SUMMARY. Mounting digital images of art objects on a Web site is only the first step in providing patron access to such materials. Libraries and museums have a responsibility to provide not only high-quality digital reproductions but also high-quality access from an integrated library catalog with controlled vocabulary and consistent access points. While some digital collections may have excellent internal searchability and require no more than collection level cataloging in a library’s OPAC, others may demand cataloging of individual components of the collection. A particular collection’s significance, its potential audience, the types of access required, as well as factors such as its size and cohesiveness need to be considered before becoming locked into a specific Web design—especially when it is that of another institution.

This paper examines several online library catalogs in which records for art objects as well as historical objects and natural history specimens have...
been merged, with varying degrees of success, and briefly addresses a modest proposal to catalog ceramic objects at the Ohio State University Libraries. The importance of consistent subject access in a merged catalog, regardless of the thesaurus or thesauri used, is stressed. Library consortia and bibliographic utilities may offer an economically appealing alternative for libraries that cannot design and construct their own digital libraries but these external organizations often have limited capability for–or interest in– modifying the design for a particular library and even less interest in cataloging the collections. Libraries, too, must be faulted for simply listing available electronic resources, either alphabetically or in broad subject categories, on a separate portion of their Web page and failing to provide full catalog records in their catalog. Finally, it is emphasized that the current debate over the viability of MARC 21 versus other metadata standards remains largely irrelevant to the importance of continuing to cultivate a monolithic online catalog, maintaining cataloging standards, and not mindlessly developing what amounts to a separate, rudimentary catalog solely for electronic resources. [Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-HAWORTH. E-mail address: <docdelivery@haworthpress.com> Website: <http://www.HaworthPress.com> © 2003 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.]
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INTRODUCTION

Although once common, talk about “taming the Internet” has largely subsided. With the diminution of such grandiose ambitions there seems to be a concomitant decrease in efforts to integrate Web resources into the library catalog. It is as if the dazzling display of infinite electronic possibilities has blinded many to the important responsibility of providing adequate, consistent access to all data, when the continued aim of librarians should be to cultivate their catalogs rather than to try to tame the Internet. Granted that the ability to “harvest” the Internet represents a quantum leap in information science technology, there is a time to reap but there is also a time to sow—and the “seeds” are catalog records. The Internet may or may not evolve into a more domestic form of beast but, regardless of whether it grows more organized or not, librarians need to facilitate a happier blending of new information technology and proven access (i.e., cataloging) strategies.
Too often in their zeal to get on the ’Net, library decision makers are haphazardly developing Web sites without any thought of the desirability of integrating the material into the library catalog. Rather, like kids in a candy store, they are besotted with the possibilities of the Web, unconstrained by any clear-cut plan or design created with their end-users in mind. URL “linking” has become the bottom line and in many instances even that slender electronic thread is considered unnecessary. In addition, the modish adoption of any of a seeming myriad of new metadatas sometimes obscures the desirability of maintaining a consistent vocabulary. It is as if automatic translation suddenly precludes the need to know foreign languages—a state we have not quite reached yet, even at the United Nations. Current economic conditions may also play a negative role, particularly when used as justification for assuming that older technologies or strategies such as cataloging and its monstrous stepchild, authority control, can simply be replaced by newer technology. Just as information technology has done away with the card catalog, some might wish—or assume—that it will also do away with the cataloger.

The importance of a controlled vocabulary in and between individual library environments (catalogs) need not even be mentioned here were it not for the frightening speed—seemingly faster than many Web searches—with which the lesson has been lost in some quarters. Keyword searching is a powerful adjunct to access via a controlled vocabulary, but it is certainly no replacement. Unfortunately, the visions of freedom and efficiency provided by the recent blossoming of diverse metadata systems may also obscure the need and desirability of some control and design in terms not only of content but also of access.

Many databases are too technical or abstruse and too large to lend themselves to complete incorporation into a library catalog. The Oberlin College collection of Maya architecture slides incorporated into OhioLINK’s Digital Media Center “Social Sciences” database (see the Baggs Library Collection section) is a case in point. Many collections may be too parochial—a teacher’s slide collection for a specific course, for example—or selected images from different illustrations in a particular text. The illustrations to Helen Gardner’s *Art Through the Ages* have been digitized in an immensely usable, albeit subscription-based, resource (The AMICO Library™). Copyright and subscription issues aside, however, one would scarcely expect the individual illustrations in Gardner to be cataloged separately in any library catalog; but surely an electronic link from the catalog record for Gardner’s monograph to the online site is in order, or even a complete record for the digitized version. With numerous OCLC records for CD-ROM and...
color slide set versions of Gardner’s illustrations, why has no one cataloged the Web version?

