientific and technological activities. These range from aeronautics (his Aerial Experiment Association resulted in the first powered flight in the British Empire) to eugenics (he maintained an experimental herd of sheep at his summer home in Nova Scotia); from the development of a pioneer hydrofoil to basic research in physics; from financial support of such projects as Science (now the most
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widely read general periodical of the American scientific community) and Albert Michelson’s work on the velocity of light (basic to the development of Einstein’s theory of relativity) to serve as a regent of the Smithsonian Institution and second president of the National Geographic Society. Numerous subject files and more than thirty five thousand pieces of correspondence and related items remain in Bell’s papers to bear testimony that the inventor of the telephone was indeed a many of many parts.

The collection is especially rich in material of interest not only to the historian of science and technology but to the biographer as well, for the Bell Papers are truly a “family” compilation, including extensive correspondence between various members of the Bell clan and families associated by marriage, such as the Hubbards, Grosevors, and Fairchilds. Groupings of papers of certain members of these families, such as Alexander Melville Bell, Mabel Hubbard Bell (A.G. Bell’s wife), and Gilbert H. Grosvenor (his son-in-law), form distinct units of the collection. The large miscellany of photographs, taken by Bell and various members of the family, chiefly Gilbert H. Grosvenor, will be housed as a separate collection in the Library’s Prints and Photographs Division. The photographs are of more than usual interest to the historian; for example, Bell carefully recorded his aeronautical research, which began with the construction of nonpowered devices and culminated with the flight of the Silver Dart, mentioned above, only in his notebooks but by frequent use of his camera. Other pictorial materials in the collection trace the activities of various persons from Alexander Melville Bell onwards and chronicle related events almost to the present. Other auxiliary materials include films and phonodiscs.

The extraordinary extent and depth of the Alexander Graham Bell Family Papers will undoubtedly provide research material for numerous scholars. It is an addition of the highest importance to the Library’s manuscript collections in the history of American science and technology from Benjamin Franklin to the present, which also include the papers of such inventors as John Fitch, Samuel F.B. Morse, and the Wright Brothers.

Marjorie Stinson Papers

The Manuscript Division is well known for its extensive research materials in the history of aviation and aerospace studies, which include, among others, the papers of such aeronautical pioneers as the Wright brothers, Octave Chanute, Grover Loening, Glenn Martin, and Sherman Fairchild, as well as the historical archives of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics and the materials on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century aeronauts assembled by Gaston and Paul Tissandier. These collections extend to the present day and include the papers of contributors to research in the space sciences, such as Wernher von Braun and Charles Stark Draper. With the recent increased interest in the role of women in aviation, it is appropriate that in 1975 the Library acquired the papers of aviatrix Marjorie Stinson.

Miss Stinson was at first somewhat overshadowed by her sister Katherine, who in 1912 was perhaps the fourth woman to fly a powered craft. Yet, the seventeen-year-old younger sister appeared in June 1914 at Orville Wright’s field in Dayton, Ohio, and applied for a course of lessons. As Marjorie recorded in her diary: “In spite of my longest skirt, they had the nerve to ask whether I was eighteen yet and I had to admit that I wasn’t, and in consequence of my ‘infancy’ had to wire home for ‘permission’ to learn to fly.” Her experience was limited to six flights as passenger with her sister, during which she had been “very much occupied with the business of holding on to the struts for dear life.” As she revealed, “I . . . have been unable to persuade Katie to give me any lessons, because, as she put it, she was afraid I ‘might hurt myself’ and so preferred not to teach me.”

Wright, impressed by the young girl’s pluck and determination, enrolled her in his flying school. After a total of four and one-half hours aloft in a Wright Model B, Marjorie Stinson had her license and became the youngest pilot in America.

Returning to San Antonio, Texas, to join the “flying Stinsons,” her sister Katherine and brothers...
Edward and Jack, Marjorie was soon placed in an unusual situation. The First World War had begun, and four Canadians who had enrolled in the Wright school but found it overcrowded wired to Texas to ask if the recent “graduate” would teach them to fly so that they could reach the front as soon as possible. The only craft at Marjorie’s disposal was the family’s Wright pusher, equipped with warping wings. (If the pilot wished to make a turn, he banked the plane by operating a lever and lowering the trailing edges of two of the wings while raising the edges of the other pair.) Worried about the physical fatigue of continued instruction, Marjorie equipped the biplane with hinged flaps, or ailerons, to accomplish maneuvers with less effort, and began her wartime flying school. Eventually as many as sixteen pupils were enrolled at a time, and Marjorie was in the air over six hours a day. Undaunted by the ordeal, she later reminisced that in addition she was sometimes up “at gray dawn . . . in the Wright Model B, chasing coyotes around the field.”

With her new reputation as the “flying schoolmarm,” Marjorie now shared the limelight with Katherine, who had been the first American pilot to succeed in a night flight and had become the most accomplished woman stunt flyer. Katherine married and retired from active flight, but Marjorie continued to barnstorm through the 1920s, appearing frequently at fairs and airports. A contemporary magazine noted, “One of Miss Stinson’s exhibition stunts is to go high in the air, turn her car sideways and drop straight down 1,500 feet, then, when the audience-thrill has reached the maximum, suddenly right herself and sail calmly over their heads. She flies also with her machine upside down, loops the loop, and makes sheer plunges for the amusement of the crowds.” In a 1928 article for Aero Digest, Miss Stinson stated that “flying, you know, never was intended exclusively for mere man anyway.” She and her remarkable sister Katherine had helped to prove the point.

In 1930 Marjorie Stinson moved to Washington and took a position as a draftsman in the War Department. Leaving government service fifteen years later, she devoted much of her time to research into the history of aviation. Living on Capitol Hill, she was a frequent visitor to the Library of Congress. She died in 1975 at the age of seventy-nine.

The Stinson Papers (approximately twenty-two thousand items; 1910–75) are the result of a lifetime of documenting the activities of the “flying Stinsons,” the history of Stinson Field in Texas, and the development of Stinson aircraft. The bulk of the papers date from Miss Stinson’s post-World War II research. Although the proportion of correspondence is not great, there is a very extensive archive of photographs, many of these dating from the second decade of the century and depicting the aviators and craft of the early days of powered flight. In addition, Miss Stinson accumulated many thousands of photocopies of printed and illustrative materials concerning the Stinsons to add to her own early materials. The Marjorie Stinson Papers, when orga-
nized and made available to researchers, will be a valuable addition to the Library's resources in the history of aviation and women's studies.

Reproductions

The Manuscript Division added more than six hundred reels of microfilm to its collections during the year, with the bulk of the accessions representing film editions of Library of Congress collections. Among the major collections now available in film editions are the papers of Frederick Douglass, thirty-four reels; Samuel F.B. Morse, thirty-five reels; Frederick Law Olmsted, fifty-one reels; and Charles Wilkes, twenty-six reels. Outstanding film acquisitions from other repositories included the William Rufus Shafter Papers, Stanford; the Henry A. Wallace Papers, University of Iowa; the Henry A. Wallace Papers, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library; and the Robert Marion La Follette Papers, State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

NOTES

1. In this report and in the list that follows, an asterisk indicates restriction on access to the collection. Information concerning access may be sought through the chief of the Manuscript Division.


3. Quoted in the American Art Association Catalog, November 5/6, 1923.


Listed below are the principal manuscript acquisitions of the Library of Congress that were added to the holdings of the Manuscript Division during 1975. Manuscripts in the fields of law, music, maps, and Orientalia, books in manuscript, and reproductions of manuscripts not of specific interest for U.S. history are described in other reports in the Quarterly Journal.

The arrangement is alphabetical by collection title within the following classified scheme.

I. Presidential Papers
II. Personal Papers
   A. Diplomatic, Military, Political, and Social History
      1. Colonial, Revolutionary, and National Period (to 1860)
      2. Civil War and Reconstruction (to 1900)
      3. Twentieth Century
   B. Cultural History
   C. Scientific History
III. Collections
IV. Archives and Records
V. Reproductions
   A. Domestic
   B. Foreign

Gifts and purchases of a small number of items for addition to existing collections are not always included in the list of acquisitions. Among the benefactors who, by gift or deposit of such material, have strengthened the national manuscript collections are the following:


A key to the symbols used follows:

A Addition
ALS Autograph letter signed
AMs Autograph manuscript
B Bequest
D Deposit
E Exchange
G Gift
N New
P Purchase
T Transfer

* See note 1, page 367.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approximate number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Presidential Papers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Grover</td>
<td>Charles Hamilton</td>
<td>P A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS, 1887, to Robert P. Hayes</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant, Ulysses Simpson</td>
<td>Sotheby Parke Bernet</td>
<td>P/G A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ALS's, 1871–85, to George W. Childs</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopies of other letters</td>
<td>John Mason Rudolph, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Andrew</td>
<td>Bradford W. Welles</td>
<td>P/G A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS, 1813</td>
<td>Alexandria, Va.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS, 1825, to Richard K. Call</td>
<td>Charles Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopies of other items</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph A. Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chattanooga, Tenn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson, Thomas</td>
<td>Hugo O. Stevens</td>
<td>P A</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ALS's to George Jefferson</td>
<td>Richmond, Va.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 ALS's to Patrick Gibson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, Abraham</td>
<td>Rogan Showalter</td>
<td>G/T A</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly photocopies</td>
<td>Fairfax, Va.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See also Collections, Arthur E. Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe, James</td>
<td>Mrs. Myrtle Johnson</td>
<td>G/P A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS, 1783, to John F. Mercer</td>
<td>Mrs. Leonard Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMs</td>
<td>Ossining, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Van Doren Stern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarasota, Fla.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Archives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce, Franklin</td>
<td>Kenneth W. Rendell</td>
<td>P A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS, 1839, to Asa Fowler</td>
<td>Newton, Mass.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt, Theodore</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Archibald Roosevelt</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies of seven letters, 1914–18</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft, William Howard</td>
<td>Charles Hamilton</td>
<td>P A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS, 1888, to John P. Clark</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS, 1915, to Anson Stokes</td>
<td>Carnegie Book Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection title</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Approximate number of items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Presidential Papers—Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, George</td>
<td>Stephen P. Dachi</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopies</td>
<td>Budapest, Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles F. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King Hostick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerald C. Paget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Personal Papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Diplomatic, Political, Military, and Social History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Colonial, Revolutionary, and National Period (to 1860)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay, Henry</td>
<td>Charles Hamilton</td>
<td>P A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ALsS, 1814 and undated</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, Benjamin Brown</td>
<td>a Gatherin'</td>
<td>P A</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynantskill, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovering-Taylor family</td>
<td>Richard S. Lovering, Jr.</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>1,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, Va.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*McGehee, Micajah</td>
<td>Mrs. Ann L. McLaughlin</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Mrs. Ellen L. McKee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chevy Chase, Md.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, N. Byron</td>
<td>Theodore Brewster</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Civil War and Reconstruction (to 1900)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury, William H.</td>
<td>Ms. Mary A. Grant</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence, Kans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglass, Frederick</td>
<td>Mrs. Ann Weaver Teabeau</td>
<td>G/T A</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Fannie Douglass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis family</td>
<td>Mrs. Ethel Lively Watson</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Personal Papers—Continued

A. Diplomatic, Political, Military, and Social History—Continued

2. Civil War and Reconstruction (to 1900)—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approximate number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harlan, John Marshall</td>
<td>Estate of Justice John M. Harlan</td>
<td>B A</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses, Raphael Jacob</td>
<td>Philip Moses</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autobiography</td>
<td>Fenton, Mo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squiers, Charles W.</td>
<td>W. H. T. Squires, Jr.</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autobiography</td>
<td>Henderson, N.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Twentieth Century

*Alsop, Joseph Wright             | Joseph W. Alsop                            | D A      | 20,000                      |
|                                  | Washington, D.C.                           |          |                             |
*Bernays, Edward L.               | Edward L. Bernays                          | D A      | 775                         |
|                                  | Cambridge, Mass.                           |          |                             |
Billings, Warren K.               | Mrs. Gertrude Anderson                     | G N      | 3,600                       |
|                                  | San Mateo, Calif.                          |          |                             |
Bingham, Robert Worth             | Barry Bingham, Sr.                         | G N      | 10,500                      |
|                                  | Louisville, Ky.                            |          |                             |
Brent, Charles Henry              | Roger W. Drury                             | G N      | 19                          |
|                                  | Sheffield, Mass.                           |          |                             |
Cline, Howard Francis             | Mrs. Howard F. Cline                       | G A      | 1,200                       |
|                                  | Arlington, Va.                             |          |                             |
Craig, Elisabeth May              | Mrs. Betty Clagett                         | G N      | 12,000                      |
|                                  | Wheaton, Md.                               |          |                             |
Denny, George Vernon              | Mrs. George V. Denny, Jr.                  | G A      | 1,400                       |
|                                  | West Cornwall, Conn.                       |          |                             |
*Fahy, Charles                    | The Honorable Charles Fahy                 | G A      | 24,000                      |
|                                  | Washington, D.C.                           |          |                             |
Feis, Herbert                     | Mrs. Arline V. B. Pratt                    | G A      | 98                          |
|                                  | Alexandria, Va.                            |          |                             |
*Gertz, Elmer                      | Elmer Gertz                                | D A      | 31,200                      |
<p>|                                  | Chicago, Ill.                              |          |                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approximate number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knox, Katharine McCook</td>
<td>Mrs. Katharine McCook Knox</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landis, James McCauley</td>
<td>Mrs. Ann L. McLaughlin</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chevy Chase, Md.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Jean Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leesburg, Va.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenroot, Irvine Luther Biography</td>
<td>Herbert F. Margulies</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*McGranery, James Patrick</td>
<td>Ms. Regina McGranery</td>
<td>D A</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark McGranery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James P. McGranery, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacVeagh, Franklin</td>
<td>Hanzel Galleries</td>
<td>P A</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery family</td>
<td>Marshall H. Montgomery</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Canaan, Conn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, John Bassett</td>
<td>Yale University Library</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdock, Victor</td>
<td>Capt. Victor Delano, USN</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bethesda, Md.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Niebuhr, Reinhold</td>
<td>Mrs. Reinhold Niebuhr</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stockbridge, Mass.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Honorable Jonathan B. Bingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Niebuhr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albany, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riggs, Thomas</td>
<td>Dr. John Beverley Riggs</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilmington, Del.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, James Alexander</td>
<td>Dr. A. Curtis Wilgus</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Miami Beach, Fla.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, James Louis</td>
<td>James L. Robertson</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Personal Papers—Continued

A. Diplomatic, Political, Military, and Social History—Continued

3. Twentieth Century—Continued

Seversky, Alexander Procoffieff de
Shuster, William Morgan
Diary, scrapbooks

LC Science and Technology Division
T N
100

Mrs. William M. Shuster
New York, N.Y.
G A
10

W. Morgan Shuster (1877–1960), government official and publishing executive, served in 1911 as financial adviser to and treasurer general of Persia. His diary entry for June 3, 1911, is optimistic in tone, but before the end of the year Russian forces entered the country and Shuster resigned. He later told his story in The Strangling of Persia. (New York: The Century Co., 1912). From the Shuster Papers. LCMS-39941-1

June 2, 1911

Wrote family letters for Egypt at 5:30 this morning. Met Ambassador... met him at 5:30 p.m.

June 4, 1911

Wrote family letters for Egypt at 5:30 this morning. Met Ambassador... met him at 5:30 p.m.

June 6, 1911

Wrote family letters for Egypt at 5:30 this morning. Met Ambassador... met him at 5:30 p.m.

June 8, 1911

Wrote family letters for Egypt at 5:30 this morning. Met Ambassador... met him at 5:30 p.m.

