CONTENTS

The New Catalog Code: the General Principles and the Major Changes. F. Bernice Field 421


A Program for a Public Library's Adapting to the New Code. Marian Sanner 444

In the Mail: Filing Problems. Theodore C. Hines 449

Corporate Authorship and Cultural Evolution. Ron Taylor 451

Library of Congress Annotated Cards for Children's Literature. Edmond L. Applebaum 455

Addendum to Article on Library of Congress Annotated Cards for Children's Literature. Patricia S. Hines 457

Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study: A Summary. Sarah K. Vann 461

Organization for Processing at the Book Processing Center, Oak Park, Illinois. Donald Hendricks 479

Processing Centers for Public Libraries: A Tentative List. 489

In the Mail: Searching. Frances Simonsen 492

In the Mail: Searching—Mr. Fristoe's Answer. 493

Solutions in Establishing a New Catalog at the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Library. Eleanor R. Hasting 495

Italian Cataloging Rules. Liana Van der Bellen 499

List of Current State Documents Checklists. Margaret T. Lane 504

Structure of Indexing Authority Lists. C. D. Gull 507

In the Mail: Commonsense Cataloging. Norman D. Stevens 511

A Proposal for a Bibliographic Bank for the Province of Ontario. H. C. Campbell 512

Further Observations on the Use of LC Classification. Daniel Gore 519

Regional Groups. Doris Ransom 525

Reviews. 527

Index. 531

ALA RESOURCES AND TECHNICAL SERVICES DIVISION
EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor, and Chairman of the Editorial Board ............... ESTHER J. PIERCY

Assistant Editors:
RICHARD M. DOUGHERTY ....... for Acquisitions Section
PAUL S. DUNKIN
for Cataloging and Classification Section
WILLIAM H. HUFF ............... for Serials Section
ALLEN B. VEANER ............ for Copying Methods Section

Editorial Advisers:
Maurice F. Tauber (for Technical Services)
Doris Ransom (for Regional Groups)

Managing Editor: ........................................ DORALYN J. HICKEY

Business Assistant:
David Turiel (for Advertising)

Circulation Manager: ....................... MRS. ELIZABETH RODELL

Library Resources & Technical Services, the quarterly official publication of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association is published at 2901 Byrdhill Road, Richmond, Va. 23205. Editorial Office: Processing Division, Enoch Pratt Free Library, 400 Cathedral St., Baltimore, Md. 21201. Circulation and Business Office: 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, Ill. 60611. Subscription Price: to members of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division, $2.00 per year, included in the membership dues; to nonmembers, $5.00 per year, single copies $1.25, orders of five or more copies (same issue or assorted), $1.00 each.

"Second-class postage paid at Richmond, Va., and at additional mailing offices."

LRTS is indexed in Library Literature and in Library Science Abstracts. Its reviews are included in the Book Review Digest and Book Review Index.

Editors: Material published in LRTS is not copyrighted. When reprinting the courtesy of citation to the original publication is requested. Publication in LRTS does not imply official endorsement by the Resources and Technical Services Division nor by ALA, and the assumption of editorial responsibility is not to be construed necessarily as endorsement of the opinions expressed by individual contributors.
The New Catalog Code: the General Principles and the Major Changes*

F. Bernice Field**
Associate Librarian for Technical Services
Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut

The Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, to be published late this year or early in 1967, will be the most complete compilation of cataloging rules that has ever been available to American librarians, for included in one volume will be not only the rules for entry and description of books and book-like materials, but also those for non-book materials. Thus catalogers will find guidance in the new code whether they are cataloging monographs, serials, microtexts, manuscripts, maps, motion pictures and filmstrips, music, phono-records, or pictorial works. Furthermore, the new code includes rules not covered by existing codes. Its very comprehensiveness will make it an invaluable tool to librarians everywhere.

That it is oriented toward large research libraries is inevitable, for a catalog code must provide for the entire range of materials that libraries have to catalog. In general, however, the headings are more direct and less complex than those prescribed by the present ALA rules so that they are more practical for all types of libraries. Moreover, an effort has been made to respond to the needs of non-research libraries; when they are in conflict with those of research libraries, alternate rules have been provided.