An extreme case of this indifference to inclusion of Web titles in the online catalog is the common habit of simply listing serials and Web sites on a library Web page rather than adding or creating catalog records for the individual titles. “It is too much work,” catalogers often claim (or are told), or, “we’ll think about that when the list becomes too long”—but isn’t that what cataloging is about? It is an axiom that catalogers should not anticipate in cataloging an item; but surely this does not excuse them from anticipating the obvious problems created by replacing catalog records with a separate alphabetic list of titles or “browse screen” of concocted subjects. When the list becomes cumbersome, it is sometimes subdivided by subject or department, a refinement that smacks sufficiently of cataloging to satisfy some administrators but in effect sets up the rudiments of a separate, rival catalog, and one that is more smoke than mirror image at that.

Too often a Web site, with whatever internal search engine is used, is its own excuse for a catalog. Some happen to be excellent, with every type of access imaginable, especially when development happens to have included a librarian with subject expertise. Other sites are more klunky but they all, obviously, are still isolated and often somewhat idiosyncratic constructs unless integrated into the library catalog. In many cases this is acceptable: U.S. patents, for example, are all available online—though struggling with the CCL is necessary for the older ones—and who would suggest that every patent should be cataloged individually in a library catalog? Simply link a catalog record for the U.S. Patent Office Web site to the Web site; but, many academic libraries have yet to provide even this tenuous access. The development of new software for indexing and accessing the contents of individual Web sites and online serials is a rapidly expanding area, including the eye-opening use of visual indexing, though there is a definite limit in the number of access points that can be accommodated by visual representation, since the eye can encompass only so much at once. The development of “meta-indexes” or “directory” Web sites that are attempting to index and order portions of the Web is also a burgeoning area of study; but, the resultant sites remain essentially resource pages, not catalogs. The Librarians’ Index to the Internet is a fine example geared toward public libraries and is certainly more efficient than simply surfing the Web. At best, however, it is a limited subject catalog and does not replace the function of the online library catalog. Undoubtedly there is room for coexistence, with development of numerous non-MARC metadata systems, but in most cases too few resources are
being directed toward integrating Web resources into the library catalog, MARC or not.

At what point does this tendency to lump or isolate data in a Web site become a detriment and a disservice to the library patron? Obviously, when the patron expects to find information in the library catalog and neither it nor a link to it is there. An appendix listing available online journals or Web sites, whether alphabetically by title or subject, no matter how prominently displayed or “advertised” on the library’s home page, is still an appendix and not an integral part of the catalog. The presence or absence of a catalog record for the U.S. Patent Office is a case in point. Even more so, in terms of art, why has no library, to judge from OCLC’s WorldCAT, ever provided even a brief record for the Digital Consciousness Web site? Sure, one (librarian or patron) who knows of the site can with a simple Web search turn it up–but why not help the patron (or librarian) unfamiliar with the site by including a record, with subject access points, in your library catalog? According to the site’s FAQ,

Digital Consciousness is a public database of contemporary art. It contains biographies and artwork of emerging and established artists working in diverse media and styles. It administers a monthly on-line art contest, an art directory and an arts bulletin board. The name was chosen because of the truly phenomenal reach of new technology. Art, an extension of consciousness, can now be reduced to bits and bytes to be viewed over the Internet no matter in what medium it was originally created. This is the birth of digital consciousness.

Which leaves us with the ultimate question: if artists can be contemporary and so clearly understand the purpose of the Internet, why cannot more collection development librarians and library administrators?

**JUST LIKE TOPSY**

The Topsy-like development of separate bibliographic databases within a library or museum often smacks of poor planning and lack of foresight, though criticisms of specific systems generally have little merit beyond that offered by hindsight. *E Pluribus Unum* has never been an easy motto to live by, even in the world of cataloging. The online catalog of the Ohio Historical Society, for example, while offering the ability to search both its print and manuscript catalog in conjunction with its “mu-
seum” catalog of realia, either separately or simultaneously, clearly ex-
hibits serious problems with display, content, and metadata. One can
search the Society’s Online Collections Catalog (OCC) and find not only
monographs on early Ohio Valley painter David Gilmore Blythe but also
records for those of his actual paintings in the Society’s collections. This
is as it should be, and how convenient to be able to find all such relevant
records with a single search. And how even more convenient if digital
images of these paintings were linked to the catalog records!

Cataloging realia and images of realia, of course, is nothing new. AACR2 standards exist, as do appropriate Library of Congress subject
headings. Yet many museums involved in the cataloging of objects/arti-
facts have found alternative thesauri more suitable for classification and
cataloging, sometimes with dire results when it comes to integrating
catalogs. Among the several separate databases searchable within the
Society’s OCC, there is very little consistency, particularly in terms of
access. Except for the Archives-Library collection, there is no separate
subject search, subject headings apparently being subsumed under the
“General” keyword search. The separate museum catalogs include His-

tory, Natural History, and Archaeology subject headings, the most egre-
gious of which are the History subject headings, utilizing Chenhall’s
classification system but only his “Categories,” and not the actual ob-
ject terms he devised. History subjects for a “redware pot fragment” are
limited to “Ohio,” “Clermont County, Ohio,” and “Unclassifiable Arti-
facts,” for example. Happily, some records include county provenance
and other geographic, personal, or corporate names, in various forms,
but a crosswalk between Chenhall’s classification and more current,
standard, metadata or the addition of LC or AAT headings, and a dis-
crete, uniform subject file clearly is desirable.