June 10, 1911

Wrote family letters for Egypt at 5:30 this morning. Met Ambassador... met him at 5:30 p.m.
### II. Personal Papers—Continued

#### A. Diplomatic, Political, Military, and Social History—Continued

#### 3. Twentieth Century—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approximate number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spivak, Lawrence Edmund</td>
<td>Lawrence E. Spivak Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>D A</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinson, Marjorie Claire</td>
<td>Estate of Marjorie C. Stinson Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>D N</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrell, Mary Church Diaries, 1908–9</td>
<td>Mrs. Phyllis Terrell Langston Annapolis, Md.</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tumulty, Joseph Patrick</td>
<td>Joseph P. Tumulty, Jr. Olney, Md.</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, John Campbell</td>
<td>Mrs. John C. White Chester, Md.</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Donald</td>
<td>Maj. Gen. Donald Wilson Carmel, Calif.</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Cultural History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approximate number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Maxwell</td>
<td>LC Rare Book and Special Collections Division</td>
<td>T A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Typescript and galley proofs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basler, Roy Prentice</td>
<td>Roy P. Basler Sarasota, Fla.</td>
<td>D A</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boorstin, Daniel J.</td>
<td>Daniel J. Boorstin Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>D N</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covarrubias, Miguel</td>
<td>Louis Barragan via Charles H. Woodford Somerset, N.J.</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denker, Henry</td>
<td>Henry Denker New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>D A</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Flanner, Janet-Solita Solano</td>
<td>Solita Solano Orgeval, France</td>
<td>D A</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Janet Flanner via Rizzoli Corporation New York, N.Y.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approximate number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Personal Papers—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Cultural History—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frissell, Varick</td>
<td>Miss Toni Frissell</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Holmes, John Haynes</em></td>
<td>Mrs. Morris L. Brown</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auburndale, Mass.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kroll, Lucy</td>
<td>Ms. Lucy Kroll</td>
<td>D A</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mearns, David Chambers</td>
<td>David C. Mearns</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria, Va.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody, Dwight Lyman</td>
<td>Mrs. Esther Moody Loos</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princeton, N.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss, Arnold</td>
<td>Arnold Moss</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted, Frederick Law</td>
<td>Mrs. W. Crosby Roper</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennell, Joseph and Elizabeth</td>
<td>Kenneth W. Rendell</td>
<td>P A</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newton, Mass.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rukeyser, Muriel</td>
<td>Muriel Rukeyser</td>
<td>D A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gailey proofs and photocopy of draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolson, Melvin Beaunorus</td>
<td>Mrs. Melvin B. Tolson</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traubel, Horace and Anne Montgomerie</td>
<td></td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gertrude Traubel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles E. Feinberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vonnegut, Kurt, Jr.</td>
<td>Kurt Vonnegut, Jr.</td>
<td>D A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafts</td>
<td>via Donald C. Farber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zorach, William</td>
<td>Tessim Zorach</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Scientific History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adler, Alfred</td>
<td>Dr. Kurt Adler</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Alexandra Adler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection title</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Approximate number of items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Personal Papers—Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Scientific History—Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames, Louise Bates-Frances Ilg</td>
<td>Dr. Louise B. Ames</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Alexander Graham</td>
<td>Heirs of Alexander Graham Bell</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>110,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bornstein, Berta</td>
<td>William Kallir</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamaica, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush, Vannevar</td>
<td>Mrs. Roy Blick</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattell, James McKeen</td>
<td>Dr. McKeen Cattell</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garrison, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Kenneth Bancroft</td>
<td>Ms. Jeannette Hopkins</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamow, George and Barbara P.</td>
<td>Mrs. Barbara P. Gamow</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boulder, Colo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gesell, Arnold Lucius</td>
<td>The Honorable Gerhard Gesell</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruenberg, Benjamin C. and Sidonie M.</td>
<td>Dr. Ernest Gruenberg</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poughkeepsie, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guggenheim, Harry Frank</td>
<td>Estate of Harry F. Guggenheim</td>
<td>B A</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loening, Grover Cleveland</td>
<td>Grover C. Loening</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key Biscayne, Fla.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Henry Ladd</td>
<td>Henry L. Smith</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle, Wash.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Neumann, John</td>
<td>Dr. Marina Von Neumann Whitman</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection title</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Approximate number of items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Personal Papers—Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Scientific History—Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman, Alan Tower</td>
<td>Mrs. Roy Blick</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wechsberg, Joseph</td>
<td>Joseph Wechsberg</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vienna, Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolman, Abel</td>
<td>Abel Wolman</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumgart, John David</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. John David Blumgart</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carderock Springs, Md.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinberg-Whitman</td>
<td>Charles E. Feinberg</td>
<td>P/G A</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt Whitman</td>
<td>Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essex, England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Freud, Sigmund</td>
<td>Sigmund Freud Archives</td>
<td>G/P A</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurt L. Schwarz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman, Harry T.-Spanish American Documents</td>
<td>Harry T. Friedman</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, W. Hugh</td>
<td>Lobo Book Shop</td>
<td>P N</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas, Tex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupp, Jan</td>
<td>Jan Kupp</td>
<td>E A</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopies</td>
<td>Victoria, British Columbia, Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, Arthur Ernest</td>
<td>Arthur E. Morgan</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>Yellow Springs, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted, Gideon</td>
<td>William R. Emmons</td>
<td>G N</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Beach, Calif.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Collections—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approximate number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sykes, Velma West</td>
<td>Mrs. Velma West Sykes</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Brown</td>
<td>Fort Collins, Colo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster, Daniel</td>
<td>Bradford Welles</td>
<td>P A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALsS, 1821, 1830</td>
<td>Alexandria, Va.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Archives and Records

| American Council of Learned Societies ACLS | G A | 250 |
| Dictionary of American Biography files     |     |     |

| *American Historical Association*          | G A | 17,500 |
| AHA                                         |     |       |
| Washington, D.C.                            |     |       |

---

Handwritten note:

My dear Sir,

I thank you very much for your kind and friendly letter. The enclosed sheet seems to me at first sight, about which you write—I do not think there is the least danger of any attempt being made to put me down in that way. Leave them, as entirely between ourselves, it is too late. This was more probably you, a year or two ago. The fact is, many things have come, and never, in an open letter, but General (for) is with an — especially on a letter, and even future movement, as we can have it to —

Thy's, my dear Sir, with ever affection,

Slye
IV. Archives and Records—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approximate number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*American Scholar</td>
<td>Phi Beta Kappa Society</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Douglass Memorial and Histor-</td>
<td>Frederick Douglass Memorial and Historical Associ-</td>
<td>G/T N</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iation</td>
<td>ation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Association of Colored Women's Clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Conference on Civil Rights</td>
<td>LCCR</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A letter of February 8, 1830, from Daniel Webster to William Sullivan, a Boston lawyer and Federalist. Webster includes a casual discussion of the immediate background of what became known as the Webster-Hayne debate, the great congressional confrontation on the nature of the Union. Webster's reply to Hayne on January 26 and 27, considered to be one of the most eloquent orations ever heard in the Senate, concluded: "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable." From the Daniel Webster Papers. LCMS-44925-1
### IV. Archives and Records—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approximate number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literary Society of Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Literary Society of Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women—Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>NCJW</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffragists Oral History Project Interviews</td>
<td>Suffragists Oral History Project</td>
<td>G A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*U.S. Senate. Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities</td>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>T A</td>
<td>2,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. Reproductions

#### A. Domestic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection title</th>
<th>Location of originals</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bache, Alexander Dallas</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>5 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley, Robert</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaillé-Long, Charles</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>2 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chennault, Claire Lee</td>
<td>Hoover Institution Stanford, Calif.</td>
<td>12 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary, R.</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chronicas Lageanas: A Record of Facts and Observations on Manners and Customs in South Brazil&quot;</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson, William</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Courcy, William</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglass, Frederick</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>34 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellicott, Andrew</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>2 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force, Peter</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderly book of Gen. Richard Montgomery</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forton Prison, England</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Thomas McKinney</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>3 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Duff</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>118 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull, Cordell</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>3 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection title</td>
<td>Location of originals</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Reproductions—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Domestic—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent, James</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>7 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Follette, Robert Marion</td>
<td>State Historical Society of Wisconsin Madison, Wis.</td>
<td>161 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Charles</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, Benjamin</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, John Pierpont</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signers of the Declaration of Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse, Samuel F. B.</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>35 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers, George A.</td>
<td>Ohio Historical Society Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>8 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association for the Advancement of Colored People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative files, <em>Branch Bulletin</em>, and <em>NAACP Bulletin</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olnsted, Frederick Law</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>51 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peale, Titian Ramsay</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinchot, Gifford</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>4 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico. Secretaria del Gobierno</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>2 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochambeau, Jean Baptiste</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>4 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shafter, William Rufus</td>
<td>Stanford University Libraries Stanford, Calif.</td>
<td>14 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw family</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>4 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story, Joseph</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>4 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tappan, Lewis</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>7 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, Daniel</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uizarron, Juan</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wager, John Philip</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection title</td>
<td>Location of originals</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Reproductions—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Domestic—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace, Henry Agard</td>
<td>University of Iowa Libraries Iowa City, Iowa</td>
<td>121 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin D. Roosevelt Library Hyde Park, N.Y.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitefield, George</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes, Charles</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>26 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Mary College</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodson, Carter Godwin Whitefield McKinlay</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>2 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Foreign</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France. Chartes</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>6 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France. Comité de Sureté Générale F7, 4577-4775, 53</td>
<td>Archives nationales Paris, France</td>
<td>2 reels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France. Controle Général des finances G7, H, and 01</td>
<td>Archives nationales Paris, France</td>
<td>1 reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Colonial Records Project</td>
<td>Archives nationales Paris, France</td>
<td>33 reels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On October 27, 1901, President Theodore Roosevelt celebrated his forty-third birthday, his first since assuming the presidency on September 24 after the assassination of McKinley. “There was no formal celebration, and the day was spent very quietly.”

October 28 was a Monday, and was, therefore, the first day of a new work week for most of the Library of Congress employees, who then numbered more than 261. For a few of them, less than half a dozen perhaps, and for many, many American librarians it was to be the first day of a new era; but most likely neither the few nor the many were fully aware of the era’s birth or of the potential implications it held for both. Births of eras are usually quite clearly seen—at least by those possessed with crystal-clear, rearview vision—for they are often signalized by the firing of a rifle or a cannon, the signing of a treaty or a proclamation, or even the successful launching of a new process or invention. This particular era’s birth was no different in that regard, for on that Monday, Herbert Putnam, Librarian of Congress, who had recently celebrated his fortieth birthday and who, like the president, had been in office only a short time—since April 5, 1899—issued a three-page circular and a four-page memorandum entitled “Distribution of Printed Catalogue Cards by the Library of Congress.” That he did not view it as being a prosaic subject was evidenced eight months later when he declared the project thus launched “the most significant of our undertakings of this first year of the new century.”

The circular contained well over seven hundred words, all of which were by way of announcing to the American library world and the press that “the Library of Congress is now prepared to furnish a copy or copies of any of the catalogue cards (a) which it is currently printing; (b) which it has heretofore printed, so far as copies of these can
be supplied from stock." The circular, mailed to more than four hundred libraries, was accompanied by samples of the printed cards that were being made available to those who might wish to obtain them, a description of the type of material for which the Library was at that time printing catalog cards, an indication of the pricing procedures to be followed in selling the cards, a self-addressed envelope, and an invitation to those libraries and to any that learned of its contents to respond to the circular indicating "whether or not you intend to subscribe and to what probable extent" and "if you do not intend to subscribe, what modifications of the plan proposed would alter your decision." 4

The four-page memorandum on the same subject set forth in some detail the reasons why the Library of Congress had decided that the time had come to proceed along the lines set forth in the circular.

Since the Library of Congress moved into the new building expectation has turned to it. It has already the largest collection of books on the western hemisphere; it is increasing more rapidly than any other single collection. It receives without cost two copies of every book entered for copyright in the United States. It receives these on or before the date of publication, and thus in advance of any other library. It receives an enormous mass of material through exchange. And it is buying a mass of other books, current and non-current, which includes a large portion of material in current acquisition by the other libraries of the United States. It is classifying and cataloguing this material on its own account. It is reclassifying and recataloguing its existing collection (excluding duplicates, over 700,000 books and pamphlets), and is printing these results also on cards. These cards are of the standard form, size, type, and method of entry. The Library has been in consultation for over a year past with a committee of experts—in order to arrive at standards, and we have now arrived at what might be called a standard in all these respects. The card we use is called the "Postal Size," about 3 by 5 inches. There is another size (also standard) in use in some libraries called the "Index Size," about 2 by 5 inches. The entry on our card is so located, however, that in almost every case the "Postal Size" can be cut to the "Index Size" without sacrificing any of the text essential to the catalogue. What the Library prints is an author card. It prints by way of memorandum on the card the subject-headings that it will use on the copies destined for subject cards. The cost to it of the first author card, including the work of the cataloguer, is doubtless over 30 cents for each book. But a second copy of the card can be run off for a fraction of a cent.

Now it is receiving this urgent appeal: To permit other libraries to order extra copies of the cards which will cover books that they are acquiring; just as they are permitted to secure extra copies of the card indexes of the Agricultural Department, or, indeed, of any government publication, paying the cost plus 10 per cent. 5

In short, the Library of Congress, at that time basically a reference library for the Congress of the United States, was announcing its willingness to sell and distribute the results of its standardized cataloging to assist American libraries in gaining bibliographic control over some of the books each library acquired. It is interesting to note that in the same year, 1901, the National Bureau of Standards was created by an act of Congress. As someone wrote concerning its creation: "With the development of science and the growing complexity of industry and commerce the need for stable and accurate standards not only of weight, length, and capacity but also of volume, power, and energy, became more and more apparent." 6 If one, perhaps, might paraphrase that statement with regard to the actions of Herbert Putnam in October 1901, one might write: "With the development of the American education scene, of which libraries comprised an essential component, the need for stable and accurate bibliographic standards became more and more apparent." Before describing the growth and changes that have occurred during the past seventy-five years in the distribution of that standardized cataloging in its various physical forms—cards, proofsheets, books, and, ultimately, machine-readable computer tapes—perhaps it is advisable to step back briefly in time to better understand how Putnam, speaking for the Library of Congress, decided that the time had come to embark upon the course of action set forth in the two documents issued in his name late in 1901.

In examining an idea which has recently surfaced in a viable form, as in examining a plant which has done the same, one frequently finds the historical root structure of the idea, like that of the plant, to be broadly based, extending horizontally far, far beyond the surfacing point. It may also be so deeply based that many of the rootlets and root hairs which provided the essential growth-inducing minerals for its successful emergence are irre-
trievably lost in the unearthing. This is most certainly true of the concept of a central agency assisting in the cataloging of books for people in an area or a nation. It was long before 1901 when some individual wondered, while struggling to describe for bibliographical or other purposes the physical and intellectual dimensions of a book—place of publication, date of publication, author, title, subject content—if perhaps someone had not already traveled this road before. If so, had that person left behind somewhere a sign, some map or guidepost, to ensure that progress would be made down that same road with a minimum of difficulty, error, and expense? If one were to limit the area of detailed examination to that small spadeful of historical data found in the second half of the nineteenth century, one would discover a plethora of articles published on the subject of a central cataloging agency.

