change, but the overall outline remains fairly constant.

Bury considers the principle of consensus to be the same as that of literary warrant because both are based on a reading of the literature.[29] Rodríguez, however, in a more perceptive analysis of Bliss' thought, points out that the idea of consensus arises not from a reading of any one literature but from "a philosophical construction, a synthesis of all historical thought on the subject of classification."[30] Fiering, writing on the epistemological and moral philosophy of Samuel Johnson (president of King's College, now Columbia University, in New York City from 1754 to 1763), notes that few histories of the philosophy of the classificatory relationships among the sciences have been written and praises the scholarliness and depth of theoretical understanding Bliss displayed in *The Organization of Knowledge*.[31] Fiering's description of Bliss as a "modern encyclopedist"[32] supports Rodríguez' view that *consensus* is not a mere restatement of *literary warrant*, but is theoretically based on Bliss' lifelong erudite research into the history of the philosophy of science.

Bliss, then, believed that the fundamental authority that infused meaning into a bibliographic classification system was the best philosophical and scientific consensual thinking that was available to the classificationist and that only on this foundation could a classification system be created that would have relatively permanent validity and usefulness. In his view, the philosophical system of the sciences ideally mirrored the orderly system of nature; as scientific scrutiny of nature had increased in accuracy, then, so could the classification of knowledge in libraries reproduce more exactly the judicious conclusions reached by scientists and philosophers.

Bliss' reliance on the concept of scientific/philosophical thought as the semantic warrant for bibliographic classification systems, although most extensively developed in *The Organization of Knowledge* and *The Organization of Knowledge in Libraries*, never altered fundamentally from opinions he had expressed much earlier.[33] Although Ranganathan later argued at length that classification systems should be based on scientifically systematic principles of division and combination (i.e., upon his own analytico-synthetic principles), his conception of science was less broad than that of Bliss and arose from his primarily mathematical, not philosophical, intellectual training and inclinations. Thus, classification theorists appeared to have abandoned the philosophy of science as a warrant for a bibliographic classification until the CRG tried to create a general system based upon the biological theory of integrative levels as explicated by Needham and by Feibleman[34] and later to incorporate into their analyses elements of general systems theory as propounded by von Bertalanffy.[35]

The CRG's exploratory excursions into the philosophies of biology and of general systems for the purposes of a general classification system failed to advance beyond preliminary "speculative" work,[36] and their joint search for a viable, nondisciplinary basis for a general system succumbed to the loss of their NATO grant in 1968. With the exception of Mills, who undertook the revision of Bliss' BC and, while retaining BC's