Reliance upon Chenhall’s hierarchical nomenclature, with his ten
“categories” serving as almost the sole subject access, is clearly inade-
quate. The problem is further complicated by the potential redundancy
and consequent confusion between object and subject in many museum
catalogs. The information content of many subject files, real or theoreti-
cal, is further reduced or made redundant by a separate file for “Material.” If the object is a vase made of porcelain, and one keyword search
retrieves all vases and another retrieves all objects made of porcelain,
why construct separate subject headings for Vases and for Porcelain?
The question may not have been relevant to Chenhall, and it clearly has
not been raised by many museum curators; the value of a structured sub-
ject file as opposed to simplistic keyword searching, or the necessity of
searching several separate files, should be obvious to anyone familiar with online catalogs.

Other museums have responded in a manner similar to the Ohio Historical Society. Although Cleveland’s Western Reserve Historical Society (WRHS) has avoided some confusion by placing Chenhall’s “categories” in a separate field for “Shelving,” which is not generally searchable by the public, this repository’s online catalog also lacks a separate subject file. Instead WRHS includes subject headings or subject-like terms in the Object Description and Materials fields and relies on General and “Subject/Object” keyword searches. As with OHS’s system, this greatly diminishes the value of an integrated catalog. In effect, neither institution’s catalog is a fully integrated system. Simply providing a “combined search” can be very misleading to the patron and to that extent is actually a disservice.

The desirability and even necessity of such access becomes especially imperative when museum artifact catalogs are merged with records for archival and library materials. OHS staff have realized this and have supplemented their restrictive Chenhall “History Subjects” with geographic names (usually based upon provenance, although this is not always clear from the record), personal and corporate names. Even some vague subject headings are used, such as, “Governor” for a portrait of Governor Thomas Corwin (apparently unaware that Chenhall uses this term for Energy Production T&E and for Mining & Mineral Harvesting T&E, not for the political office). Surely “Governors–Ohio–Portraits” is not too much to ask in an integrated catalog? To their credit, OHS staff are aware of such problems and are now adding LC subject headings, but it would have been much better had the problem been addressed by administrators before putting the merged catalog online.

The Natural History subject headings in the OCC consist mostly of hierarchical taxonomic entries, so that a keyword or “general search” on genus or common name often works. Archaeology database contains very detailed descriptions and provenance data, so that a “General” word search is more successful. One still must be careful, however, in devising searches—“Adena Culture” does not retrieve artifacts of the Adena Culture. Because only “Adena” was input in this field: the search must be limited to this single word, and it also retrieves numerous unrelated records for Historic artifacts from the Adena estate of Governor Thomas Worthington. Even this insight does not always work, however, for a search on “Early Woodland” retrieves records not only for the Early Woodland culture but those much later artifacts labeled “Early Late Woodland.”
Problems of access of the OCC History and Natural History records is exacerbated by the fact that searching is impacted by truncation of many fields, due to a systems problem in migrating from an IBM 36 system not intended for public use to the present online system. A Weller Pottery Hudson vase decorated by Hester Pillsbury may be found by searching on *Heste Pillsbury* but not by searching on Hester Pillsbury! Thirty-five artifacts are found with a word search on “unglazed”: 144 appear with a search on “*unglaz*”! This problem extends to geographical names. If one were looking for clay tobacco pipes made at Point Pleasant, Ohio, a search on “Point Pleasant” retrieves nothing; one has to search on “Pt. Pleasan,” which finds 161 hits. (Note, too, the unorthodox and inconsistent abbreviation of “Point.”) A random search (“ce”) of the browsable Natural History subject list reveals the following hits shown in Table 1.

This, of course, is in large part a systems problem, not a cataloging problem *sensu stricto*, although idiosyncratic abbreviations and inputting in the original History and Natural History databases clearly are an unfortunate cataloging aspect. The file may be cleaned up eventually, but only with considerable effort and cost. Meanwhile, it serves as a warning to administrators to examine any system thoroughly before buying it or buying into it.