A work published in 1902, entitled Bibliography of Cooperative Cataloguing . . . (1850-1902), contained descriptions of 366 articles or works published on this subject in Western Europe, Great Britain, the United States, and Australia. The preface of this bibliography reads: “It will be noticed during the last decade the need of fuller catalogues and more systematic bibliographies in the various fields of literature has been a subject for discussion at numerous conferences of librarians and international congresses of scientists. It is generally conceded that these ends are only to be attained through cooperation and centralization.” An examination of the entries in this bibliography gives an indication of how widespread the idea was for a centralization of the cataloging of the books of a region, an area, or a country, for the places of imprint of the articles literally ranged from A to Z, from Antwerp to Zurich, admittedly no great geographical distance, but they also ranged from Berlin to Bordeaux to Brussels to Boston to Brisbane; from Copenhagen to Chicago and back to Cambridge, Massachusetts; from Venice to Vienna; from Naples to New York; and from Stockholm to Strassburg and on to San Francisco. The idea was discussed on the floor of the House of Commons and within the newly erected, red sandstone walls of the Smithsonian Institution. An 1852 publication written by Charles C. Jewett, librarian of the Smithsonian, with the title . . . On the Construction of Catalogues of Libraries, and of a General Catalogue; and Their Publication by Means of Separate, Stereotyped Titles. With Rules and Examples, was among those cited. The plan set forth was relatively simple, at least in contrast to the title, although its execution was never to take place.

. . . it is proposed to stereotype the [book] titles separately, and to preserve the plates or blocks, in alphabetical order of the titles, so as to be able readily to insert additional titles, in their proper places, and then to reprint the whole catalogue. By these means, the chief cost of re-publication (that of composition) together with the trouble of revision and correction of the press, would, except for the new titles, be avoided. The great difficulty, which has so long oppressed and discouraged librarians, and involved libraries in enormous expenses, may be thus overcome. . . .

Every library, uniting in this plan, [is] to have the right of using all the titles in the possession of the Institution, as often as desired, for the printing of its own [book] catalogue, by the Smithsonian Institution; paying only the expense of making up the pages, of presswork, and of distributing the titles to their proper places.

In short, Jewett was proposing that the Smithsonian print the book catalogs of any American library that asked for and was willing to pay for such a service. Being the recipient agency for copyrighted publications at that time, the Smithsonian possessed the number one essential ingredient of a centralized cataloging agency—a large, regular source of current publications. What it lacked, however, alas for Jewett, was an individual at the head of the agency who would agree to proceed with the plan.

Jewett’s boss, Joseph Henry, secretary of the Smithsonian, invited a committee of five individuals, representing the library and educational interests of the country, to consider the idea. In his letter to them of August 16, 1850, he wrote: “The Smithsonian Institution, desirous of facilitating research in literature and science, and of thus aiding in the increase and diffusion of knowledge, has resolved to form a general catalogue of the various libraries in the United States, and I submit to you for examination the plans proposed by Professor Jewett, librarian of the Institution, for accomplishing this object.” The committee agreed that the idea was a good one and in its reply of October 26 of the same year recommended its implementation. The mem-
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bers concluded their several-page report by stating: "The undersigned consider the permanent superintendence of this plan to be an object entirely within the province of the Smithsonian Institution. They are satisfied that it will tend both to the increase and diffusion of knowledge, and they therefore hope, that the sanction of the Regents and of Congress will be given to the undertaking." Henry ultimately refused to give his sanction to the concept for a number of reasons—not the least of which was his differences with Jewett as to the national bibliographic role of the Smithsonian—and the plan found its way into the archives of history.

The years after the Civil War saw the establishment of numerous learned and professional associations and their related journals which reflected the needs and demands of a growing educational system in a growing country. The National Education Association was born in 1870, and the American Library Association came into being some six years later, when a small number of American librarians met at the Pennsylvania Historical Society in Philadelphia in early October of the Centennial year of the American Revolution. Almost from the date of its birth, ALA raised its voice and demanded to be dragged, not kicking and screaming but willingly, into the twentieth century of centralized cataloging and into the distribution of that cataloging to those who needed it. Melvil Dewey, the developer of the Dewey decimal classification system for libraries and an individual whose enormous role in the general development of American libraries has, most likely, never really been fully told or possibly fully appreciated, proposed in the fourth session of that conference that the subject of "the preparation of printed titles for the common use of libraries" be taken up for discussion as there remained some time before adjournment. He declared: "People on all sides are continually urging the great desirability of doing something. About once in so long articles appear in different countries rehearsing the follies of the present system of doing the same thing over a thousand times, as we librarians do in cataloguing books that reach so many libraries. But right here they all stop. There somehow seems to be an idea among certain leaders of our craft, that such a thing is wholly visionary. . . . If we have sufficient faith to take the matter in hand, I have full confidence that we shall make a success of this co-operative cataloguing. I hope there will be free discussion, and that those who think it impracticable will give their reasons." Those who attended the conference certainly knew that the Copyright Office of the United States was at that time administratively part of the Library of Congress, for the centralization of all U.S. copyright deposit and registration activity had been placed there by legislation in 1870. That meant, of course, that copies of copyrighted publications were now being sent to the Library of Congress located in the U.S. Capitol, where all shelf space had been exhausted by 1875 and the books were being "piled on the floor in all directions." Some librarians had certainly discussed with Librarian of Congress Ainsworth Rand Spofford the possibility of the Library assuming the role of a national cataloging center, for upon Dewey's introduction of his proposal, it was suggested by another person in attendance that "Mr. Dewey's motion be deferred until tomorrow, when Mr. Spofford would be in attendance, and could perhaps afford assistance." Spofford's views certainly were known, for Dewey responded immediately, "I think that it is impossible for some time at least for Mr. Spofford to give the help which has been suggested" for "I have been informed that Mr. Spofford is in favor of something of the kind, but does not think it possible to attempt this matter in the Congressional Library at present." Justin Winsor of the Boston Public Library "believed that the Library of Congress was so crowded and limited in help that it could not give any assistance now." The Library certainly was crowded at that time but it is unlikely, at any rate, that Spofford ever seriously entertained any of the proposals of a cooperative nature put forth in 1876 or in any other year. As one writer has put it: "He did not view the national library as a focal point for cooperative library activities and simply was not inclined to exert leadership in that direction. Furthermore, his personal interests were acquisitions, bibliography, and the 'art of reading,' while the main concerns of the new breed of professional librarian centered on the mechanics of library organization and administration." At any rate, Dewey called for the question on his motion to instruct the Committee on Indexing to report a plan for cooperative cataloging. The motion was made, seconded, and carried by a unanimous vote.
From that day forward Dewey's proposal was scarcely absent from ALA's official agenda; neither, apparently, was it ever far removed, if removed it ever was, from the mind of Melvil Dewey. In his role as editor of the Library Journal—ALA's first official house organ, which also was created in 1876—Dewey set forth on a regular basis his belief in the necessity of an agency providing centralized and standardized cataloging for the libraries of the nation. In fact the title of the first article he wrote for one of the first issues of the Journal was "Co-operative Cataloguing." It was a lengthy article, as articles of this nature often tended to be, but a sample of several brief paragraphs is sufficient to savor the sum and substance of what his thinking was at that time.

At the present time, if a specially valuable book is published it finds its way to at least a thousand different libraries, in all of which it must be catalogued. One of the highest salaried officers of each of these thousand libraries must take this book and examine it for the scores of points that only a cataloguer can appreciate the necessity of looking up. Then the title must be copied and revised. Perhaps a half day is spent in preparing a satisfactory note to append for the benefit of readers, etc., etc. And all this work is repeated to a certain extent in each of the thousand libraries! Can librarians complain if practical business men call this sheer extravagance? . . . When the cataloguing costs more than the books themselves, there is certainly some ground for inquiry. . . . Can the publishers be induced to prepare suitable titles and furnish them with books? Is it practicable for the Library of Congress to catalogue for the whole country? There will be a score of plans, all having more or less merit, and from them the committee appointed at Philadelphia will be able to select something satisfactory. It was to be a number of years—frustrating ones no doubt to those who, like Dewey, pleaded the cause—before some actual, substantive efforts were made to establish an agency to do much of the country's cataloging and make the results available to libraries of the nation. Several attempts were made in the closing quarter of the nineteenth century, with those inaugurated by the Library Bureau in Boston and the American Library Association being the most prominent and partially successful ones. The bureau actually succeeded in preparing and issuing catalog cards, selling them in the same way that Henry Ford in 1909 said he would sell the Model T: "Any customer can have a car painted any colour that he wants so long as it is black." From the Library Bureau you could get any particular card you wanted, just so long as you ordered every one the bureau printed on a subscription basis. You could not order specific cards for individual books contained in your library but had to take all cards printed by the bureau, regardless of whether or not those cards represented books you were cataloging. The bureau, however, was a commercial firm, albeit connected in a tenuous way with ALA, and its efforts to obtain gratis the necessary books from publishers, so as to create catalog copy, were to a considerable extent unsuccessful. The June 1896 issue of the Library Journal contained the text of a circular issued by the bureau, which admitted, in effect, its failure to fully accomplish what it had set out to do.

Our service of printed catalog cards for current literature has now continued for two and one-half years, and the experiment, which until we took the matter up had failed whenever tried, is now an assured fact.
One condition seriously impairs our service to our library subscribers, and that is the feeling of the publishers toward us. They cannot refrain from clasping us with the balance of their “free list,” and this has a tendency (1) to delay their service to us, so that with only the greatest difficulty do we get reasonable promptness, and (2) to restrict their supply to us so that we do not get as many books as we ought.

We do not wish our name connected with any project in the interest of the public libraries of the country unless it is in every way a thorough success, and therefore we have called the attention of the Publishing Section of the American Library Association to this work. We believe that should we transfer to them the actual responsibility for this co-operative work the publishers would at once put themselves into closer connection with them than with us, and the difficulties we have enumerated above would be for the most part, if not entirely, removed.

The probability is that the Publishing Section would be able to arrange to have the cataloging done at the Library School in Albany, under the supervision of an expert cataloger . . . so as to secure promptness in the work.19

The American Library Association subsequently agreed to the general concept set forth in the bureau circular but chose to ignore the bureau’s recommendation as to a suitable site for a cataloging center and to prepare the cataloging in a place other than Albany, New York. William C. Lane, Harvard University librarian and member of ALA’s Publishing Board, wrote to Putnam:

On October 1, 1896, the preparation of printed catalog cards for current books was transferred from the Library Bureau to the ALA Publishing Section, and the work is now done under the direction of the Executive Board of the Publishing Section at Boston Athenaeum, where every facility in the way of reference books is at hand.

It is hoped that the publishers will recognize more easily that the work is not a commercial venture which attempts to get their books free and give no return, but a movement in the general interest of libraries, and so will be more willing to furnish their books promptly and continuously.

It is also hoped that more libraries will find it to their advantage to take the cards . . . . The more subscribers we have the stronger the inducement to publishers to supply us with books and the lower can the price of the cards be made.19

It was certainly far more logical to select Boston rather than Albany, for the Massachusetts city was more accessible to publishers as well as being considered the intellectual and cultural capital of the country at that time. It was, also, perhaps most significantly, where ALA’s headquarters was located, so, all in all, it made sense to utilize the Hub City as the hub of a national cataloging effort.

In January of the following year ALA issued its own circular, which was sent to the “chief libraries of the country, explaining the system of issue of printed catalog cards formerly carried on by the Library Bureau . . . and giving the details of a new plan . . . to furnish selected cards to the smaller libraries,” so that as many libraries as possible would become subscribers to this service.

Beginning January 1, 1897, it is proposed to send once or twice a week to the subscribing libraries two copies of a short-title list of the books cataloged by the Publishing Section. On these lists each librarian will mark the titles of books he is likely to buy, for which he wishes cards, and will return one copy to the Publishing Section . . . . Two weeks from the date of the list, cards will be printed to correspond to the orders then on hand, and will be immediately distributed.20

By making it possible for a library to select the cards it desired, the publishing section hoped to avoid one of the defects of the Library Bureau’s program. In addition, it hoped to eliminate another principal shortcoming—an insufficient supply of current books—by utilizing every effort “to get the titles from the publishers as long in advance as possible, so that the cards may be delivered about the same time as the publication of the books.”20

Concurrently with the preparation in Boston of the January 1897 issue of the Library Journal—the issue which contained ALA’s declaration of intent to accept the baton passed on by the Library Bureau—there was being prepared in Washington, D.C., a report of the Joint Committee on the Library, entitled Condition of the Library of Congress, which was ordered to be printed on March 3, 1897. The joint committee had held hearings between November 16 and December 7 of the preceding year during the congressional recess to inquire into the condition of the Library of Congress and to report its findings and recommendations at the next session of Congress. The new home of the Library of Congress was nearing completion on Capitol Hill and would in fact be ready for occupancy by the late fall of 1897. It was, therefore, quite proper and necessary for the Congress to discuss officially where the Library had been and where, precisely, it might be going in the future once it had moved into its new home. Called to testify at these hearings were several individuals prominent at that time in the library world and ALA—such individuals as Dewey, secretary of the University of the State of New York and state librarian; Herbert Putnam, librarian of the Boston Public Library, then the largest public library in the country; William Fletcher, librarian of
Amherst College; and, of course, Ainsworth Rand Spofford, Librarian of Congress. The time had come to talk of many things concerning the Library's past and its possible future, but of immediate concern to this article are the discussions relating to the possibility of the Library assuming, among its other national roles, the responsibility of distributing the results of its cataloging to all libraries in the country that wished to use the service. In his statement to the joint committee as to "what the Congressional Library can accomplish for the country," Dewey declared that "the first great requisite of the new Library will be a well-made catalogue." He emphasized the importance to other libraries of having the cataloging work done by the Library of Congress for its own needs, and that it be "properly done here."

We have perhaps 4,000 public libraries in the country of 1,000 volumes or more. If a book is published that 500 of these libraries will buy, where can you think of a greater waste than that every one of the 500 should have to undertake, each for itself, with, in most cases, limited bibliographic machinery and insufficient force, to catalogue that book when it has been already catalogued in the National Library by the most expert staff in the country, having at their disposal every known resource? Printing is very cheap. Any library willing to pay the cost of paper and postage could have a copy of these cards furnished without extra expense to the Government, which has already paid for making its own cards. This distribution of printed catalogue cards has long been the dream of librarians. By cooperation among ourselves we are now carrying it on to a limited extent under great disadvantages. It would mark an era when the National Library was ready to do this incalculable service to the libraries and students of the country.

The following day Putnam testified with regard to what Dewey had proposed: "I agree . . . that, in case of new publications, a national library can save money to the United States by simply employing persons to have copies made of the [catalog] entries." This reference was, of course, to newly received books, and he reaffirmed his position in a letter which he subsequently sent from Boston a few days later, offering supplementary words to those he had given in person before the committee.

If, as is to be hoped, the National Library will be able to catalogue once for all the new publications under the copyright law, to print these catalogue entries upon cards, and to furnish duplicates of these cards (for some proper charge) to other American libraries, it will be important that it adopt both a form of entry and a size and weight of card that will render these duplicates capable of insertion in the catalogues of these other libraries.

Your committee may therefore well consider as a possibly desirable expenditure the transcript of your present author catalogue into a form of entry and upon a size of card to which these future undertakings may conveniently conform.

In essence, what Herbert Putnam was saying in this letter was that two things were vitally necessary before catalog cards could be printed and distributed by any agency on a broad scale: there must be agreement on a standard size card and there must be agreement on a standard form of describing a book on that card. It is impossible for an individual today who has used card catalogs in libraries to comprehend the fact that at that time the size of catalog cards was not standardized—not even within the Library of Congress itself. Librarians around the country often felt as strongly about the particular size of the card they were using as they did about the data the card contained—if in fact they used cards at all, which many of them did not, relying upon printed book catalogs or printed lists of their collection or paste-up catalogs. Living as we do in an age of standardization, when an automobile or other piece of equipment purchased in Oregon can readily be repaired in Maine or Miami or Midland, Texas, through the use of standardized parts, we liken the idea of a lack of standardization in something seemingly so simple as the size of catalog cards to the slightly unreal quality of a photograph of one's father taken when he was a very small boy: he could never have been that small. And yet he was. The card size situation could never have been like that. And yet it was. And if standardization in card size was remote, standardization in the format of the information the cards contained seemed light years away. Putnam clearly knew this in 1896, and he most certainly knew it even better after he had become Librarian of Congress in April 1899. But before even considering how he might assist the American library community, first and foremost, and in accordance with the mandate of his position as Librarian of Congress, he had to look inward and put the house in which he now worked in order.