The rules have been designed to meet the requirements of multiple-entry alphabetical catalogs in which all entries for particular persons or corporate bodies appear under a uniform heading or are related by references, and they provide sufficient entries and references for each item and heading to give access under the various approaches that readers not familiar with cataloging rules might be expected to look. Since, however, the rules prescribe what shall be the main entry, they also give a standard means of identifying a work, which is important in library, bibliographical, and book-trade activities.

The new code is divided into three sections. The first two deal with books and book-like materials, Part I containing the rules for Entry and Heading and Part II those for Description. Part III, which is devoted to Non-book Materials, gives the additional rules needed for cataloging these specialized materials, with each chapter including rules for both entry and description. The rules for entry and heading were developed

* Paper presented at the RTSD-CCS program meeting during the ALA Conference, July 14, 1966.

** Editor's note: Miss Field was also Chairman of the ALA Descriptive Cataloging Committee and a member of the Steering Committee for the Catalog Code Revision Committee.
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The ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee, under the editorship of Seymour Lubetzky, and since 1962 of C. Sumner Spalding, while those for descriptive cataloging are the work of the Library of Congress Descriptive Cataloging Division and the ALA Descriptive Cataloging Committee, with Lucile M. Morsch, Chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division at the Library of Congress through 1965, taking the responsibility for preparing the final draft.

Both the Catalog Code Revision Committee and the Descriptive Cataloging Committee have fostered widespread discussion of the rules through frequent reports in professional journals and through programs and exhibits at ALA conferences. The ALA Cataloging and Classification Section and the Catalog Code Revision Committee have sponsored two institutes on the rules for entry and heading, one at Stanford University in 1958 and the other at McGill University in 1960; and membership of the Catalog Code Revision Committee has included representatives of the ALA divisions and library associations other than ALA as well as an extensive list of catalogers. Particular mention should be made of the contribution of the Canadian Library Association's Special Committee on Revision of the ALA Catalog Code, which has made many useful suggestions on the rules for entry and heading. The Descriptive Cataloging Committee has sought opinions on the descriptive rules through the regional groups of technical services librarians and through Library Resources & Technical Services, the journal of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division. It is the belief of both committees, therefore, that the new code represents the thinking of the profession insofar as it has been possible to ascertain it.

Both committees have also had strong support and enthusiastic cooperation from the Library Association in Great Britain. Through the generosity of the Council on Library Resources, representatives of the British Library Association have attended many meetings of both committees at the Midwinter and annual conferences of ALA and have corresponded with the Editor and the committee chairmen between meetings. Thus, even though there will be differences between the British and American editions of the rules, the principles on which they are based are essentially the same, and many of the British ideas have been incorporated into the rules. The new code, therefore, is justifiably entitled Anglo-American Cataloging Rules.

Since the general principles of the code are, with only a few exceptions, based on the "Statement of Principles" adopted by the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, held in Paris in 1961, we can truly say that this code also represents a giant step toward international agreement on cataloging rules.

This paper will outline the general principles of the new rules for entry and heading and summarize the main differences between the new code and the present rules for entry and descriptive cataloging. It will be divided into four sections: (1) Rules for Entry and Heading, (2) Rules for Descriptive Cataloging, (3) Non-Book Materials, and (4) Broader Scope of the New Cataloging Rules.
The rules for entry and heading are the result of a comprehensive re-thinking of our practices in this area and the development of principles on which the rules should be based.

Seymour Lubetzky's study of the *ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries*, published in 1953, showed clearly that, because the ALA rules were not based on clearly-defined principles, they had become a collection of rules developed to fit specific cases rather than the conditions which the cases illustrated. This approach had led us into a maze of arbitrary rules, exceptions to rules, and repetition of rules under the various cases to which they were applicable that inevitably precluded a logical approach to cataloging problems.