Even less successful, at least from an academic point of view, is the Society’s “Ohio Memory Project,” which is, rather deliberately, an ele-

### Table 1. Random Search (“ce”) of OCC Natural History Subject Headings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subject Headings</th>
<th>Hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carbonates -- Hydrous Carbonates</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carc</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Central Mottled Sculpin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ceph</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cest</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chae</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chameleon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Char -- Char</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chil -- Lith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chil -- Scut</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chio -- Chae</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chio -- Clad</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chio -- Haem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tronic hodgepodge of some of the flashier Ohio historic memorabilia images that have been contributed by libraries and local historical societies across the state. A patchwork quilt of artifacts, lacking little design or control other than keyword searching, the project is popular, intriguing, and about as useful as a Ripley’s Believe It or Not museum. Visitors to the electronic scrapbook can search for specific information by subject, contributing organization, and geographic area. The electronic scrapbook is organized into five categories for “easy navigation”: Ohio Citizenship, Economy, People, Culture, and Environment. Although proper names appear to be consistent with the LC Name Authority File, subject headings are limited to broad categories such as “Military Ohio,” “Minerals,” “Presidents and Politics,” “Ohio Women,” and “Religion in Ohio.” Specific minerals such as sphalerite can be found only by a title search or by a “Minerals” subject search. A list of subject headings can be browsed but there is considerable inconsistency in application of the headings. “Murder” and “Hangings” both retrieve documents about the murder of one William S. Finney but “Hangings” retrieves three other items related to Ohio murders and the hangings of the perpetrators; neither term, however, finds the preserved fingers of Mary Bach, now part of the Bach Murder Collection, physical evidence that helped convict her husband of murder and led to his hanging.

From the standpoint of a librarian or scholar, the effort expended to provide an image of such grisly eye-candy would have been better spent consistently cataloging these objects and thereby making them accessible by more specific methods than merely the simplest of keyword serendipity (one must search “fingers,” not “Bach,” “Murder,” “Hangings,” or the logical geographic headings). Greater foresight might have resulted in the use of LC subject headings or another type of structured metadata. Currently, one can use the subject search in this database and recover the following number of hits: “Ceramics,” 1 photograph of a pottery; “Porcelain,” 1 soup plate (that most definitely is not porcelain); “Potteries,” 1 photo, same as that found by searching “Ceramics”; “Pottery Industry,” 7, including one found by the previous searches; and “Pottery,” 16, including all of those found in the previous subject searches. It would be difficult to construct a better case demonstrating the importance of a consistent subject thesaurus and subject authority control.

To some extent the Ohio Historical Society itself has kept pace with the input of its own collections in the Ohio Memory Project, though many records are not yet found in their Online Collections Catalog (OCC) and those that remain are subject to the vagaries discussed above. Thus, records for realia appearing in their OCC are very idiosyn-
ocratic—when there are records—and further demonstrate the perils of trying to integrate separate catalogs with different and non-standardized metadata. It is to the Society’s credit that they have envisioned such an integration and are aware of the necessity for a tremendous amount of clean-up. Other libraries are also remiss in not cataloging realia submitted to the Ohio Memory Project. Even the State Library of Ohio has submitted images of portraits of three Ohio governors. A link provides quick access to the State Library’s WINSLO catalog, but records of these three important portraits are nowhere to be found.

Art museums, by virtue of the fact that their “objects” more frequently have a unique title and a named creator, do tend to create records that appear more closely akin to “old-fashioned” bibliographic records, although subject access is still often given short shrift. For example, the Akron Art Museum has cataloged Edward S. Curtis’ 1911 “Fisherman–Wishham” photograph in OhioLINK’s Digital Media Center (DMC) INK (see Figure 1). No significant public access points other than Creator and Title are provided in this record, and content is accessible only by visual inspection of the related digitized image. Object Type is browsable in the

FIGURE 1. Akron Art Museum DMC Record for Curtis Photograph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>The Fisherman, Wishham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creator:</td>
<td>Curtis, Edward S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation Date:</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Type:</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements:</td>
<td>15 1/2 x 11 3/4 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>No Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>Akron Art Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Credit:</td>
<td>Gift of Nancy and Robert F. Meyerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession Number:</td>
<td>1992.44 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier:</td>
<td>397237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributor:</td>
<td>Akron Art Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© Akron Art Museum

Used with permission.
DMC database but cannot be limited by Contributor. To be fair, the Akron Art Museum’s online catalog is currently under construction, so that these apparent limitations may be imposed by DMC protocol. In any case, compare this bare-bones record with that for the very same photographic image as cataloged by Northwestern University for the American Memory digital project (Appendix). Not only is the text of the original Curtis caption included but, more relevant for our purposes, there is also a subject heading for the Tlakluit Indian tribe (*Tlakluit Indians*), as well as a legitimate geographic subject heading (*Columbia River*), and three content identifiers (*Fishing, Men, Loincloths*) providing additional subject access within the American Memory Web site for the Curtis photographs.