The condition of that house at the time of his arrival could not have been very encouraging; neither could it have left him with many illusions about the difficulty of the task ahead. He did, in fact, declare on several occasions that it would require a quarter of a century to put the collections in order. In a letter written to President William McKinley on December 15, 1899, stating his ap-
THE
Remington

Standard Typewriter
Has demonstrated its superiority for all kinds of Library Work

For CARD INDEXING it greatly excels the pen. It is more convenient and easy to operate, and its work is far neater, more rapid and more legible.

The REMINGTON is strong, simple, and durable. It never fails at critical moments. It can always be depended upon to do the highest grade of work.

Among the libraries in which the Remington Typewriter is now in successful use for card indexing are the following:


Send for special pamphlet giving specimens of card work

Wyckoff, Seamans & Benedict
327 Broadway, New York.
preciation for his appointment, he declared: “The Library as a library, although a fairly large [one] is, at present, neither a great nor, within its compass, an organic collection of books; nor is it, nor without years of labor can it be made, fully effective for use. The means at its disposal for development are present meagre, and the organization which is most vivid descriptions of the Library when Putnam first reported for work has been provided by Frederick William Ashley:

Of the Library’s collections half were on the shelves in the stacks; the other half piled on the floors of vacant rooms, under lock and key, awaiting future action, where they had been for a year and a half.

Dr. Spofford added 4 classes. No provision was made for the Capitol, and there were the future accessions coming in every day: by copyright, by exchange, by deposit, by gift and by purchase. Should these coming books be marked and shelved according to the old classification, or should a new system be adopted? . . .

The old system, adopted and applied in 1815 was a system devised by Sir Francis Bacon who was born in 1561 and died in 1626. It divided books into 40 classes, to which Dr. Spofford added 4 classes. No provision was made for the growth of knowledge. . . .

When the collection of books came from the Capitol nothing had been published about radio, or moving pictures. There was no such word as “aviator” in use. Farmers had not heard of tractors. Not even military men had heard of “camouflage.” Boy Scouts were all in the future. . . .

It is easiest enough to see now that what was needed was an expansive classification system capable of indefinite extension that could take care of the 5,500,000 books now almost here and the 10,000,000 books certain to come. . . . Not so easy to see in 1899.24

In the months that ensued, Putnam and his associates, primarily J. C. M. Hanson and Charles Martel, respectively in charge of the cataloging and classification of books in the Library at that time, came to see with increasing clarity that a new system of cataloging and classification had to be developed. The system would be based primarily upon the Library’s estimated future needs, with one ear tuned to the increasingly audible voice of the growing American library community. Hanson reported: “The possible future relations of the Library of Congress to other libraries of America were freely discussed and constantly kept in mind” when working out the details of the new classification system. “It was felt that distribution of printed cards might be one of the first of the cooperative activities to assume definite form.” 25 Several classification systems and variations of them were proposed, considered, and discussed for several years. At the turn of the century, there were at least six different cataloging codes which librarians of the country used in describing a book physically and intellectually to assist their readers.26 The proponent of one, Melvil Dewey, wrote to Putnam on June 29, 1900, informing him:

I had hoped to see you at Montreal to answer in person your letter of April 6th about the classification. . . . I am very anxious indeed that you should utilize the D.C. [Dewey decimal system], and believe it can save an immense amount of work and be of great value to you in your library. I am so much interested in this that any parts of it which you are anxious to put in use we would take in hand and finish our 20th century revision so as to adapt that work to your special needs. I am confident if you give the matter close enough attention you will find it for your interest to adopt this, and we will do everything in reason to make such adoption satisfactory.26

As late as April 1901 Herbert Putnam had not yet decided how the Library of Congress should proceed in a program that would distribute cataloging information to American libraries. That month the American Library Association was considering a cooperative venture with the Library, one in which the cards would be issued by ALA’s Publishing Board “through the machinery and facilities of the Library of Congress,” although just what that meant specifically is not made clear in the Library Journal editorial statement. Presumably this meant that the Library would catalog the books, and the board would distribute the resulting cards to subscribers. It is known, at any rate, that such a concept was presented that month to a bistate library conference in Atlantic City, New Jersey, by, among others, William Fletcher of Amherst University Library, a member of the ALA’s Publishing Board, and Putnam and his friend Richard R. Bowker, general editor and publisher of the Library Journal and an important figure in the developing
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American library scene. Here again specific details are lacking.28

The summer and fall of 1901 were busy and most likely exhausting times for Herbert Putnam, for he traveled by train—and by whatever connecting surface transportation that was available—to Burlington, Iowa; Chicago and Champaign, Illinois; Waukesha, Wisconsin; Sandusky, Ohio; Lake Placid, New York; and Boston. He personally checked the pulse of the library community to determine the need for transfusions of aid from the Library of Congress and just precisely how assistance might be given. During these months he conferred with members of ALA and state or regional library associations and subsequently announced that the Library was ready to assist them. His letter-books for the period contain numerous copies of correspondence to officials of these organizations and other individuals concerning these visits. On July 4 he spoke at some length to ALA members concerning what the nation might do for libraries. He declared that a new Library of Congress had been constructed, "the most costly yet erected for library purposes"; the cost of building it, seven million dollars, "has been paid not by the District of Columbia, but by the country at large." It seemed unlikely to him that such a "sum would have been requisite for a building to serve Congress alone. It seems to intend a library that shall serve the country at large, if there is any such thing possible. In fact the library is already being referred to as the National Library of the United States." He discussed the possibility of distributing the Library's cataloging, along with the potential difficulties that might arise, without once actually stating if and when it might be done. Twice he used the phrase, "It may not be feasible." He closed the speech by stating:

In the equipment of the library, in the reconstruction of its service, in the addition of more expert service, in the improvement of immediate facilities, our appeal to Congress has been based on the work to be done near at hand. I have admitted to you the possibility of these other undertakings of more general concern. If they commend themselves to you as proper and useful—the appeal for them must be primarily your appeal.29

What Putnam had given was a qualified yes and not the definitive yes that Dewey, for one, assumed it to have been when he spoke at a morning session on July 9, expressing his happiness "that printed catalog cards are really to be undertaken at the National Library, that what we have waited for over 20 years and what we have been dreaming about has come to pass at last." At that same session Putnam said:

The readiness of the Library of Congress to take up the work of supplying printed cards has been stated. For the Library of Congress, I wish to say that we do not repudiate anything of what has been stated as to our readiness; it must be understood, however, that we are justified in entering upon this undertaking only in case it presents a reasonable probability of success. Now, for that probability three elements are essential. First, some body that should represent judgment and experience, in such co-operative work, and be in touch with the interest at large of the Library Association. That body is furnished by the Publishing Board. Second, there was necessary some office that was directly in relation with the publishers of this country. That office is the Publishers' Weekly, and the Publishers' Weekly has generously offered to place at our disposal all of its facilities for securing prompt information as to every recent publication. Third, there is a strong probability that during the first year at least there will be some deficit, while the experiment is merely beginning. That danger has been met. Mr. Bowker, personally, has tendered a guaranty amounting, if necessary, to $1000, to meet the possible deficit of the undertaking during the present calendar year. Repudiating nothing of what has been said about the readiness of the Library of Congress to serve in this undertaking, I nevertheless wish this matter to appear in its proper proportions, and we should not be willing to have these other elements overlooked.30

This was certainly not a loud, clear, resounding yes. The issuance of a more audible yes came at another time and another, far more appropriate, place.

The New York Library Association meeting, held at the Lake Placid Club in the final week of September 1901, was a large one, twice as large as the one held the year before.

. . . the registration list running up close to 175 persons, and its character for distinction being so marked that the comment has often been made that this State meeting resembles a gathering of the American Library Association, which is a National body. . . .

The programme of these meetings is governed by the condition of the weather, night sessions being held when the day is fair and day sessions when the weather is stormy or threatening. . . . In fair weather parties have usually gone to Adirondack Lodge, the grave of John Brown, or have climbed the lofty peaks which here stand within full view of the meeting place.

. . . While these occasions are, in a sense, playtime, they give opportunities for conversation concerning library
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work which . . . are believed to be quite as fruitful in good results afterward as the more formal gatherings. That Herbert Putnam may have indulged in some phase of the "playtime" seems likely. Possibly he went for walks in the cool, fall Adirondack weather for on September 23, Allen Boyd, his secretary at the Library, wrote to him: “I have your note of September 22, and the soft brown cloth cap has gone forward to you by the noon mail.” Considering the speed with which the mail moved at that time, the probability is strong that by late afternoon of the next day the cap was in its proper place.

If the cap was where it belonged, Putnam had decided that he also was in the proper place to announce that, although the Library's printing arrangements were not "satisfactory enough to guarantee reasonable promptness in the distribution of these cards," the Library was "ready to undertake to supply the cards directly to any subscribing library. . . ." The cards had been printed for the Library, and in adopting a style of entry the Library had modified its form to one that commends itself to the committee on catalog entries of the American Library Association." It was beautifully appropriate that Putnam made this statement in Lake Placid, literally in Dewey's backyard or perhaps on his front porch, for few had pushed harder or fought longer for this concept than the mercurial Melvil Dewey. If Putnam made his announcement there because of consideration for Dewey and the efforts he expended over the years, it was not unusual, for he was acutely aware of the niceties of human life. It is more likely, however, that after the long summer of travel and deliberation, he decided that the time had come to proceed, that governing circumstances and conditions necessary for success were not now fortuitous but fairly well known and defined.

Within a few days of his return to Washington Putnam received a letter from Richard Bowker, dated October 14, declaring his regrets that he could not be at Lake Placid, but adding: "The outcome is most satisfactory, and I rejoice the Library of Congress can make itself, in respect to printed card[s] as in other relations, the central ganglion of the library system." Bowker then once again offered assistance to the Library in carrying out this new program.

Mr. Andrews was at the office Friday, and I said to him that the Publishers Weekly would be glad to print weekly, or at longer intervals, the titles of foreign books of which you are to print cards. I shall be glad also to facilitate, through the Publisher's Weekly or otherwise, any feature of the general plan in which I can be of use. When you are ready to desire proofs of our weekly record, please inform me. If you should decide to have a representative in New York in connection with the catalogue cards, I should be glad to give him any facilities at the Publisher's Weekly office, and would endeavor to arrange that he might make headquarters there, if that should prove desirable.

Bowker then appended a brief postscript, offering the financial assistance he had previously pledged, stating: "If you need the $1,000 which I promised, in whole or in part, as capital in the catalogue card scheme, please let me know at any time."

What Bowker was offering in the body of his letter was to assist the Library in making public, as best he could, information on just which titles the Library cataloged and what the individual card numbers were so that libraries in general would have this knowledge, thus facilitating card ordering. This was, of course, long before the days when LC card numbers would appear on the verso of the title page of many domestically published books. On October 16, in his reply to Bowker's letter, Putnam wrote:

I am glad to have your note of the 14th, and welcome most appreciatively your additional offers to facilitate this project. Let me appreciate particularly your special mention of the guarantee. I sincerely trust that it will not be necessary.

I have thought that the project itself might well be stated to the public in some rather specific way, and accordingly set it forth in an interview which appeared in last evening's "Star." A copy of this will, of course, reach you. . . .

I have promised to be at the meeting of the Massachusetts Library Club on October 31. Is there any chance of your being in Boston at that time? If not, I shall stop over in New York on my way thither or returning.

The Washington Evening Star article, which Putnam mentioned in his letter, covered the trips the Librarian took that summer and a statement he made detailing "a most important progressive move of the library world in years, the perfection of a plan of co-operation in book cataloguing, in which the Congressional Library is to perform an important part."
If Putnam took great care that summer and fall in soliciting the feelings and views of librarians at large and in keeping concerned individuals in the field informed of his intentions, he was no less aware of the subtleties of the legal requirements of his job. He felt that specific statutory authorization was necessary to print and sell additional copies of the catalog cards being produced exclusively for the Library’s own needs. He had discussed such authorization several times with various individuals, particularly in early October with F. W. Palmer, the public printer of the United States. On October 25, he wrote to Palmer:

At the conference I held with you on October 12, the Chief Clerk and the Foreman of the Printing Office being present, I referred to the new provision of law which I propose to ask, that will enable the Librarian of Congress to take the subscriptions for the catalogue cards and other publications of the Library, and will insure that the amounts received and covered into the Treasury shall go to reimburse the allotment of the Library for printing.

His letter also contained a request that Palmer respond as to whether or not the following wording of the proposed law was acceptable:

And the Librarian of Congress is hereby authorized to furnish to such institutions or individuals as may care to buy them, such copies of the card indexes and other publications of the Library as may not be required for the ordinary transactions of the Library, and charges for the same a price covering their cost.

Palmer’s response was astonishingly prompt, for his letter was dated October 26. The wording proposed by Putnam was satisfactory, with, however, one minor but quite significant suggested change. Where the Librarian had stated that the Library would charge for the cards “a price covering their cost,” Palmer appended four words: “and ten percent added.”

And that is the way the law eventually was passed, stating that the Library of Congress could sell additional copies of its cards and other publications so long as it received in return an amount sufficient to offset the costs of printing and distributing, plus ten percent. The law was signed by President Roosevelt in 1902 and continues to this day to be the legislation under which the sale of the Library’s cataloging, in whatever physical form, is carried out.

Herbert Putnam was not in Washington on October 28, the day that copies of the circular and memorandum containing his signature were mailed to more than four hundred libraries in the United States. He had gone to Boston to attend a library conference, as he stated he intended to do in his letter to Bowker, and thus the mailing of the two documents was to be carried out by others. His secretary Allen Boyd wrote to him on October 29 to say:

Full sets of the circulars relating to the cards go forward to each of bibliographic and literary journals on our exchange list, and to each library in Washington. Full sets are ready for mailing to the foreign bibliographic and literary journals named in the attached list. Mr. Hastings is in doubt as to whether you intended to include the foreign journals, but both he and Mr. Hanson think that they should be included.

The Printing Office was unable yesterday to furnish more than the 150 copies of the circular and of the memorandum sent you by express. We have this morning received 500 copies. All will be mailed today, so Mr. Hastings states.

The attached list contained the names of sixteen foreign bibliographic and literary journals in England, France, Italy, and Germany to which these items were to be mailed.

With the placement of the envelopes containing the circulars and memoranda in the mailbox—and it is assumed that Charles Harris Hastings did the mailing—the Library of Congress had entered into the mail-order business of selling and distributing its cataloging to those who might wish to buy it. Absolutely no one on that day could have foreseen the ultimate extent of the demand for the Library’s cataloging and what that demand portended for the Library and for the entire library world. By including the card distribution service in its functions, the Library, at that time a reference library to Congress with a small constituency consisting almost exclusively of congressmen and their staff members, was adopting a potentially enormous constituency—that of the total American library community, whose collective voice was to be only a shade less vigorous or insistent upon service in the years to come than that of the constituency on Capitol Hill.

To successfully sell and distribute anything—catalog cards, data contained on those cards, books, or lumber—requires a minimum of four essentials: (1) an inventory of items upon which to draw; (2) a reliable means of replenishing that inventory any time the stock of a particular item becomes depleted; (3) an assured clientele, the total number of which is stable or growing; and (4) a conscien-
ious, hardworking, reliable employee to watch over the store.