The Catalog Code Revision Committee, therefore, before considering the rules themselves, spent many months discussing the objectives of the catalog and the principles which should underlie the rules for entry and heading. The objectives which were accepted reaffirmed those generally followed at present, namely, that a catalog should enable readers to determine readily (1) whether the library has a particular book and (2) which works of a given author and which editions of a particular work the library has.

The Committee further decided that since the most prominent identifying characteristic of a book is the title page, the underlying philosophy of the new cataloging rules should be that "The entry for a work is normally based on the statements that appear on the title page, or on any part of the work that is used as its substitute." Other statements that are openly expressed (e.g. on the cover, half title, verso of the title page, in the caption title, or colophon) are taken into account; but, in determining the main entry, catalogers will not be concerned about material that appears only in the preface, introduction, or text unless the information on the title page is ambiguous or insufficient. This is a definite variation from current practice.

The new rules for entry and heading aim to make cataloging more logical than it is presently by focusing on types of authorship rather than types of works and on classes of names rather than classes of people. Thus many specific rules in the ALA code are brought together into fewer general rules; and librarians, in using the new rules, will have to think in terms of general principles of cataloging rather than specific types of material or headings. This does not mean that there are no specific rules, but rules for types of publications and classes of persons and corporate bodies have been included only when they involve special problems in authorship responsibility or require special headings that cannot be dealt with satisfactorily in the general rules. In using the new code, librarians should keep in mind that "each rule dealing with a specific problem is to be understood in the context of the more general rules" and that "the relevant general rules apply to any aspects of a specific problem that are not dealt with in a specific rule."
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Choice of Entry

The first chapter of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, like the ALA Cataloging Rules, deals with choice of main entry; but it differs from the present code in that it brings together in one place the rules for choice of entry of books and book-like materials that are scattered throughout the ALA code. Here are found the rules for selecting the entry for publications issued by corporate bodies and government agencies, for legal publications, and for religious publications, as well as those for works by personal authors and works of unknown authorship. Thus the new code makes a clear distinction between choice of entry and form of heading.

The problem of entry has been treated as a problem of the determination of authorship responsibility, and the rules “are framed around an analysis of the various patterns in which this responsibility may be distributed between persons, between corporate bodies, and between persons and corporate bodies.” Based on this, the following general principles underlie the rules for choice of entry:

1. Entry should be under author or principal author when one can be determined.
2. Entry should be under editor when there is no author or principal author and when the editor is primarily responsible for the existence of the work.
3. Entry should be under a compiler named on the title page in the case of collections of works by various authors.
4. Entry should be under title in the case of works whose authorship is diffuse, indeterminate, or unknown.

The rules contain some exceptions to these principles, such as entry under special headings denoting type or form of work; but, in general, they follow the principle approved by the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles that a work shall be specified by its author and title or, if it lacks an author, by its title.

The organization of the chapter on choice of entry exhibits very clearly the consolidation of many specific rules into comprehensive general rules. For example, the ALA rules for works by joint authors, composite works, debates, and correspondence, are covered by one rule called Works of Shared Authorship; those for periodicals and newspapers, almanacs and yearbooks, directories, and series, are included in a rule for Serials. By considering categories rather than specific cases, the new code thus becomes both simpler and more comprehensive.

Throughout this chapter the rules specify that, when there are more than three authors or editors, entry is under title. This rule of three is consistent throughout the code and makes the basis for such decisions easy to remember.

The main differences in choice of entry between the present rules and the new ones are as follows:

1. Entry of a work of unknown or uncertain authorship, or by a group that lacks a name, is under title. Thus the subdivision Spurious and doubtful works following an author’s name in the heading and made-
up headings for groups and classes of citizens, such as Boston. Citizens and London. Women, will no longer be used.

2. For works involving two or more authors, editors, compilers, etc., entry is primarily under the person or body to whom principal responsibility is attributed, by wording or typography, rather than under the author named first on the title page, which is the basic consideration in many of the ALA rules.