Thus, the American Memory Project is considerably more sophisticated not only in terms of accessing the included digitized images but also in terms of overall selection and treatment of the site’s content. The particular example cited, the Edwin S. Curtis collection of American Indian photographs, was digitized and cataloged by Northwestern using the Dublin Core. Added to the OCLC database are collection level records for the 1,506 plates included in the original 20 bound volumes, with the titles of the individual plates listed in a note and the record linked through an intermediary HTML page that acts as a list of plates with an alternate “gallery” view. Additionally, an HTML table allows users to browse by volume and provides access both to all the portfolio images associated with each volume and to the lists of images bound into the volumes. For the 1,506 images in the bound volumes there is no specific indexing of artifacts or activities in individual scenes. However, the text of the titles supplied by Curtis can be picked up by a general search, and provides a variety of information such as “harvest,” “granaries,” and “potter.” (The user must remember that this is not controlled, consistent vocabulary.) The content-identifier index terms were assigned to the 720 portfolio plates, describing prominent features recognizable to the general viewer, including gender and social status of portrait subjects, as well as clothing, artifacts, structures, and daily activities. The Edward S. Curtis project is exemplary in the manner in which it has included adequate subject access to a major digitization project.²

---

**THE BAGGS LIBRARY COLLECTION: A CASE IN POINT**

The Arthur E. Baggs Memorial Library at Ohio State University was an outgrowth of the Arthur E. Baggs Memorial Fund, established fol-
following the death in 1947 of this internationally renowned ceramist and teacher (Carney, 1999). Financial support is also derived by two other memorial funds. For many years preserved and sustained almost single-handedly by Margaret Fetzer (1906-1997), the uncataloged collection deteriorated physically and became very disorganized despite Ms. Fetzer’s heroic efforts. The collection includes important manuscript materials, important ceramic objects, and ca. 1,000 published volumes that are currently being cataloged by the Ohio State University Libraries’ Cataloging Department and entered into OSCAR, the University Libraries’ online catalog.

As cataloging of the monographs and serials neared completion, the University Library proposed cataloging the ceramic objects in the Baggs Library as well, including digital images. Although this project has stalled because of funding considerations, The Ohio State University Libraries is hoping, in cooperation with the Department of Art, to create a similar database, creating and integrating catalog records for the ceramic objects with the OSU Libraries’ OSCAR online catalog and linking digitized images of these objects to the catalog records. The project is a logical progression from initial efforts to catalog the monographs, serials, and OSU theses in the Baggs collection, particularly since many of the objects are illustrated in the theses and almost all are products of OSU students and teachers, including works by such famous artists as Arthur E. Baggs, Paul Bogatay, Carlton Atherton, Adelaide Robineau, Hal Riegger, Herb Sanders, and Edgar Littlefield. The intent is to convert the Baggs Collection from an unorganized repository to a thoroughly cataloged and internationally accessible resource.

How should this be done? With some previous experience in cataloging realia and a knowledge of ceramics, The Ohio State University Libraries initially felt that the actual cataloging of the objects would be a relatively simple matter, particularly since the beginnings of a paper catalog of the ceramic pieces had recently been started by Dr. Margaret Carney. From the beginning, even before development of the initial proposal for this project, all parties agreed that the ceramic objects should be cataloged individually and, however and wherever mounted digitally, that there should be individual records for each piece in the OSU online catalog, as well as in OCLC’s database. The rationale for this approach included the fact that the collection is relatively small (ca. 1,000 pieces) and that OSU students, teachers, and alumni created the vast majority of pieces. The collection, in other words, is “of a piece” and an integral part of the Ohio State University’s resources, one that with few exceptions has long been overlooked nationally and has been
barely accessible locally, other than to the random ceramics student. On
the other hand, the collection is diverse enough in terms of the number
of different creators, types of materials, and other aspects that individ-
ual records rather than collection-level cataloging is merited.

As Ohio State University Libraries is a member of the OhioLINK
consortium, OhioLINK’s Digital Media Center seemed a logical and
desirable site for the proposed Baggs project. But would we be willing
to catalog our objects according to the Visual Resources Association
Core Categories, which eschewed Library of Congress subject headings
in favor of the Getty Research Institute’s Art and Architecture Thesau-
rus (AAT)? This raises significant access questions. Examining selected
ceramic subjects in the AAT and mapping them to the equivalent Li-
brary of Congress subject headings revealed that about a fourth of the
LC subject headings are the same in AAT (34 of 126); but the 126 LC
subject headings are exploded into 253 AAT headings, clearly a much
more finely defined thesaurus; but, the important point is that virtually
all of the AAT headings could be squeezed into existing LC subject
headings. Both thesauri could be used in the OSU Libraries’ existing
online catalog, although it would not be cost effective to pay for cre-
ation of an additional index for the AAT headings, so that these wouldremain searchable only by a keyword search. In some systems, with
considerable effort, it might be possible to merge the two vocabularies,
using “See” and “See also” cross-references, but this would require a
tremendous input of cataloging time and talent and is not a viable option
for us at this point. For the sake of consistency in searching the OSUL
catalog, the importance of including LC headings in our Baggs records
is obvious and incontrovertible (see Figure 2).