With regard to the number one essential, the Library had begun printing its cards in 1898 utilizing the recently invented linotype machines as a few other large libraries were doing. At the time it began printing the cards—from fifteen to one hundred copies each for its own needs—it also began storing extra quantities of them, generally fifty, for its future needs and against the day when it might sell them. The first card to go into that inventory, with LC card number 98-1—the card which actually assumed the pole position for almost six million titles to be cataloged for printed cards in the seven-plus decades that lay ahead—was for an English-language edition of the collected works of Honoré de Balzac, published by G. Barrie and Son in Philadelphia. If one briefly reflects on the difficulties that were to be faced in the ensuing seventy-five years—enormous and frustrating difficulties in creating, maintaining, and housing an inventory as well as a staff, in supplying the cards to libraries, in explaining over the years just what it was that the card distribution service was attempting to do—if one considers the sometimes rough, often explosive, liaison between the distribution service and the libraries of the country which it was created to serve, that person might view the individual titles listed on this first printed card with an ironic smile: "The Novice," "A Dark Affair," "The Involuntary Comedians," "A Start in Life," "Lost Illusions," "The Elixir of Long Life," "The Unknown Masterpiece," "The Quest of the Absolute," and "Petty Worries of Conjugal Life."

As for the second requirement, the Library had a means of regularly replenishing its inventory of catalog cards, for in the fall of 1900 a branch of the Government Printing Office had been established in the basement of the building to do the Library's printing. The printing office was to remain within the walls of the Library throughout the seventy-five year period covered here. At first, in addition to the cards, it printed forms for the Library, particularly copyright forms, but by 1906 the foreman of this branch reported to Putnam: "Fourth-fifths of the work done in the Branch Printing Office is on the printing of catalogue cards."

The third requisite for a successful sales operation, a stable or growing clientele, seemed assured from the beginning, for the launching of the card distribution service was made during the Andrew Carnegie period of American libraries. Between the years 1890 and 1917 the Carnegie Foundation gave over $41 million for the construction of 2,500 libraries in such names on the land as Eagle Rock, Loveland, Derby Neck, Palmetto, Peru, Gas City, Coffeyville, Old Town, Thief River Falls, Broken Bow, Niagara Falls, Xenia, Sioux Falls, Centralia, Sturgeon Bay, Thermopolis, Eureka City, and, of course, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the town in which Carnegie spent many of his formative years. The
2,500 libraries receiving endowments were to be, in many cases, the first libraries in their communities. Many were lightly funded, scarcely meeting the minimum requirements for funding set forth in the Carnegie grant. Often they were part-time libraries, run by part-time personnel, frequently with only a part-time knowledge of the principles and practices of operating a library. To some of these people catalog and cataloging were not exactly household words, so they were prime candidates for whatever assistance the Library of Congress could provide.*

The fourth essential—someone to watch over the store—was available in the Library; his name was Charles Harris Hastings. It has become trite to say, as Emerson did so many years ago, that an institution is the lengthened shadow of one man; in Mr. Hastings's case, perhaps it may even be an inappropriate metaphor, for considering the hours which he generally worked—arriving before the sun rose and leaving well after it set—there was little opportunity for him to cast a shadow, at least by natural light. And yet the institution he created cast an enormous shadow. It is impossible to conceive of the Library's card distribution service surviving in its early years and continuing and growing during the thirty-seven years before Hastings's retirement in 1938 without his day-to-day ministrations and supervision. He knew every job in detail because he had performed every job in detail. He was the card distribution service of the Library during that time, although, admittedly, he was assisted by a growing number of employees each succeeding year, many of whom would share his dedication.

Hastings was a man from Maine, which to some would provide the master key to his character. He was born on November 6, 1867, the sixth of at least seven children of Elizabeth Atherton and St. John Hastings, on a farm just outside Bethel on the western side of the state near the New Hampshire border. He was graduated in 1891 from Bowdoin College, located a few miles down the road in Brunswick, and then pursued graduate work for two years at Johns Hopkins University in history, political science, and economics before moving on to the University of Chicago to devote two more years to graduate work in sociology. Somewhere along the line, after habituating several libraries in the course of his studies, he became interested in library work as a profession and joined the staff of the University of Chicago library in 1895 as an assistant in charge of the departmental libraries of history, political science, political economy, and sociology—a position he held for five years. One of his principal interests was bibliography, and he was one of the founders, and the first president, of the Chicago Bibliographical Society.

He wrote to Putnam at least twice during the summer of 1900, inquiring about the possibility of employment at the Library of Congress, stating in one letter that he had, in preparation for his job at Chicago, taken “six weeks of special instruction at the N.Y. State Library School. Have had charge of the cataloging and classification of some 15,000 volumes. Should you contemplate revision of the Dewey or the Cutter System in the division of the social sciences, or should you devise a new system of classification I believe I could be of service in the work.” He then wrote, perhaps prophetically: “Am especially impressed with your idea that the Library of Congress should stand ready to supply bibliographic information by mail. Have had some experience in this line of work and I expect great developments in the future.” ** What that experience might have been is not known, although the assumption is that he was referring to his strong interest in bibliography, which was certainly to stand him in good stead in the years to come. He was, at any rate, subsequently hired by J. C. M. Hanson and reported to work on December 17, 1900, as an assistant in the Catalogue Division. His salary was $900 a year, which is interesting in view of the fact that in his second letter he had asked for $1,500 a year. His desire to work in the Library seems to have been so overpowering that it offset the rather sizable difference between the requested salary and the one he received.

From his first day on the job this tall, spare man with steel-rimmed glasses so impressed people with his energy, his dogged work habits, and his extraordinarily unusual working hours that he was Hanson's choice to take over the duties of the card distribution work when the final decision to initiate the system was made. Hastings's personal work calendar contained no holidays; neither, apparently, did it contain many Sundays, for a day and a man were meant for work, and work he did. He generally arrived at the Library around seven in the morning and left around ten in the evening, seven days a week. No one who worked for him could remember arriving at work before he did; neither could any-
one ever remember leaving after he departed in the evening. One employee stated: “You could see his light on and his shadow on the window every night as you went home.” One of the catalogers with whom he worked during the early years of the twentieth century revisited the Library in the 1930s and declared: “He is still working twenty-four hours a day, eight days a week, so they say, just as when he first organized his section.” Hanson observed at one time that, like Charles Martel, Hastings “worked until midnight and later, Sundays and holidays. . . .” The only official record of the leave that Hastings used during those early years is a memorandum he wrote to Putnam, dated August 9, 1906, in which, while asking for more help to distribute the cards, he set forth his leave record for 1905 as well as those of the eleven assistants who worked for him at that time. Hastings had taken one day of annual leave and had taken no sick leave! At that time employees were authorized to use up to thirty days of annual leave. It is fascinating to speculate as to just why Mr. Hastings took that day off in 1905. One can also speculate as to whether or not he was in the Library 364 days that year! It was certainly fortunate for the Library, the card distribution service, and American libraries, but most likely not so fortunate for his wife and family, that Hastings believed in work, for it was definitely cut out for him in the years ahead.

The years 1901–5 in the life of the card distribution service of the Library were, like the years from one to five in the life of a child, developmental and frequently difficult. As is the case with some infants, these years were critical ones—so much so that there were times when the survival of the service was in doubt. There was little in the past experiences of those responsible for conducting the sale and distribution of the Library’s cataloging which would have prepared them for conducting a printing and sales business operation located within the walls of a large reference library. Hastings touched upon the difficulties of those early years in an article he wrote in 1929, stating: “No sooner had we filled the first collection of orders than queries, complaints, and suggestions began to pour in.” Within thirty days after the service was begun, a particular phrase was first used in communications to subscribers to the cards, a phrase which was to be used on innumerable occasions in the following years: delay in filling orders. In this article Hastings also described his efforts to issue the first Handbook of card distribution, which was a form of Fodor’s practical guide, not to countries or cities, but to catalog cards available for sale. It described the procedures for properly planning the purchase of cards from the Library and gave all the facts on the steps a subscriber should follow. The Handbook was so detailed that, upon first seeing it in draft form, Putnam declared: “It seems to cover the ground, but will the subscribers read it?” Hastings must have entertained similar doubts, for he responded: “Some of them I am sure never did. I once explained to one of them that his library could save a hundred dollars a year if he and his assistants would read the Handbook. He replied that he had rather save money some easier way, and I fear he died without ever having read it.” Nevertheless, the Handbook was issued in 1902, and several revised editions were subsequently released over the years through the 1940s in a continuing effort to describe what was, perhaps, increasingly
indescribable—a continually growing inventory of thousands upon thousands of unique items which multiplied into millions upon millions of the same.

In the summer of 1902, Putnam and Hastings journeyed to Magnolia, not a large, moss-covered plantation south of the Mason-Dixon line, but a small coastal town just northeast of Boston, where the American Library Association was holding its annual conference and where Putnam reported on the newly initiated service. It was Hastings, however, who spoke at length, giving what was a nine-month, state-of-the-art report on catalog card distribution work at LC: “Up to June 14, 1902, 170 libraries had subscribed for cards. In addition to these there were . . . seven individuals, mostly university professors, who subscribe for cards in their special lines.” Public libraries made up the overwhelming proportion of the total, numbering 118, while there were only 12 university libraries and 14 college libraries buying the cards at that time. In addition, depository sets of cards—that is, one copy of each card printed by LC for each newly cataloged or recataloged book—had been distributed and were being maintained on a continuing basis in twenty cities around the country to inform scholars and librarians specifically what the Library was cataloging so that they could order copies of cards for those titles.

Most of Hastings's paper dealt with “the chief difficulties in the card distribution work, . . . what is being done by the Library of Congress to overcome the difficulties, and wherein the libraries subscribing for cards may assist in their solution.” In some of his comments he displays a sense of humor that was, most likely, part of the baggage that accompanied him from his native Maine. He referred to “one large library, the best waiter on our list,” and “another large library which . . . is a poor waiter . . . .” In commenting on some orders for cards being submitted he observed: “Orders are constantly being received for books in series, some of which we believe are still in a nebulous state in the mind of the author.” The final sample is perhaps a little testy:

While we cheerfully give credit for cards returned on which we have made a mistake, we cannot give credit with the same cheerfulness, or at all, on cards in the case of which the mistake was made by the library ordering the cards. Two or three cards, once they are removed from the stock, are poor property. We do not wish them returned even as a gift, much less can we give credit for them and write a polite note of acknowledgement.

Sending staff members to conferences was to be a practice of the Library over the years to come, for personal discussions about problems that related to the Library or to the distribution service often solved problems or clarified situations as correspondence never could. In the days before the extensive use of the telephone it was all the more important that someone from the Library visit other areas of the country; the year 1904 offered such an opportunity in an unusual way.

There are few people today who have any personal recollection of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1904, the largest fair of its kind ever held, designed to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase by the United States; it was more commonly known as the St. Louis fair. On the other hand, there are a great many people who experienced the fair vicariously by having seen a motion picture of the 1940s in which Judy Garland sang, among other songs, the title song of the picture, which was actually the official theme song of the exposition. The first two lines of the chorus were: “Meet me in St. Louis, Louis/Meet me at the fair.” The librarians of the country and a contingent from abroad were going to meet each other in St. Louis in 1904; they were, in actuality, going to meet each other at the fair, for ALA’s annual conference was scheduled to be held on the fair grounds in late October, and its headquarters was the Inside Inn, so named because of its being inside the gates. A charge of fifty cents a day was added to the room bill to cover the cost of daily admission to the fair. One of the contemporary publications concerning the fair, and they were numerous, stated that the inn possessed “dining rooms so large as never to be overcrowded, and the service so prompt as to cause remarks. . . .” This fact, if fact it were, certainly would be viewed by conference attenders of all ages with much happiness and, no doubt, an equal portion of scepticism. It is assumed that Putnam dined in that inn, although how prompt the service was is additional speculation, for on October 5 Allen Boyd wrote to the manager of the inn:

The Librarian of Congress . . . has a reservation certificate for accommodations, which he desires, beginning October 15. . . .

Mr. Putnam is President of the American Library Association, which will make the Inn its headquarters,
beginning October 15th. It will be desirable therefore for him to have a room which will be reasonably convenient of access, but he prefers one on the second floor on the side towards the grounds, and as quiet as possible.\[61\]

Putnam thus wore another hat in 1904; in addition to his customary role as Librarian of Congress, he was president of ALA for a second time. In his dual role he had to ensure the coordination of ALA's exhibit with that of the Library and participate in the preparation, publication, and distribution of the \textit{A.L.A. Catalog}. Both efforts were to have a shattering impact upon the young card distribution service, literally bringing it to its knees in the following year. In the months before the conference, Putnam traveled on several occasions to Lake Placid, Boston, and St. Louis on related business. During these months he also corresponded extensively with a number of people in preparation for the conference. As Librarian it was necessary that he have an exhibit prepared pertaining directly to the Library for display at the exposition; however, as president of ALA, it was necessary to have a comparative library exhibit in cooperation with ALA. Both exhibits were to be housed in the U.S. government building, "the largest structure ever built by Governmental authority for any exposition. $450,000 was set aside for its construction." The general style of the building was, in the words of one writer, "Pseudo Classic." \[53\] Unfortunately in Putnam's eyes, the building was pseudo stone, being constructed of wood to look like stone, and he was reluctant to display in it some of the Library's treasures. Therefore, the exhibit was to a considerable extent photographic in nature, displaying pictures of books rather than the books themselves. Two of the rather sizable nonphotographic objects shown were a large model of the Library building and several model card catalogs; both the Library building and the card catalogs, being in their infancy, were likely to be of interest to the general public and librarians who viewed them. The annual report of the Librarian for that year declared: "As the work of the Card Section is as yet imperfectly understood by many libraries in the country, it was given special prominence in the exhibit of the Library of Congress at St. Louis." \[54\]

Work on the very detailed model of the Library had been in progress for some time. Bernard R. Green, superintendent of the Library building and grounds, wrote to Putnam on July 22, 1903, informing him: "Before you went away I forgot to ask you if you did not expect me to push along the proposed model of the building for the St. Louis Exposition. A good workman for the purpose lives here in the city and I have been in consultation with him. A
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good model at ¼” to the foot ... will cost fully $2,000. To be finished in good season for the Exposition next spring it should be well under way before your date for returning home.”  The construction of the model card catalogs was also under way under the guidance of another good workman, Charles Hastings, who wrote a memorandum to Putnam on March 14, 1904, asking: “Can we count on having an assistant from the Card Section with the exhibit after June 1st? If not, I should be decidedly in favor of keeping the main catalog here for a month ... until it is in an entirely satisfactory state. The bulk of the material intended for the exhibit of the Library of Congress, including the catalogs of printed cards, was scheduled to start March 15.” By start he meant it was scheduled to be shipped. He wrote to Putnam from St. Louis on May 3 reporting: “The table and show case for exhibiting the old catalogs have now arrived. Shall be able to finish arranging the card exhibit Friday or Saturday and expect to be at the Library Monday, May 9.”

Hastings was absent from the Library a total of four months in the summer and fall of that year, traveling back and forth to St. Louis to set up and man the exhibit there and also doing the same at the Lewis and Clark Exposition held subsequently in Portland, Oregon. At the latter exposition the exhibit contained additional items: “(1) A group of thirteen transparencies, illustrating the production, distribution, ordering, and use of the L. C. catalogue cards. (2) A collection of 29 sample catalogues con-
tributed by subscribing libraries in different parts of
the country, showing methods of adapting the L. C.
cards to their catalogues.” Clearly the intent of
the Library of Congress at both of these expositions,
as would be its intent at numerous conferences in
the years to come, was to provide assistance to the
libraries of the nation, easing their individual and
collective cataloging and book processing problems,
thus making the libraries a stronger arm of the
American educational and research world. On this
extensive sojourn, Hastings brought along sets of
cards for titles listed in the A.L.A. Catalog.