3. Serials which change title, or are entered under a corporate body that changes its name, will have separate entries for each new title or author instead of being entered under the latest title or the latest name of the corporate author. At the request of the Catalog Code Revision Committee, the Library of Congress will not adopt this principle of successive entries for serials, however, but will continue to catalog them under the latest title and the latest name of the issuing body. The reason for this unusual request was that Committee members recognized that libraries depend on the bibliographical information which the LC cards provide when a serial is cataloged as one entry under its latest title or corporate author and thought this too valuable to lose.

4. Adaptations of a work in a different literary style will be entered under the adapter if known rather than the original heading.

5. Court rules will be entered under the name of the jurisdiction followed by the subheading Court rules and the name of the court governed by the rules instead of under the jurisdiction and the name of the court. The introduction of this form subheading between the name of the jurisdiction and the name of the court was made at the request of the American Association of Law Libraries.

6. Headings for treaties have been extensively revised, with the aim of making them more readily findable in the catalog. An enumeration of the many details of these changes would be confusing, but there are two major ones that should be called to your attention.

a. The subheading Treaties, etc., used after names of countries, will no longer be followed by the inclusive dates of an administration or reign, but instead by the name of the country with which the treaty is made and the date of the treaty. Example: U.S. Treaties, etc., Burma, June 24, 1959, instead of the present entry: U.S. Treaties, etc., (Eisenhower, 1952-1961). Added entries, in the same form as the main entry, are made for the country or countries with which the treaty is made.

b. Peace treaties are entered under a uniform heading consisting of the name by which a treaty is known and the date, instead of under the signatories or under the name of the conference at which the treaty was signed; e.g., Treaty of Paris, 1783, instead of Gt. Brit. Treaties, etc., 1760-1820 (George II). You will note that entries for the treaties are in direct rather than in the inverted form now used for subject headings.

These are the major changes in choice of entry. Catalogers should study this chapter carefully before they start using the new code, not only to
note the differences between the ALA and the Anglo-American cataloging rules, but also to develop an understanding of the approach of the new code to cataloging problems. Intelligent use of this code will depend on catalogers’ ability to understand the implications of a general rule in a specific situation. The conditions covered by a general rule are not repeated under special rules; catalogers are expected to apply the general provisions to any case covered by them. Special rules spell out additional considerations that are not included in the general rule.

Entry of Names

Following the chapter on choice of entry, the code proceeds next to choice of headings, giving in the second and third chapters the rules for establishing personal and corporate names. The entry of names is based on the general principle of following the form customarily used by a person or corporate body rather than the full name of a person or the official name of a corporate body, which present cataloging rules specify.

Personal Names. Thus the basic rule for entry of a person is that he shall be entered under “the name by which he is commonly identified, whether it be his real name, assumed name, nickname, title of nobility, or other appellation.” Furthermore, the entry shall use only as much of the name as the person himself uses. For an author this means entry under the form of name that usually appears in his works; for other persons it is the form most commonly found in reference sources. Examples of this are:

Hildegarde instead of Sell, Hilda Loretta
Ruth, Babe instead of Ruth, George Herman
Wodehouse, P. G. instead of Wodehouse, Pelham Grenville

This rule, which in essence is both sensible and logical, would be very simple if names themselves were simple. But many authors use different forms of name or even different names in their various publications, and there are compound names, as well as titles of nobility; there are people who change their names, people with no surnames, and people with the same names. The code, therefore, expands the basic rule to include the many situations which confront a cataloger. But the main point to remember is that there is more emphasis on the form of name which a person generally uses or by which he is generally known than on his full name.

The problem of pseudonyms was discussed at length before agreement was reached. The main rule follows the general principle of the code, that is, entry under the name most commonly used. Thus, if all works of an author appear under one pseudonym, entry is under that name; if they appear under several pseudonyms, or under one or more pseudonyms and his real name, entry is under the name he uses most. In case of doubt, entry is under the real name.

This is one place where the code provides an alternate rule for non-research libraries. Each work of an author who uses several names may be entered under the name he uses in that particular work, with see also
references to connect the various names of an author, if a library so prefers.