Yet, as we have seen in looking at the existing OhioLINK Digital
Media Center’s Art and Architecture database, there is no subject ac-
cess at all, even in the case of the 80,000 subscription-based AMICO
Library™ images that constitute the overwhelming majority of the
DMC’s holdings. And, as one reviewer of The AMICO Library™ some-
what nonchalantly notes, that database lacks any controlled vocabulary,
“because the details come from the owning museums who currently
prefer to use their own language and descriptors,” which necessarily
“leads to some confusion and complexity in searching the database”
(Safford, 2002). In terms of controlled subject access, it appears that the
barbarians are not only at the gates but are being abetted by a substantial
fifth column already inside the walls. Currently the OhioLINK DMC’s
Art and Architecture database offers searching only by keyword, cre-
ator, creator nationality, title, date, object type, and museum/repository.
Access within other DMC databases varies, apparently with the sophistication and/or at the whim of the cataloger/contributor. Thus, some of the records for the Oberlin College Dept. of Anthropology’s 500+ slides of Maya architecture (included for some reason in the DMC’s “Social Sciences” database rather than in its “Art and Architecture” database) have a LC subject heading—and I do mean a subject heading, for it is “Maya architecture,” although nicely divided geographically. One can also browse or search by place in a separate index which is not included in the subject search, nor does there appear to be any control over the form of place names. Clearly, one cannot assume that all records are created equal, even in the same institution let alone throughout the members of a consortium. These remarks are not intended as a criticism of the consortial approach to digitizing collections; but, there must be some control of standards of description and access points for a catalog to remain functional and efficient.
METADATA OR “MUDDY DATA”?

Considerable consternation among catalogers has been created by the recent assertion that “MARC Must Die” (Tennant, 2002). Reading past the overly-dramatic title, Tennant’s essay provides a very likely scenario of the MARC format sooner if not later being replaced by a more flexible form of metadata, most likely XML, albeit one incorporating much of the MARC 21 standard. This is not an entirely new idea, however. El-Sherbini (2001) surveyed and compared the major existing cataloging metadata sets used to catalog electronic resources and demonstrated that these are often extensions of or based on the MARC 21 standard.

And well they should be. Tacitly admitting the likelihood that the MARC 21 standard may eventually be replaced or significantly restructured, El-Sherbini recognized the value of developing new metadata standards, and the unprecedented flexibility these provide in describing electronic data but at the same time stressed the potential problems inherent in the multiplicity of metadata standards currently being generated. Just as the plethora of 19th century railroads eventually merged into a few major lines and eliminated all but a standard “gauge,” so will a modern standard for cataloging electronic resources likely emerge. In the mean time, though, the process may be a bit painful and even divisive for librarians and administrators. El-Sherbini rightly stressed the wisdom of relying upon established principles of information classification and existing standards. In any case, the demise of MARC is less likely to be a sudden death than a metamorphosis—small consolation to the caterpillar, but who wouldn’t prefer looking at a butterfly?

The Visual Resources Association’s Data Standards Committee has developed standards for cataloging “works of visual culture and the images that document them,” with a deliberate effort to allow mapping to the Dublin Core and MARC 21 metadata. That is not a problem. Recently, Cornell University Geospatial Information Repository’s (CUGIR) Metadata Sharing Project has set an example of how both MARC and non-MARC metadata can be managed and shared among institutions (Chandler and Westbrooks, 2002). For the present, for cataloger and library administrator alike, this means worry less about the container, more about the content, and most of all, provide consistency in access for your patron.

Freedom to call an object whatever you will simply muddies the waters. In the introduction to the online description of the Categories for the Description of Works of Art (CDWA) developed by the Art Information
Task Force (AITF), Baca and Harpring (2002) are eloquent in recognizing the evolutionary nature of art information systems, hoping that the CDWA framework “will contribute to the integrity and longevity of data and will facilitate . . . its inevitable migration to new systems as informational technology continues to evolve.” Above all, they hope that it will help to give end-users “consistent, reliable access to information, regardless of the system in which it resides.” Significantly, the CDWA also stresses that the indexing of key elements for access (retrieval) “should be a conscious activity performed by knowledgeable catalogers who consider the retrieval implications of their indexing terms, and not by an automated method that simply parses every word in a text intended for display into indexes.” Why, it appears not only that MARC may not yet be dead but also that there may even be some life left in cataloging. Finally, putting the words right into my mouth, the CDWA advises “the use of controlled vocabularies, authorities, and consistent formatting . . . to ensure efficient end-user retrieval” (Baca and Harpring, 2002).

CONCLUSION

Digitization is not prestidigitation; rather, like magic, once the mechanics are made clear, there is very little mystery left about the process. Many library service providers are beginning to offer to do the work. OCLC’s CONTENTdm® is a good example particularly aimed at smaller libraries that may well lack the computer expertise to develop Web-based collections independently. Significantly, though, while the CONTENTdm program advertises “increased visibility for your library and its collections” by virtue of records in OCLC FirstSearch®, this apparently does not mean that these records are accessible through OCLC’s Cataloging and Resource Sharing® system (formerly known as PRISM®) or the WorldCat™ database, as a FirstSearch® search for several of Contentdm’s “featured collections” fails to find them. Subscription to OCLC’s Electronic Resources Online® database appears to be necessary, and it is up to the individual library to provide more general access by cataloging their digital collections.