The first edition of this printed catalog, designed
to assist small public libraries in deciding which
books in various subject areas they should acquire
for their collections, had been issued in 1893 under
Dewey’s editorship and the auspices of the ALA. It
had been published by the U.S. Bureau of Educa-
tion, with the publication date having been timed to
coincide with the Columbian Exposition held in
Chicago that year. As one writer stated: “Since
1893 . . . the Library of Congress, promoted into
the position of a national library for the United
States, has come to be the logical agent of the gov-
ernment” to issue a new, up-to-date edition, “pre-
sumed to be in the interest of American libraries as
a whole.” In extensive correspondence during
1903–4 with Dewey and the members of the ALA
Publishing Board, Putnam had agreed to undertake
the issuance of a new edition, printing as many as
40,000 copies and making them available at the an-
nual conference in St. Louis. It was thought that the
Library could finance the printing expenses “out of
the allotment of the Library for printing and bind-
ing.” It was finally decided, however, to provide
one bound copy “free of charge to each library in
the United States” and have additional copies
printed for the Superintendent of Documents to sell
to anyone wishing to buy them. The most signifi-
cant contribution the Library of Congress made to
this new edition of the A.L.A. Catalog was to guar-
antee the acquisition and cataloging of each title
listed in it “so that a complete card catalog of the
entire 8,000 volumes may be procured from it, at
nominal cost, under its system of card distribu-
tion.” The Library also promised to facilitate the
ordering of catalog cards for the titles contained in
the work.

The issuance of the catalog was a resounding suc-
cess for ALA and American public libraries. Bowker
wrote to Putnam on December 8 from his home in
Glendale, Massachusetts: “I am more and more
pleased with the results of the publication of the
A.L.A. Catalog by the Library of Congress; it seems
to me to have turned out one of the most useful
things that has ever been done, and the fact that
your printing of it has made possible to put a copy
at the service of every small library—as ours in
Stockbridge—has to my mind meant a great deal
for the development of the usefulness of the smaller
libraries.”

The response to the publication of the catalog
was of landslide proportions, for, according to the
Librarian’s annual report of 1905, the sales of cata-
log cards, which for the previous three years had
been escalating at a rate of about ten percent a year,
totaled $15,500—106 percent higher than in 1904,
when card sales totaled $7,515. Hastings and his
eleven assistants were inundated with orders. Put-
nam further noted in his report: “The catalogue
has especially facilitated the ordering of cards by
the smaller public libraries, which before its publi-
cation had no practical means of ordering them by
number. To it is no doubt due the notable increase
in the number of subscriptions received from small
libraries.” It seems likely that the card distribution
service came of age in 1905, for if it could survive
the workload engendered by the two fairs and the
A.L.A. Catalog—a task far greater than anything
experienced in the four years of its existence—it
could, most likely, survive whatever was to follow.

In late June and early July of 1906 ALA held
its annual conference at Narragansett Pier in
Rhode Island, where the “opportunities for pleas-
ure out of doors were numerous—drives, walks,
trolley trips, and, last but most important, bathing.
There was nothing more popular than this, and
either by the grace of God or grace of the program
committee, there was always time for a delightful
surf dip between the end of the morning session and
the hour for dinner.” Two evening sessions of
that conference, which conflicted little, if any, with
“the time for a delightful surf dip,” were devoted
to discussing problems of small libraries. One of
the general recommendations arrived at was: “Buy all
catalog cards, if possible, from the Library of Con-
gress. Don’t allow yourself to be misled by those
who counsel against them because the fulness of
imprint, etc., is confusing to the public. Cross off
everything that confuses you and you may be sure
that the public, whose intelligence we are inclined to underestimate, will derive as much comfort from the catalog as you do." It isn’t known whether Putnam or Hastings attended those two evening meetings; Putnam probably not, Hastings perhaps. But they were listed as attendees at the conference, and some discussions they might have had with others in attendance would probably have centered upon a number of articles which appeared in the June Library Journal, articles which dealt with the subject that was discussed in the two evening round-table sessions: the utilization of LC cataloging and catalog cards by libraries throughout the country. How did the libraries view this service almost five years after its birth?

In May and June of that year Hastings had corresponded with Helen Haines, managing editor of the Library Journal, who had asked him to contribute an article on the card service and to assist her in selecting about fifteen representatives from libraries using the LC cards who might write papers describing their experiences. On May 22 Hastings replied:

I am quite ready to accept your invitation to contribute something to your collection of statements as to the use of L.C. cards, but I wish to know beforehand what libraries are to contribute. Fifteen out of seven hundred [there were that many subscribers to the cards at that time] is such a small percentage that the chances are strongly against their fairly representing the average. . . .

In a talk we had with Mr. Bowker on the subject some time ago, he spoke of our selecting a representative list of libraries. We are quite willing that you should select the list if you will permit us to pass on it.**

Several letters were exchanged between the two, including a three-page, handwritten letter by Hastings giving in considerable detail his list of possible participants. Hastings subsequently declined to submit an article, since, as he wrote her on June 1, “there is no good reason why I should contribute anything to this collection of articles. It will be much better to use the space for testimony from libraries . . . using the cards.”** The Library Journal contained statements or articles from representatives of twenty-one libraries, all from east of the Mississippi and primarily from the northeastern United States.

Sixteen public libraries were represented, reflecting, no doubt, the fact that at that time the card subscribers were to a large extent public libraries, along with four university libraries—Harvard, Princeton, Wesleyan, and Northwestern—and one government library, the U.S. Naval War College Library at Newport, Rhode Island, most likely added to the list of participants because of the conference being held nearby. An editorial in the Library Journal stated:

The present number of the Journal is very largely devoted to a consideration of the use now made by libraries of the printed catalog cards issued by the Library of Congress. . . . [The] articles will show how great has been the increase in the libraries using the cards and in the variety of purposes to which they are applied. . . . There is no question that the reports here given indicate that the work of the Library of Congress in providing these cards is proving of very great value to libraries throughout the country, and that the usefulness of the cards is bound to increase and become more diversified as time goes on.

Prophetically, it also voiced a small doubt about the future, perhaps a slight but early case of future shock, when it wondered about the inevitable growth of card catalogs in libraries, particularly the larger ones:

Architects have not as yet given much attention to the demands of the catalog, in planning library buildings; but it is apparent that these demands are considerable, and that the growing use of cards means a steadily increasing requirement of storage space. The printed catalog now seems in large measure to have been superseded by the card cabinet; but it is a question whether in time the printed volumes, despite the expense and time involved in their production, may not prove necessary to replace the ever-increasing array of card cabinets. . . . It is probably a long look ahead to the day when the card catalog will require so much storage space as to become a pressing problem, yet this possibility demands thought in the planning of library buildings.**

The time of pressing needs for card space in the Library of Congress was not too far in advance, certainly not “a long look ahead” as posited by the editorial.

By the outbreak of World War I the Library’s card distribution service had been in existence thirteen years, and, like all rapidly growing youngsters, it was beginning to experience difficulties fitting into its quarters and its clothes. From the very beginning in 1901 the service had been housed on the second floor of the main Library building as part of the Catalogue Division. By 1910 the growth in the card stock alone—to say nothing of the growth in staff of the Card Section as well as the growth of its parent division, the Catalogue Division—was sufficient to necessitate moving the catalogers to the
area immediately below on the first floor, leaving the Card Section and the inventory of cards the sole remaining occupants of the second-floor southeast curtain. The growth in the inventory of catalog cards to be sold was inexorable as tens of thousands of books were cataloged or recataloged each succeeding year and the printed cards for these, usually no less than seventy copies of each, were stored. By 1909 there was no additional horizontal space to be found for the card stock or the staff, which meant there was no place to go but up. Consequently, in that year, out of a total of $40,000 spent for all library furniture and equipment, $13,051 of it was spent for the purchase and installation of “two-tier stacks in steel, dust-tight, and of original design, conveniently accessible and fireproof.” The card cases in these stacks contained “36,096 catalogue card trays 19½ inches long.” By 1913 the superintendent of the Library building and grounds reported: “The stack of steel storage cases for printed catalogue cards, in the Card Section, was extended by placing on top of an existing second tier of cases a portion of a third tier consisting of 18 double-faced and 5 single-faced newly manufactured cases and 14 old cases of the same type, already filled with cards. . . .”

The superintendent was far from sanguine about the amount of growing room left for the future, for he also wrote that “these additional trays will have been completely filled with cards by July 1 of next year.” He further implied that completion of the third tier and the addition of “a fourth or top tier, erected on the third and reaching to the ceiling of the room” was inevitable and would cost no less than $22,000. The cost of the newly erected, partial third tier of stacks and cases in 1913 was $7,045.47; the total furniture and equipment budget for the entire Library for that year was $10,000! Thus, as the superintendent declared: “The cost of the new work, including electric wiring, was . . . about seven-tenths of the entire appropriation for furniture for the year.” By 1914 Putnam reported: “The whole number of different titles now represented in the stock is approximately 622,000. . . . The average stock of each card is estimated at 70, making the total number of cards in stock about 43,500,000.” By 1921, when the stock had ballooned to 63,625,000 cards, Putnam observed: “Early in the year a fourth floor was added to the card stack and the long awaited supply of steel card cases was installed. The entire stock was then moved up and back to give the maximum room for new cards on the first floor. . . . For about two months, while the steel construction was in progress, a large portion of the assistants had to work in other divisions.”

Talking to individuals who worked in those tiers of steel stacks, with their steel staircases and bare light bulbs for illumination, and a close perusal of the few remaining photographs of the tiers leave one with no regrets for never having worked in them. The cards were printed and reprinted by the tens of thousands in the GPO Branch in the lower levels of the Library and brought up daily to the Card Section by the elevators. They were then manually carried in boxes up the steel stairs to the appropriate tier—the second, the third, and ultimately the fourth—to be placed in the steel trays as inventory. Orders for these cards were filled in the same manner, with the assistants—everyone in those days was called an assistant in the Card Section—walking up the stairs to the appropriate tier to find the cards being ordered. Attempts were made to store the infrequently ordered cards on the highest and most inaccessible tier, but such efforts at scientific management did not always meet with success. During certain extraordinarily hot summer days, those who worked in the tiers, particularly on the uppermost levels, experienced extreme discomfort, for the temperature was far higher than on the lower levels. A skylight was opened on those warmer days to allow some of the trapped hot air to escape.

By 1914 there were 1,986 subscribers to the cards and forty-one staff members who worked to fill their orders. If the card distribution service was bursting its physical seams in this period it was also outgrowing its administrative garments as well, so the Card Division was established in that year as an administrative entity to carry on this work exclusively as an operation removed from the Catalogue Division. As was to be expected, Mr. Hastings was named chief.

The story of the twenty-year span of the card distribution service, which included World War I, the depression shortly thereafter, the twenties and the early years of the Great Depression of the thirties, could more easily be told graphically than by the written word, for line or bar graphs showing the number of subscribers or purchasers of cards, the number of cards printed and added to the card stock, the receipts of dollars for deposit in the U.S.

Treasury, and the number of staff members required to cope with the ever-increasing workload—all pointed ever upward. Even World War I failed to break this trend, and it wasn’t until the years 1932–34 that there was a reduction in the dollar amount received from the sales of cards and proofsheets, traceable, of course, to the generally poor economic conditions in the country at that time. Even in those three years, however, the number of subscribers did not decrease; there was a decrease only in the quantity of cards many of them purchased. In 1935, 5,738 subscribers to the card distribution service were listed on the records of the division. The American Library Directory for that year listed 9,947 libraries in the United States and Canada and, while that number, admittedly, did not include special libraries or some business libraries, it was evident that a large majority of the libraries on the North American continent were utilizing the card distribution service.15

The Washington Herald for June 30, 1933, contained an article entitled “Card Catalog Division of Library Recognized as Model of World,” with a photograph of Hastings seated at his desk. This photograph was definitely not in character, for according to the recollections of staff members Hastings far preferred to stand than to sit when working. The reporter for the Herald was obviously aware of
this fact when he wrote: "For the past 32 years . . . a soft-spoken, broad-shouldered former athlete has been bending his spine into an arc leaning over an old battered desk . . . ." The article further stated: "The card division is one of the branches of the Library, concealed from the cloistered quiet of the study rooms, which the general public hears little about. There, 90 men and women, surrounded by overflowing stacks of cards, efficiently perform tasks that would drive an untrained personnel into hysterical insanity or early graves." It might be added, parenthetically, that the impression created upon this reporter of the work's complexity and detail and its possible deleterious effects upon those who performed it was to be shared by many other people over the ensuing years who were to visit the division and view the staff at work. The article then continued:

From the division, catalogue cards are scattered all over the world into more than 6,000 libraries, offices and private homes. And as fast as the cards are distributed millions of others pile up waiting to be scattered.

This amazing service to the American people and their friends in other countries does not cost the taxpayers one cent. The receipt from sales of the cards amounted this fiscal year to about $225,000, which was sufficient to pay all salaries and the cost of the cards.

The libraries of the world would fail to reveal a man so perfectly qualified for his job as Mr. Hastings. And the same could be said of the majority of his staff.

The photograph in the article revealed an elderly man, one within four months of celebrating his sixty-eighth birthday and who was, therefore, approaching the end of a long and singular career with the Library of Congress.

The period of the late thirties which saw the close of his career was, perhaps, a more difficult one in many ways for Mr. Hastings than some others had been, for there never seemed to be sufficient funds for printing or salaries to do the job that he felt was necessary to get the cards out to the libraries ordering them. There were always tens of thousands of orders waiting to be filled and thousands of books which had been cataloged but for which no cards had yet been printed because of the printers' inability to keep up with the catalogers' output or a lack of sufficient money to do all the printing that was needed. In short, for Hastings as for many Americans, although for reasons at the opposite ends of the pole, the thirties produced considerable frustration: many Americans could not find work, while Hastings and his staff never seemed able to get out from under it. His frustrations from his inability to fill all the orders for cards and to be more responsive to the demands of the librarians of the country were evident in the annual reports he submitted during those years, which were usually cited almost verbatim in the Librarian's annual reports.

In last year's report I expressed the hope that measures would be taken which would prevent repetition of the congestion in the Library Branch Printing Office that had prevented us from giving the subscribers a satisfactory card service . . . . the total number of orders held . . . runs into the thousands, and the complaints from the subscribers are as numerous as they were a year ago. The subsequent annual report read:

Owing to a shortage of assistants in the Card Division, as well as in the closely related Accessions, Catalog, and Classification Divisions, the service to our subscribers has been less satisfactory than usual. In connection with the annual convention of the American Library Association at New York in June, a special meeting of representatives of subscribing libraries was held to discuss ways and means of keeping the card-distribution service up to a satisfactory standard.

In the next annual report, the last one he would write before his retirement, he declared: "It is again necessary to report chronic and increasing delay in the production of the cards. The subscribers' dissatisfaction with the present service is registered in an increasing stream of queries and complaints."