Another change in the entry of personal names is that well-established English forms of names are to be used instead of the vernacular forms; e.g.,

Francis of Assisi, Saint instead of Francesco d’Assisi, Saint
Horace instead of Horatius Flaccus, Quintus

There are some differences in entry of names of foreign origin with separately written prefixes; the changes conform to the practices outlined in "National Usages for the Entry of Names of Persons,"4 by A. H. Chaplin for the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles. The chief differences are in German and Italian names; some of these, which presently enter under the part of the name following the prefix, will henceforth enter under the prefix. The section on names with prefixes also includes several languages not covered by the present rules.

Another change concerns the use of dates with a person’s name; they are added to names if readily ascertainable at the time of cataloging but are not required except to distinguish between persons with the same name. Other means of distinguishing such persons, if dates are not available, are to add terms of address, titles, or initials denoting a degree or membership in an organization; these are used only if they regularly appear in the author statement or in reference sources, however. When there are neither dates nor words or phrases commonly associated with a person’s name to distinguish one person from another with the same name, the heading is used without distinction for all; the cataloger does not make up a phrase to add to the name, such as poet, writer on agriculture, etc. The purpose of this is to facilitate the use of the catalog by readers who cannot know what phrases a cataloger has decided to use to distinguish a particular author.

Corporate Names. Entry of a corporate body follows the basic policy of using the form of name that the body itself uses, which generally means in its publications, except when the rules provide for entry (1) under a higher body of which it is a part, (2) under the name of the government of which it is an agency, or (3) in certain cases under the name of the place in which it is located. As for personal names, the rules spell out the choice of name when variant names appear in a body’s publications, or when the name appears in more than one language; and they specify additions that are to be made to a name to distinguish it from another body with the same name.

There are four major differences between the present rules for corporate headings and the new ones. First, the distinction between societies and institutions has been dropped; the rules for entry of corporate bodies apply to all corporate names regardless of the nature of the organization. Second, in accordance with the underlying principles of the code, the form of name chosen for entry of corporate bodies is the one which the body generally uses, which is not necessarily the official name. If the
body customarily uses a brief form of name, that is adopted, as, for example, Huntington Library and Art Gallery instead of Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery. If the brief form consists of the initial letter of the words or principal words of its name, or of syllables of the words, that is adopted as the form of entry; e.g.,

Unesco is used instead of the full name, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Euratom is used instead of the full name, European Atomic Energy Community

If the body normally uses a conventional name, that form is used for the catalog heading; e.g. Westminster Abbey instead of its full name, Collegiate Church of St. Peter in Westminster. Thus the rules stress use of the name which is most generally known and under which library patrons are most likely to look in the catalog.

The third main difference, as already mentioned, is that when the name of a corporate body changes, a new heading is established under the new name for cataloging publications that appear under that name. Thus, if a corporate body has had three names in the course of its existence, each of these names is used as a heading rather than only the latest name.

The fourth change relates to entry of subordinate bodies. These will continue to be entered under the body of which they are a part when the name includes the entire name of the higher body, when it implies subordination, or when the name of the higher body is required for its identification. But such a body is to be entered more directly than present rules permit; that is, a heading will no longer show the full hierarchy of a subordinate body. For example, the Bylaws Committee of the ALA Cataloging and Classification Section, which is a subdivision of the Resources and Technical Services Division, is entered under American Library Association. Cataloging and Classification Section. Bylaws Committee rather than under the full hierarchy, which would be: American Library Association. Resources and Technical Services Division. Cataloging and Classification Section. Bylaws Committee. Present rules require the latter form.

Furthermore, subordinate bodies whose names do not imply subordination will be entered directly under their own names rather than under the parent body, as at present; e.g., the Bodleian Library of Oxford University will be entered under Bodleian Library; the World Health Assembly will be entered under its own name instead of under World Health Organization, of which it is a part.

Government Agencies. A parallel pattern is followed for entry of government agencies. The general principle is that those agencies through which the basic legislative, judicial, and executive functions of the government are exercised shall be entered under the government; but other bodies created and controlled by a government shall, like non-governmental bodies, be entered under their own names whenever possible.