Library and museum administrators eager to join the many institutions that are making their unique holdings available on the World Wide Web in digitized format should look before they leap, for there is much more involved in access than simply lumping a bunch of images together on a Web site or server. Numerous companies, library consortia, and other agencies are willing to make the transition easier, but be cer-
tainty beforehand that you know what you want and what your patrons
need in terms of access. Be certain that what you are offering is a dis-
crete, cohesive, and hopefully unique collection of material that is in de-
mand and has not already been duplicated on the Web. While the nature
and extent of access and navigability within the Web site is important,
this is only the beginning of providing adequate access, and mere acces-
sibility on the Web is only the most rudimentary form of access. Don’t
be befuddled or distracted by the metadata tempest. In short, know what
you have, why you want it on the Web, why it should be on the Web,
and how to describe it both consistently and accurately.

Bear in mind that it will undoubtedly fall upon you and your library to
make the collection accessible to your users via your catalog and larger
consortial or union catalogs. Whether you lump the material into a single
online collection or link its individual components to discrete catalog rec-
ords is one of the most basic decisions to be made in terms of patron access,
and requires a thorough knowledge of the collection, its significance, and
the multiplicity of ways in which the data might be used. Howsoever, ac-
cess can only be improved by responsible subject analysis and adoption of
a uniform subject thesaurus. These are intellectual necessities, not frills to
be discarded because of the cost, a cost which will not likely be absorbed
by the consortium or large “bibliographic utility” eager to house your digi-
tal collection. Do not be beguiled by bells and whistles such as thumbnail
views in lieu of real access points or the real freedom and greater flexibility
of searching with accurate subject access and a controlled vocabulary. Pre-
tend that you are taking your baby to the hospital. One doesn’t expect the
hospital to provide a name for it, unless John or Jane Doe is acceptable. The
same is true of your catalog records, regardless of whether they represent
books or ships in bottles. Both the library catalog and the library collection
are your babies. How well they get along together and even whether they
both survive remains your responsibility.

NOTES

1. Actually, only three are retrieved with a General search on Blythe’s full name.
Four are found if his middle name is omitted, an instance of more being less.

2. Although Northwestern created individual records for OCLC for each of the 720
individual portfolio plates and each of the 20 volumes of The North American Indian, it
has not seen fit to add these records to its on-line catalog. Access is provided by a single
record for the collection, with a URL linking it to the American Memory project. Obvi-
ously, these records are of considerable significance, however, to any library that
might wish to catalog individual plates and include the link to the American Memory
digital image of that plate.
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A. Northwestern University library sample WorldCat record of an individual Curtis plate

**Detailed Record**

*Click on a checkbox to mark a record to be e-mailed or printed in Marked Records.*

**WorldCat results for: kw: fisherman and kw: wishham. Record 2 of 2**

**Fisherman - Wishham (The North American Indian)**

Edward S. Curtis

1909, 1911  
English Internet Resource : 2-D Image Computer File Visual Material  
Evanston, Ill. Northwestern University. Library.

Among the middle course of the Columbia at places where the abruptness of the shore and the up-stream set of an eddy make such method possible, salmon were taken, and still are taken, by means of a long-hauled dip-net. At favorable seasons a man will, in a few hours, secure several hundred salmon - as many as the matrons and girls of his household can care for in a day.

Ownership: Check the catalogs in your library.  
* Libraries that Own Item: 1  
* Connect to the catalog at OhioLINK

More Like This: Search for versions with same title and author | Advanced options...

Title: Fisherman - Wishham (The North American Indian)

Author(s): Curtis, Edward S., 1868-1952.

Publication: Evanston, Ill.; Northwestern University. Library.

Year: 1909, 1911

Language: English


Abstract: Among the middle course of the Columbia at places where the abruptness of the shore and the up-stream set of an eddy make such method possible, salmon were taken, and still are taken, by means of a long-hauled dip-net. At favorable seasons a man will, in a few hours, secure several hundred salmon - as many as the matrons and girls of his household can care for in a day.

Access: http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.award/1encurt.cp06019

**SUBJECT(S)**

Descriptor: Tlaxult Indians.

Genre/Form: Photomechanical print

Identifier: Fishing; Men; Loincloths

Note(s): Original photogravure produced in Boston by John Andrew & Son, c1909. / Digital images of the plates by Edward Curtis were prepared for a project awarded in 1988 through the Library of Congress/Ameritech National Digital Library Competition, for inclusion on the American Memory site.