Hastings, those who worked with him, and his successors were always, of necessity, attuned to the outside library world far more than to the general world of the Library of Congress itself. This was inevitable and, to the extent that it fostered a zeal to provide all libraries with bibliographic aid and assistance, highly commendable. That most of the libraries in the country needed assistance was clearly evident to Hastings, so much so that from 1928 to 1938 he was actually using his own money to pay the salaries of some of the people he had hired to distribute the catalog cards to outside libraries. He did, in fact, on several occasions borrow money from a local bank on his own personal note to pay such salaries near the close of a fiscal year. He wrote:

I am again obliged, to ask the National Capital Bank to loan me enough money to pay the salaries of assistants in the Card Division while we are collecting in the credits due the Library of Congress from other libraries supported by the U.S. Government. These libraries are scattered over the earth and are subject to various restrictions as to payment and it takes time to collect in the credits. Am
likely to need to borrow as much as $5,000 to meet the remaining pay rolls for the year . . .

Please explain to your Board that this money is immediately turned over to . . . our Disbursing Officer and is paid out by him just as tho it were U.S. government money. He was reimbursed for the money borrowed, but it seems certain that the interest paid on the loans was not, Hastings asked him to come on over and work. When the employee arrived at the Library, the two of them, standing side by side, searched orders for cards, most likely silently, for talking while working ranked only slightly below the use of annual leave in Hastings's list of personal sins.  

In November 1938 Hastings retired, having reached the mandatory retirement age; the number of subscribers to the card service stood at 6,311, and the number of cards sold in his final year totaled 13,939,565. An editorial in the August 1938 Library Journal observed that “thanks to the skill of Charles Hastings they [printed cards] have become the basis for the catalogs of 90 percent of the libraries of America.” Herbert Putnam's statement in his annual report for that year was followed by “Clk.” He would, no doubt, have viewed with a great amount of pride the listing in the subsequent Polk's Directory for his name that year was followed by “consultant Libr Cong”; he had been appointed Honorary Consultant in the Use of Printed Catalog Cards for one year and was so listed in the 1940 annual report of the Librarian.

And so Hastings retired to his house on Ordway Street, where he had lived since 1912. He would now have time to avidly pursue another interest—watching baseball games—but he did not, of course, stop working. He was seen by some of his former staff members working in a grocery store, which would account for the fact that in the 1939 Polk's Directory his name was followed by “consultant Libr Cong”; he had been appointed Honorary Consultant in the Use of Printed Catalog Cards for one year and was so listed in the 1940 annual report of the Librarian.

Within thirty days after Hastings's retirement the Card Division moved into temporary quarters in the southwest courtyard of the Library, where it was to remain for one year. As early as 1934 the division was scheduled to move to the new annex being constructed to the east across Second Street, for Putnam stated in his annual report that the floors of this new building "will provide ample room for the Copyright Office, the Card Distribution Division, and the Printing and Binding departments. The transfer of these activities from their present locations . . . would result in liberating space now greatly needed for an expansion of the other divisions of the Library, at present functioning under adverse conditions due to lack of space." The floor plans for the annex, which appeared as front matter in the 1934 report, show the Card Division scheduled to occupy the peripheral office areas of the entire third floor with "card storage stacks" filling the north end and the east side in areas now occupied by the Serial Record and Shared Cataloging divisions. By 1937, however, it had become obvious that the occupancy date would not arrive soon enough to solve some serious problems, one of which was the construction of the Hispanic Foundation which was scheduled to begin at that time.
On September 30, 1937, Putnam wrote to David Lynn, architect of the Capitol at that time, stating that a temporary structure was required and "need be little more than a shed, which could most economically and unobtrusively be erected in the southwest courtyard. . . . It is to house the equipment and personnel of our Card Division pending available space for them in the Annex itself." Thus, during the winter of 1938 he reported that it was found necessary to move the entire Division, including the stock of over 100,000,000 cards, to a temporary structure in the southwest courtyard. The desks, cases, and main catalog used by the searchers were transported to the new structure during December 23–25, so that, when the assistants returned from their Christmas holiday, they were able to go to work at once. It took over one month of continuous trucking to move the stock of cards to the new location. There was never any interruption of the service, but the time required to fill orders and the cost of filling them naturally increased.

And so the division moved into this two-story, wooden structure given numerous names—not all of them complimentary—but generally called the woodshed or the shack. Temporary structures were common in Washington at that time, with a considerable number of them having been temporary since World War I. Unfortunately, photographs or drawings of the structure are difficult to locate. Some former staff members recall the shack being hot in the summer and somewhat less than warm in the colder months of the one year of occupancy.

One of the purposes of the move to the courtyard, where the staff carried on its work until December 30, 1939, was to allow construction for the Hispanic Foundation quarters to begin. The general reason for the move of the division, however, was the ever-growing demands made upon the Library's space by a constantly growing staff and a regularly growing collection of books and other materials, a growth which necessitated over the years the construction of two permanent stacks in courtyards of the Library and an addition on the east side of the building.

The staff of the Card Division had grown, as had other units, and would continue to do so, but this division had one unique problem with which no other organizational unit of the Library had to contend: an ever-growing inventory of printed cards maintained for sale. The growth of the staff and collections of the Library seemed to be arithmetic growths; the growth of the card inventory was geometric. That is, for every book cataloged it was necessary to print multiple copies of the cards for the card stock so that orders might be filled at some future date.

The administrative files of the Library contain scores of memoranda written over the years on how to cope with this ever-swelling appendage of the Card Division as each succeeding year tens of thousands of books were cataloged and the cards for them were printed and placed in stock. How and where was it to be housed? Could the volume be reduced? How was it to be moved? Where would money be found for cases in which to store it? In short, how to care and provide for this stock of cards, but never, never how to feed it, for it grew, seemingly without feeding, like some giant culture left in a warm pan overnight. As the years went by, the growth of this particular card file—admittedly unique in any library—and regular card catalogs throughout the country, particularly those in large libraries, pointed up more and more the truth set forth in the Library Journal's June 1906 editorial: "It is probably a long time ahead to the day when the card catalog will require so much storage space as to become a pressing problem, yet this possibility demands thought in the planning of library buildings."

That this problem was already of considerable concern to the larger libraries around the country was evidenced in many ways by several people during the thirties, particularly by representatives of those libraries which had been attempting to maintain a full set of all LC cards printed since 1898, sets called depository sets of cards. At the time of Hastings's retirement, the Card Division was mailing one copy of each card printed to over seventy libraries, most of them in the United States. Staff members of those libraries were interfiling, as received, each shipment of new cards so that a complete record of the books cataloged by the Library was being maintained in various places as an aid to libraries and general research. But these catalogs were only available in those specific depository sites.

B. Harvey Branscomb, at that time director of libraries at Duke University, proposed in 1936 that the Association of Research Libraries look into "the possibility of obtaining a printed [book] catalog of the contents of the Library of Congress." The library at Duke did not have an LC depository set of cards, and it was felt, at any rate, that the main-
Preparation costs of one would be prohibitive even if one were available. His proposal that such a catalog be published followed a rather circuitous route through various in-boxes, out-boxes, and an occasional hold-box here and there, and in several offices of ARL, ALA, and the Library of Congress, with Herbert Putnam, almost a year later, turning down the idea for the first time. It was probably too late in Putnam’s career for him to have considered such a proposal, for he had, after all, been Librarian for almost forty years at the moment of receiving it for the first time. It was probably too late in Putnam’s career for him to have considered such a proposal, for he had, after all, been Librarian for almost forty years at the moment of receiving it for the first time, and the implementation of the idea had to await the arrival of his successor. After additional discussions in various circles over several years, an agreement between the Library and ARL was signed on July 10, 1942, which contained the following statement in its first paragraph:

In order to further the progress of scholarly research in the United States and abroad and in order to promote bibliographical work in general, the Library of Congress agrees to deposit a complete set of its printed catalog cards with the Association of Research Libraries or its agent to be reproduced in book form under the auspices of the Association of Research Libraries.

Preparing the cards for shipment to the ARL’s agent, the J. W. Edwards firm in Ann Arbor, Michigan, was performed by the Card Division staff under the guidance of John W. Cronin, the chief who succeeded Charles Hastings. Like his boss, Cronin was from Maine and a graduate of Bowdoin—two facts which were apparently coincidental and unknown at the time by either man when Cronin first came to work in the division in 1925. He also was a bear for work with a tremendous knowledge of the details of the card distribution service, gained from having performed all the tasks of the service much as Hastings had. Daniel Melcher, then president of the R. R. Bowker Company, wrote at one time: “Effective public service is surely the highest calling, done as it inevitably is under conditions of large difficulties and small thanks. Within this elite, my favorite public servant is John Cronin.” Cronin would have agreed with that statement about public service and, most assuredly, never spent the better part of three seconds worrying about “large difficulties.” And it’s doubtful that he spent half that time being concerned about the thanks. That the difficulties were large was a fact of life; that the thanks, perhaps, were meager was of little import. You did what you had to do.

Cronin certainly did an enormous quantity of work in nursing into life the large book catalog that was ultimately to constitute 167 volumes—A Catalog of Books Represented by Library of Congress Printed Cards. In addition to being chief of the division from 1938 to 1944, Cronin was the editor of this catalog and examined, by his own admission, every one of the approximately two million cards which it comprised. He journeyed several times to Ann Arbor in 1942-43 to advise and assist the publisher and the small LC staff there which was performing the final editing of the mounted cards before they were photographed for offset printing. He traveled out and back by train, as Herbert Putnam before him had traveled through the Midwest in the summer of 1901, on a mission which would result in actually extending and expanding the work started earlier by Putnam to the benefit of all libraries.

The significance of the catalog subsequently published lies not in the fact that the preliminary work on its preparation was done by staff members of the Card Division or that Cronin nursed this huge book catalog into its final completed form over the
years 1942–45, but that its issuance represented a sharp expansion of the catalog card distribution concept set into motion by the Library in October 1901 with the advice, guidance, and assistance of the American library community. The introduction to this multivolume work contains almost three pages of a beautifully succinct history of the national efforts to make workable a fully cooperative venture in cataloging books as an aid to the American research community. To merely quote from that introduction, written by Archibald MacLeish in 1942, is to run the risk of diluting its impact, but nevertheless only a quote is possible here:

In the light of this history it seems appropriate and just that the great research libraries of America should now combine to publish in these volumes the cards of the Library of Congress. What is here published is not, of course, the full catalog of the Library. The rapid growth of the book collections of the Library of Congress over the last half century has proved too great for the Library's technical staff, maintaining the Library's meticulous standards of technical accuracy, to match with printed cards. Nevertheless, the reproduction in this form of the cards which the Library of Congress has printed and distributed for the libraries of the country will make available to all who have access to this work the fruits of one of the great cooperative enterprises of American scholarship.

It is not excessive, and certainly it is not rhetorical, to say that the appearance of this work marks the end of one chapter of American librarianship. It is even truer to say that it marks the beginning of another. The problem with which Mr. Jewett and Mr. Bowker, and Mr. Dewey, and Mr. Putnam wrestled has not been solved. The essential question still remains: by what cooperative means can American librarians advance the technical and bibliographical services of their libraries? How can American librarians, working in harmony and as equal participants in a common labor, assure the citizens of this democracy that the scholarly materials they require for their government of themselves and the advancement of their lives and aspirations will be present and available?

To the solution of one aspect of that problem the time and thought and effort of the foremost librarians of the generation now past were devoted. To the solution of that same aspect of the problem the facilities of the Library of Congress were also, for 40 years, committed. They are still committed to that end, and they are still available for the use of those librarians who, in common labor, will undertake to master the difficulties which confront us now. Neither in 1901 nor in 1942 has the Library of Congress had any purpose but the advancement of the common effort to provide the people of this nation with the materials of knowledge they have a right to expect to find within their reach.

That the publication of this catalog marked “the end of one chapter of American librarianship” and “the beginning of another” was made clear in the years that followed, for the Library of Congress began issuing on a regular basis different book catalogs which contained the newly issued catalog cards in different physical arrangements.

Thus in 1947 the Library initiated the Cumulative Catalog, the first of the Library's regularly published catalogs to be issued and sold in book form; in 1950 publication on a regular basis of Books: Subjects, a companion to the Cumulative Catalog, with the card entries arranged by subject was commenced; in 1953 coverage of the Cumulative Catalog was expanded by including titles of works cataloged and reported by other libraries, and the publication was renamed the National Union Catalog; in 1959 the issuance of the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, designed to do for manuscript collections in the country what the NUC was doing for books, was inaugurated; in 1974 the publication on a regular basis of Monographic Series, which contained the data on catalog cards printed for works published in a series, was launched; and in 1975 issuance of the Chinese Cooperative Catalog, which was composed of catalog cards for Chinese works cataloged by the Library and other cooperating research libraries, was begun. In most of these book catalogs—many of them issued monthly, quarterly, and annually—the individual entries were exact facsimiles of the LC printed cards, somewhat reduced in size so that approximately eighteen of them could be reproduced on a page. All of the catalogs were originally produced by means of inexpensive, photo-offset processes which made their publication and sale to libraries possible at the lowest price. The prices were, of course, set in accordance with the provisions of the 1902 statute which required a return of cost plus ten percent.

The general reception of these book catalogs in the United States and abroad was so enthusiastic that by 1975 sales had reached the annual figure of over $4.5 million, thus outdistancing the card sales by a considerable margin in dollar amounts. The manpower needed to handle the subscriptions to these book catalogs and to do the wrapping and mailing was not large, so throughout the forties, fifties, and sixties the growth in Card Division staff was primarily the result of the continuing escalation of the demand for the cards, a demand which was, to some extent, partially fueled by the issuance of the book catalogs, which contained the perfect
means of ordering cards—the individual LC card number.

In 1951 a system for further expanding the availability of the LC card numbers for domestically published books was inaugurated. For many years Publishers' Weekly, the Cumulative Book Index, and other organs of the book trade had, in the hope of providing service to libraries, included the card numbers for LC printed cards as part of the entries for current titles listed. It has already been mentioned that Bowker had offered, from the very beginning of the service but particularly in a letter written to Putnam in October 1901, the services of Publishers' Weekly in whatever way possible. “I shall be glad,” he had written, “to facilitate, through the Publishers' Weekly or otherwise, any features of the general plan in which I can be of use.” The subsequent and regular publication of the LC card numbers in that journal and elsewhere has aided libraries over the years in ordering cards, for the stock was maintained in numerical order and it was, therefore, simpler to fill orders when the stock control number was provided by the subscriber—simpler and cheaper.

Thus in 1951, Duell, Sloan and Pearce Publishers first suggested the idea of having the LC card number for each particular publication printed by the publishers themselves on the verso of the title page. J. B. Lippincott followed suit, and by the close of the fiscal year, twenty-four publishers had indicated they would participate. “Efforts on the part of the American Book Publishers' Council,” the Librarian wrote in his annual report, “and publicity in Publishers' Weekly did much to promote this practice.” The report further stated:

If the maximum benefits are to be derived, however, publishers should further cooperate by depositing copies of their current publications in the Library of Congress as early as their review copies are sent out. This would enable the Library to have its printed cards ready for mailing on or before the publication date of the work covered by the cards. A number of publishers already follow this course and efforts are being made by a joint committee of the American Library Association and the American Book Publishers' Council to persuade others to adopt the practice.

The late fifties and sixties were enormously difficult times for the Card Division, in fact the most difficult in the history of the service. In 1960 the Library cataloged 87,863 titles for printed cards; in 1969 it cataloged 212,466—two and one-half times as many per year. In 1960 it sold a total of 32,057,488 catalog cards; in 1968 it sold 78,770,000. The division had 10,000 subscribers listed on its rolls in 1960; by 1969 it had 25,000. Two large-scale acquisitions programs initiated in the Library during the sixties brought publications in for cataloging—and for the printing and distribution of cards—in numbers totally unprecedented in the Library's history: the Public Law 480 program was initiated in 1962 for the acquisition of multiple copies of foreign publications for American research libraries, including the Library of Congress, utilizing U.S.-owned foreign currencies; and the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, authorized and funded originally by Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965, was successfully launched in 1966. This act and subsequent related authorizations gave the Librarian the responsibility of acquiring, insofar as possible, all library materials of value to scholarship currently published throughout the world, of cataloging them promptly after receipt, and of distributing bibliographic information through printed catalog cards or by other means to American research libraries. As one librarian stated shortly after the program was started, this system was “the most momentous and far-reaching development in the library world since Melvil Dewey conceived the unit card and the Library of Congress began to provide catalog cards to other libraries.”