Thus ministries, departments, offices, archives, courts, and similar agencies are entered under the government, as at present, while bodies
of certain types are entered under their names. Typical of the latter are organizations engaged in commercial, cultural, or scientific activities; bodies created by intergovernmental agreement; authorities and trusts for the operation of industries and similar enterprises; and established churches.

These rules result in two major changes. First, many more governmental agencies will be entered directly under their names than at present. Among these are:

Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization
   presently entered under Australia

National Agricultural Library
   presently entered under U. S.

Bibliothèque nationale (France)
   presently entered under Paris

Second, more government agencies that are subordinate to other government bodies will be entered directly under the government rather than under the higher agency of which they are a part. The rule specifies that a subordinate agency is entered directly if its name has not been, or is not likely to be, used by another body in the same jurisdiction. Thus we shall have the following entries:

Missouri. Industrial Education Section
   instead of Missouri. Dept. of Education. Industrial Education Section

U. S. Division of Coal Mine Inspection
   instead of U. S. Bureau of Mines. Division of Coal Mine Inspection

If a subordinate agency must be entered under a higher body, it is entered as directly as possible, omitting any unit in the hierarchy that is not needed to identify the body or to distinguish between two bodies with the same name. This follows the rule for non-governmental corporate bodies of not showing the entire hierarchy of a body in the heading.

Entry Under Place. Some types of corporate bodies are entered under the place where they are located instead of under their names, however. Let me repeat that the distinction between societies and institutions made in the ALA code is no longer maintained. Rather the entry under place of some corporate bodies is an exception to the general rule of entry under name made chiefly for economic reasons (libraries cannot afford to make the widespread changes in their catalogs that would be required), but also because many librarians find access to local institutions, such as public libraries, hospitals, and churches, easier when they are entered under place.

Thus a local church is entered under the place in which it is located unless the first word of its name is the name of that place in catalog entry form; in the latter case it is entered under its name. The following examples illustrate this:
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Third English Lutheran Church of Baltimore
enters under Baltimore

but

Tenafly Presbyterian Church
enters under its name.

Other types of corporate bodies which will continue to be entered
under place under certain conditions are:

- Educational institutions
- Libraries
- Galleries
- Museums
- Agricultural experiment stations
- Airports
- Botanical and zoological gardens
- Hospitals

These are so entered if the name of the body consists of a common word
or phrase and the jurisdiction of which it is a part, such as Free Library
of Philadelphia, or such a word or phrase modified by an adjective in-
dicating one of these jurisdictions; e.g. city, municipal, state, provincial.

Religious Bodies. There are some major changes in headings for
religious bodies, which librarians from institutions with large collec-
tions of literature in this field should study carefully. Since these head-
ings are complicated, even to those familiar with them, I shall cite only
two of the changes:

1. Dioceses of the Catholic Church are entered under the Church,
with the subdivision Archdiocese of [place], Diocese of [place], in-
stead of under the place, as at present. Those of the Protestant churches,
some of which are now entered under the denomination and some under
place, follow the same pattern. Thus we shall have:
   Catholic Church. Archdiocese of Santiago de Cuba
   instead of Santiago de Cuba (Archdiocese)
   Church of England. Diocese of London
   instead of London (Diocese)

2. State, provincial, and lesser organizations of Protestant denomi-
nations are entered under their own names instead of under form head-
ings such as Baptists and Congregational Churches in Connecticut. Thus
Philadelphia Baptist Association enters under that name instead of
under Baptists. Pennsylvania. Philadelphia Baptist Association. This
not only follows the general policy of entering corporate bodies under
their own names whenever possible, but it also removes from the code
headings that have no basis for existence.