Class Descriptors: Dewey: 970.0049741

Responsibility: Edward S. Curtis ; v. 6

Material Type: 2-D Image (npf); Picture (pic)

Document Type: Internet Resource; Computer File; Visual Material
Digital Images and Art Libraries in the Twenty-First Century

APPENDIX (continued)

Entry: 19991011
Update: 20020509
Accession No.: OCLC: 44372950
Database: WorldCat

This information is taken from OCLC's WorldCat® database and is used with OCLC's permission. WorldCat® is a registered trademark of OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc. © Copyright 2003 OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., 6565 Frantz Road, Dublin, Ohio 43017-3395 USA.
B. Northwestern University sample WorldCat record of an individual Curtis volume

**Detailed Record**

- Click on a checkbox to mark a record to be e-mailed or printed in Marked Records.

![WorldCat results for: kw: npi and kw: perceo and kw: wallawalla. Record 38 of 39](image)

**[Illustrations from volume 8 of The North American Indian]:**


**Edward S. Curtis**

1999, 1911

**English** Internet Resource : 2-D image Computer File Visual Material

Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University. Library.

Ownership: Check the catalogs in your library.
- Libraries that own item: 1
- Connect to the catalog at OhioLINK

More Like This: Search for versions with same title and author [Advanced options ...]

**Title:** [Illustrations from volume 8 of The North American Indian]: The Nez Perces. Wallawalla. Umatilla. Cayuse. The Chinookan tribes /

**Author(s):** Curtis, Edward S., 1868-1952.

**Publication:** Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University. Library.

**Year:** 1999, 1911

**Language:** English

Access: [http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.award/fencurt.008](http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.award/fencurt.008)

**SUBJECT(S):**

- Nez Perce Indians.
- Walla Walla Indians.
- Umatilla Indians.
- Cayuse Indians.
- Chinook Indians.
- Tkakut Indians.

**Genre/Form:** Collection
- Image
- Photomechanical print

**Note(s):** Digital images of the plates by Edward Curtis were prepared for a project awarded in 1999, through the Library of Congress/Amearthc National Digital Library Competition, for inclusion on the American Memory site. Original photographs were produced in Boston by John Andrew & Son from 1899-1910.

**General Info:** Coverage: Oregon, Idaho, Washington (State); Plateau Region; Tsangigai'í, the guardian of Nikuhílahá — A typical Nez Pierce — Nez Pierce woman — A Nez Pierce — Nez Pierce matron — Kukuhílahá (Nez Pierce) — Grizzly-beer Ferocious (Nez Pierce) — Half-Shorn (Nez Pierce) — No Wings (Nez Pierce) — Nez Pierce profile — Fort Lalgo — Joseph (Nez Pierce) — Three Eagles (Nez Pierce) — Half Moon (Nez Pierce) — A young warrior (Nez Pierce) — Half Moon (Nez Pierce) — Nez Pierce girl — A young Nez Pierce — Last home of Joseph (Nez Pierce) — Joseph Dead Feast Lodge (Nez Pierce) — Nez Pierce sweat lodge — The scout (Nez Pierce) — Nez Pierce canoe — The old-time warrior (Nez Pierce) — A real lodge (Umatilla) — White Bull (Umatilla) — A young Umatilla — Umatilla chid — In the forest (Cayuse) — With her proudly decked horse (Cayuse) — Umatilla girl — Cayuse type — Cayuse profile — Falling On The Land (Cayuse) — Cayuse monarch — Cayuse youth — Cayuse mother and child — Cayuse woman — A mountain home (Umatilla) — Youth in holiday costume (Umatilla) — Learning to ride (Cayuse) — Chinook
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female type — Chinook female profile — Tsimshian (Namat) — Spiedis (Wisham) — Wisham beadwork — Pounding fish (Wisham) — Island of the dead (Wisham) — Salmon fishing (Wisham) — Wisham fishing platform — Bone carving (Cascade) — Wisham female type — Wisham female profile — Petroglyphs (Wisham) — Wisham basket worker — On the Columbia (Wisham) — Wisham man — At the spring (Wisham) — Mshahwa (Wisham) — Wisham young woman — Wisham girls — Water baskets (Wisham) — Kytari (Wisham) — Wisham child — Below the cascades — Wind Mountain — Kamagishw (Cascade) — Wisham bowl — At the site of the Wisha (Cascade) — Preparing salmon (Wisham) — Map of the Nez Perce territory — Daughter of Tashius (Cayuse) — Wisham handcraft — Caches at Celilo — The rock slide (Wisham) — Lewis and Clark's landing place at Nithludith — Map of Chinookan territory.

Class Descriptors: Dewey: 973.009741
Material Type: 2-D Image (neg); Picture (pic)
Document Type: Internet Resource; Computer File; Visual Material
Entry: 19930912
Update: 20020509
Accession No: OCLC: 44280401
Database: WorldCat

This information in taken from OCLC's WorldCat® database and is used with OCLC's permission. WorldCat® is a registered trademark of OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc. © Copyright 2003 OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., 6565 Frantz Road, Dublin, Ohio 43017-3395 USA.