The number of catalog cards printed and distributed each year for newly acquired and cataloged works under these programs increased in staggering quantities, swelling the inventory and creating space and personnel problems for the Card Division unlike any experienced before. As early as the summer of 1964, even before the impact of these two programs was felt, the space needs of the division plus those of the Library necessitated a move from the Annex on Capitol Hill to a new annex, a mile away, in the Navy Yard on the edge of the Anacostia River. The initiation of these new programs and their growth during the sixties corresponded to and in many ways were prompted by the general phenomenal growth in the American educational system during that time, particularly in the amounts of federal funding involved.

Library employees searching card orders on the third floor of the Annex where the Serial Record Division is now located.
By early 1968, education in the United States was receiving more money than at any time in its history. Fred M. Hechinger reported in the *New York Times*: “The total education expenditure, public and private, at all levels, stands at $32-billion, almost 7 per cent of the gross national product, up $3-billion over a year ago. . . . Total enrollments in all types of institutions, public and private, stood at 57.2 million, well over a fourth of [the] total population. . . . Education and its supporting professional, manufacturing and publication services are now the nation’s biggest business.”

Another writer, Marjorie Hunter, observed in that same issue of the *Times*: 

While other Great Society programs struggled for their very existence last year, Federal aid to education continued to ride the crest of the Congressional popularity wave. . . . “By the end of the long, trying session, Congress had poured nearly $3.9-billion for the current fiscal year into programs administered by the United States Office of Education—97 per cent of the money sought by the Administration. . . . [Some of this money was] earmarked for the purchase of textbooks and library materials, for supplementary educational centers and for strengthening state departments of public instruction.”

Thus, fueled by federal funding in quantities never before experienced and pushed by student bodies, faculties, and other users in numbers never before known, the schools and libraries of the country ordered books during the late sixties in totals that were mind boggling. They also ordered from the Library corresponding catalog cards for those books that greatly overtaxed the facilities and staff of the Card Division. In 1968, for example, 15,039,396 individual three- by five-inch order forms for sets of cards poured into the division.97 The wave of card orders, which had been building inexorably since 1901, crested in the late 1960s with the force of a tidal wave which only those who survived could properly appreciate. The division was, quite frankly, unable to fully meet the workload as quickly as it would have liked, but not through any lack of desire, planning, or effort on the part of the administration and the staff. That it did meet the challenge as extraordinarily well as it did is a tribute to every staff member who played his or her respective role.

It has already been mentioned that the Library's first printed catalog card was for the collected works of the French novelist Balzac. Another Frenchman, Montaigne, wrote: “I have never seen greater monster or miracle in the world than myself. . . .”

The card distribution service could have achieved animation during this particular time in its history—and it was most assuredly an animated place in the late sixties—it could have said with equal assurance that it had never seen a greater monster or miracle than itself. The word *monster* is used advisedly but correctly as Webster's defines it as something "departing greatly in form or structure from the usual type of the species" or "any enormous animal or thing" or something which is "enormous in size, extent or numbers." Clearly and unarguably the card distribution service as carried out by the Card Division filled those criteria to the maximum degree in the sixties. By 1968 the positions authorized by Congress for the preparation, printing, and distribution to libraries of book catalogs, technical publications, proofsheets, and catalog cards numbered 564. The total number of positions authorized by Congress for the entire Library that year was 2,721. Thus, the appropriation to fund the preparation, printing, and distribution of the Library’s cataloging, in whatever physical form, accounted for 20 percent of the authorized positions in the Library.

In 1968 the Card Division had almost six hundred staff members, many of them filling part-time and temporary positions, working two shifts from seven in the morning until ten at night with overtime, frequently seven days a week, attempting to fill orders, which arrived 60,000 strong each working day, primarily for catalog cards. The division was the largest of any in the Library both in terms of staff and floor space. There was only one university library system in the United States which had more staff members that year, and that was Harvard with a total staff of 746 people. The Yale University library system employed 487 people; Columbia University libraries, 401; the University of Michigan, 511; the University of California at Berkeley, 399; Ohio State University, 220; and the University of Washington in Seattle, 348.

At the end of the sixties the division needed the ground floors of two adjacent buildings for its staff, the inventory of printed cards, the printing plant, the searching catalog, and the shipping and receiving area; the total floor space occupied was 76,765 square feet, not in itself a significant figure until one is reminded that the total square footage of a football field, including both end zones, is 57,600 square feet. No other division of the Library could make that claim; it is unlikely that any wished to.
The corps of searchers in the division, whose responsibility it was to search those card orders submitted without the identifying LC card numbers, had a fleet of over fifty specially made stools, each with four oversize casters, which enabled them to scoot up and down the aisles, seated, with some degree of speed, ease, and efficiency. The chief of the division requested maintenance on this fleet of stools as one might request maintenance on fleets of other four-wheeled government vehicles. “At the present time,” he wrote to the chief of the Buildings and Grounds Division, “two of the principal supervisors . . . periodically clean and oil the casters on 50 stools used in the Searching Unit. These stools are used constantly and the casters gather a great deal of dust and lint. This often causes the wheels to freeze, thus producing a safety hazard. It would be greatly appreciated if someone on your staff could clean and oil the casters once every month.”

One of the division’s units, the Arranging and Billing Unit, had over fifty staff members at that time, a figure which exceeded the individual staff strength of many divisions in the Library. Its responsibility was to manually arrange and interfile the daily receipts of card order forms in one numerical sequence by LC card number. Having all orders in one numerical sequence facilitated the pulling of the cards from areas where they were stored by number. Unfortunately, it did not facilitate the return of filled orders to the individual libraries, so the staff of the unit had to rearrange the filled orders by the name and number of the subscriber and then bill thousands of individual libraries for the orders filled every day—an enormous and tedious manual operation which went on day after day after day.

The number of overtime hours the division’s employees worked during these years could be termed monstrous, for the total hours worked are difficult to comprehend. Permission for overtime work had to be requested by a memorandum from the division chief to the Librarian; once approved, a list of those staff members working extra hours had to be submitted to the guard’s office so that it would be known who was authorized to be in the area after regular hours. The 246 overtime memoranda which appeared in the division reading file for a period of ten months, from January through October 1966—an average of better than one memo each working day—show such daily totals of staff members working overtime as 35, 250, 119, 140, 134, 144, 14, 135, 62, 75, 82, and 61. And yet funds for overtime were not always available, especially near the end of a fiscal year. In one letter the division chief declared: “Since February 1 we have worked only a 40 hour week, when we should have worked 70 hours each week. Also the Printing Office has not been permitted the use of overtime, so consequently, they are three to four weeks behind in their schedule . . . We are struggling just to hold our heads above water.” Clearly an operation which seemed normal only when its staff was working seventy hours each week would have to be considered unusual, possibly even monstrous in size or in concept.

If the card distribution service had become a physical and administrative monster it was also most assuredly a miracle, for somehow or another, with or without overtime, the staff managed to fill the overwhelming percentage of all those orders that flooded in, although perhaps not always as rapidly as some librarians in the country would have liked. The total number of subscribers to all services carried on the rolls of the Card Division in 1968 was 25,000; the American Library Directory for that same year listed 24,666 libraries in the United States and Canada. Clearly, in shipping out 78,770,000 catalog cards and tens of thousands of copies of the Library’s book catalogs and technical publications, the division was servicing almost the entire American library community.

And if the card distribution service was an enormous operation in the late sixties, its future portrait as depicted by the projections made at the time showed something far more gargantuan, something almost frightening. The number of orders per day, five to eight years in the future, was expected to reach 100,000; the staff was expected to exceed 600 in a very short time; the amount of space estimated to be needed to house this enormous operation was set at 135,000 square feet, or two and one-half football fields, both end zones included. The figure of 100,000 orders per day was, in fact, used in invitations sent out by the Library in 1968 to bid on automatic equipment to handle the division’s workload. In his report for the previous year the Librarian wrote concerning the division: “The ever-increasing workload, turnover of staff, and, above all, lack of space for card stock continues to hamper its effectiveness, making it increasingly ap-
parent that a drastic overhaul is required to achieve the maximum in efficiency of operations. To that end, the Card Division has begun a full-scale effort to mechanize its operations.°°

In October of 1968, the very month in which the original circulars and memoranda had been sent out over Herbert Putnam’s signature in 1901, the first phase of the automation of the division began. The machinery, consisting of computers and optical readers, was designed to automatically handle the sorting and billing of card order forms, and it filled card orders which had formerly been done manually by the more than fifty members of the Arranging and Billing Unit. The machinery performed much as it was expected to do and thus provided the division for the first time in its history with automatic billing and updating of customers’ monthly accounts. It also subsequently provided a means of controlling the growth of inventory, for it was now known precisely which specific cards were being ordered by means of data compiled on the computer tapes. The second phase of the automation effort came later and “involved the design and procurement of special-purpose equipment capable of storing [on computer tape or disks] the [bibliographic] information now on the catalog cards in stock, retrieving it on demand, and reproducing the required number of copies for filling each order.” In short, phase two of the automation effort was designed to solve the long-standing card stock problem—to do away with the stock—which had plagued the Library and adversely affected the card distribution service off and on for nearly all of its six decades of existence; it was to do this by storing the inventory on tapes or disks. Phase two did not, unfortunately, completely solve the card stock problem, primarily because it turned out to be far more expensive and far slower than expected, and neither additional expense nor slowness was needed by a... operation that often seemed to have more than its fair share of both. It also turned out to be extraordinarily expensive to build a large computer-based inventory of bibliographic data for the older titles of cards in stock.

When viewed in retrospect, an event which took place in 1969, actually before the installation of the phase two portion of the automation equipment, had a far greater impact upon the division’s organizational structure, workload, future role, staff size, and even its name than did the automation efforts that began with the flick of the switches which started the phase one machines in October 1968. That event was the beginning of the distribution of the Library’s cataloging, at least its cataloging of English-language titles, in another physical format: magnetic tapes. It was called the MARC Distribution Service, with MARC being an acronym for M.Achine-Readable Cataloging. The story of the development of the MARC system and its universal acceptance as the standard format for machine-readable bibliographic records is not within the purview of this article; it has, at any rate, been told in numerous places, particularly in the annual reports of the Librarian in recent years. Its physical distribution and the effects of that distribution upon the general distribution of the Library’s cataloging are, however, within this article’s scope.

By 1976—seven years after the first tapes were mailed to subscribers—the effects of the availability of these tapes and the utilization being made of them throughout the country had a dramatic effect upon the work of the Card Division. Where the projections for card orders to be received each working day had been 100,000, the actual number being received in late 1976 was 19,500 and falling; where the projections of staff had been well in excess of 600 employees, the actual number in late 1976 was about 230 and falling; and where the projections of the space needs of the division had been 135,000 square feet, the actual area needed was less than half of that. The Library’s cataloging, in the form of the MARC tapes, was on a regular basis being purchased by and shipped to publishers, book jobbers, and other commercial firms; government agencies in this country and abroad; university and public libraries; and, perhaps most significantly, cooperative processing centers which were funded by libraries cooperating to meet their technical processing needs. Most of these organizations were then redistributing that cataloging in a variety of forms: microfiche, book catalogs, computer printouts, and, of course, millions upon millions of line-printer-produced catalog cards. The fees these organizations charged for the computer-produced catalog copy provided were, for numerous reasons, cheaper than the copy produced by the Library. As a result, with the demands for catalog cards produced and distributed by the Library through its Card Division falling steadily every year beginning with 1968,
by 1972 for the first time in the history of the distribution service, the dollar sales of cards fell below the dollar sales of cataloging in other physical formats. Thus, on February 1, 1975, the name Card Division was dropped and the Cataloging Distribution Service Division came into being; its name was shortened one year later to the Cataloging Distribution Service. The name changes were made to reflect the fact that it was "cataloging" which was being distributed and not any particular one of its physical forms.

The future of the service was uncertain in 1976, but only insofar as its physical and administrative structure and its staff size were concerned. Well over half of the 230 staff members have continued to work with the printing, handling, and distribution of cards, both within the Library and outside, although the income from card sales has accounted for only about 28 percent of all sales and is expected to fall as the demand for cards continues to fall. There were two major staff reductions in 1974 and 1975, with sixty positions being abolished in the former year and forty in the latter. By the close of 1976 another staff reduction will probably become necessary as sales continue to drop and the postal rates, printing costs, and salaries continue to rise. Each reduction brings in its wake morale problems, which are most likely inevitable in any organization faced with an uncertain future. But the future in terms of what the service will continue to do is not uncertain, for the Library's role as the original distributor of its cataloging to those who wish to acquire it, in whatever form, remains in principle, as it has always been, solidly based on law and long custom. The law of 1902 remains unchanged and still states that "the Librarian of Congress is authorized to furnish to such institutions or individuals as may desire to buy them, such copies of the card indexes and other publications of the Library as may not be required for its ordinary transactions. . . ."

It was stated earlier that October 28, 1901, was a Monday and the first day of a new work week for Library staff members. October 28, 1976, seventy-five years later, fell on a Thursday, near the end of a work week. As far as the Library ever reaching Friday, however, the end of a work week in the distribution of its cataloging to libraries, it is unlikely that that day will ever come as long as libraries continue to be a significant segment of the American educational and cultural scene. It seems impossible that the law of 1902 will ever be repealed, and no one is asking that this be done. It also seems impossible that the Library will sell in the next seventy-five years anything approaching the 1,613,111,283 catalog cards which it sold to more than thirty thousand libraries here and abroad from 1901 to 1976, representing close to six million titles cataloged by the Library staff during that time. The figure is, of course, incomprehensible and, perhaps, of itself insignificant. What is significant, however, is the effect that the distribution of the Library's cataloging has had upon American libraries over the seventy-five years. Few libraries have been untouched by the cataloging, printing, and distribution work done by Library staff members over the years, whether those libraries have purchased the cards, the proofsheets, the book catalogs, the technical publications, or the MARC tapes. It would be difficult to walk into a library anywhere in the United States and be unable to find one of these physical byproducts of the intellectual efforts of the cataloging staff of the Library of Congress. In fact, it is impossible to conceive of the American library system being the finest in the world without the cataloging and distribution performed by the Library. In that respect, the work done over the past seventy-five years by hundreds of staff members—of the Card Section from 1901 to 1914, of the Card Division from 1914 to 1975, and of the Cataloging Distribution Service from that last date forward—may, perhaps, be viewed as a miracle of no small dimensions.
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The American Revolution in Drawings and Prints; a Checklist of 1765-1790 Graphics in the Library of Congress. 1975. 127 p. $14.35. The 921-item checklist was compiled by Donald H. Cresswell. Liberally illustrated, the book is divided into five sections covering portraits, events, views, cartoons and allegories, and weapons and implements.
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of the Library. The essay on the events preceding and during the Revolution is richly illustrated with more than 100 reproductions, eight in full color, of manuscripts, maps, prints, and rare books, the great majority of which are in the Library's collections. Produced through the Verner W. Clapp Publication Fund. For sale by the Information and Media Services Office, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540.

Twelve Flags of the American Revolution. 1974. 13 p. $1.25. This catalog to accompany a Bicentennial exhibition depicts the flags in both black and white and color and gives notes on their origins and symbolism. Produced through the Verner W. Clapp Publication Fund. For sale by the Information and Media Services Office, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540.
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