Uniform Titles

The fourth chapter of the new rules deals with “Uniform Titles.”
In the ALA rules uniform titles are used only for anonymous classics,
although there is a footnote to the rule for entry of music suggesting
that they may be necessary for music, and, in fact, this has become gen-
eral practice. In the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, however, rules
are given for uniform titles to provide the means for bringing together
“all catalog entries of a given work when its editions, translations, etc.,
have appeared under various titles and for properly identifying a work when its title is obscured by the wording on the title page." The rules are applicable to titles of individual authors which have appeared in multiple editions as well as to anonymous works which enter under title. The term "anonymous classics," used for the latter in the ALA rules, is not perpetuated in the new code.

Whether a library uses uniform titles for all works in these categories is a matter of individual decision. Most libraries already use them for sacred scriptures, such as the Bible and the Koran, and for early anonymous works, as, for example, the Arabian Nights and Beowulf. Large libraries also tend to use uniform titles, or filing titles, as they are frequently called, under prolific authors in order to bring together editions of the same work; examples are Shakespeare's Hamlet and Homer's Odyssey, both of which have appeared with many variant titles. They also use them to bring together editions of collected works of an author, regardless of the individual titles appearing on the title pages. Probably very few libraries apply this principle to all modern works, however. If a library feels the need for uniform titles for any work, rules are provided for establishing them, based on general principles and formed according to a standard procedure.

References

The final chapter in the section on "Entry and Heading" is on "References." Directions for references are given throughout the code in appropriate places, but this chapter summarizes in general terms the kinds of references that are normally made and gives examples of explanatory references.

RULES FOR DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING

The descriptive cataloging rules, in contrast to the rules for entry and heading, are not completely reorganized and rewritten but are a revision and expansion of the Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress, published in 1949. Since the descriptive cataloging rules had been thoroughly reconsidered and drastically revised at that time, the Executive Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section considered extensive revision unnecessary and instructed the Descriptive Cataloging Committee to work with the Library of Congress to clarify, extend, or revise the 1949 rules as seemed desirable.

Following a study by the Descriptive Cataloging Division at the Library of Congress of their experience with the limited cataloging rules, which they had been using for certain categories of material, and a survey by the Descriptive Cataloging Committee of opinions on the possible extension of these rules to most cataloging, the Library of Congress, with the full concurrence of the Descriptive Cataloging Committee, decided to abandon their limited cataloging rules in favor of one body of rules for all descriptive cataloging and to aim toward a simplification of existing rules that would give catalogers more opportunity to use their judgment.
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A great many sections of the present descriptive rules have been reorganized or expanded in order to make their meaning clearer and to incorporate revisions which are necessary to enable catalogers to cope with the increasing variety of publications that are appearing. Some of the rules have been simplified through the use of added directives, explanations, or definitions; examples have been updated; irrelevant or repetitious material has been deleted. Directions about punctuation, largely lacking in the 1949 rules, have been inserted in the body of the rules at appropriate places; and an appendix has been added which summarizes punctuation practices.

Since the revisions of these rules are generally not changes in the intent of the rules but are more in the direction of clarification or extension, this part of the paper will not discuss the principles underlying them, which are already familiar to you from the 1949 code, but will merely point out the sections that have been revised most extensively and indicate the more important differences.

Author Statement

A major change, which was announced by the Library of Congress in 1964 in Cataloging Service Bulletin 65 and put into effect immediately, is the restoration of the author statement in the body of the title—the practice followed prior to the 1949 rules. The Library of Congress recommended this for two reasons particularly. First, the primary criterion for choice of name for entry in the new code is the way an author's name appears in his works; it will, therefore, be important to have a record in the catalog of the forms which appear in the publications, especially if the form of a name changes. Secondly, the author statement is frequently the chief clue that identifies an author of a new book with one already in the catalog; and, because present rules do not call for transcribing this on catalog cards, Library of Congress catalogers were spending a great deal of time checking books that were already cataloged to find out how the author's name appeared in his books. Members of the Committee, having experienced the same difficulties, strongly backed the Library of Congress in this change.

The revised statement lists situations when the author statement is not included. In general, it is omitted when the heading and the author statement are identical or so similar that inclusion contributes nothing to the identification of the author.

Imprint

The sections on imprint have been both rewritten and expanded, many of the changes being the result of questions which the Library of Congress or the Descriptive Cataloging Committee received. The revised sections on “Place of Publication,” “Publisher,” and “Date” are clearer and easier to follow than the present rules, and they take into account current trends in publishing practices. At the same time, the cataloger is given freedom in the description of works of varying importance.
Collation

The major change in the collation section is in the paragraphs on "Illustrative Matter." The rule is re-stated to permit the use of the abbreviation "illus." for all types of illustrative matter unless a cataloger thinks that particular types of illustrations are important enough to be specifically designated. When any are designated, they are given in alphabetical order instead of in the arbitrary order which present rules require, except that "illus." always comes first. Some of the terms used in the present rules have been omitted, also. This new rule leaves a good deal to the judgment of catalogers.

Notes

The section on notes has been completely revised, again with the purpose of leaving more to the judgment of catalogers. Following a statement of the definition and purpose of notes, the new section describes the types of information which are generally indispensable and must be given in notes and those which are important but not indispensable and are supplied at the discretion of the cataloger. In the first group are those that contribute to the identification of a work or the intelligibility of the catalog entry, such as a note explaining the relationship to the work of a person or corporate body for whom an added entry is indicated, or one to show the contents of a multi-volume work. In the second group are notes that characterize a work or tell its bibliographic history, as, for example, a note to show the nature and scope of the work, or its relationship to other works. A section on style of notes gives general principles to guide a cataloger in formulating them, and there are directions as to the preferred order of notes.

The rule for "Dissertation Note" has had some rewriting, the major change being the deletion of the paragraphs on "Theses Without Thesis Statement," which takes up almost a page in the 1949 rules. This seemed an unnecessary elaboration to the Committee and to the Library of Congress.

The "Full Name Note" has been deleted, as has already been announced in Cataloging Service Bulletin 63, issued in 1963; and the "Contents Note" rule has been expanded to show how to give contents for works with joint authors and how to specify in contents the numbering of volumes in series.

The section labelled "Series Notes" in the present rules has been removed from the sections on notes and given separate status, with the heading "Series"; and the terminology used in referring to series on catalog cards has been changed from "series note" to "series statement." The British Committee took exception to calling this a note because it is part of the transcription of the title page and is not included with other notes on a catalog card, and the American Committee agreed.

Serials

The chapter on "Serials" has been revised to provide for separate
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entries for each title of a serial that changes title or has a corporate author which changes its name. Since, however, as already mentioned, the Catalog Code Revision Committee, when it adopted the principle of successive entries for serials, voted in favor of the Library of Congress continuing to catalog serials under the latest title or latest name of a corporate author, the rules for this system are included, also.

Photographic and Other Reproductions

The chapter in the descriptive rules entitled "Facsimiles, Photocopies, Microcopies," has been completely rewritten to provide for cataloging photoreproductions in terms of the originals and has been given the title: "Photographic and Other Reproductions." This revision, which was published in Cataloging Service Bulletin 60, in 1963, has had some minor changes made in it since then.

NON-BOOK MATERIALS

The section on non-book materials includes not only the rules for maps and music, formerly part of the Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress, but also those for cataloging Motion Pictures and Filmstrips, Phonorecords, Pictures, Designs and Other Two-Dimensional Representations, all of which have been issued in one or more preliminary editions, and Manuscripts, which have previously appeared in draft form only. For awhile, because of time limitations, it was planned to publish these separately as part two of the new code; but Miss Morsch, aware that these rules would be dependent on the general rules for entry and heading and that their use would be greatly facilitated if they were in the same volume with the general rules, pressed for their inclusion. The Descriptive Cataloging Committee enthusiastically backed Miss Morsch and offered to cooperate with her to complete the work on scheduled time. This placed an additional burden on the Editor of the code, for it fell to him to coordinate the rules for entry in these chapters with those in the first section of the code; but he, too, managed to complete his part of the work.

As stated earlier, this section includes rules for both entry and description, but it should be understood that the rules for choice of entry are only the special rules required by the medium with which the chapter is concerned; they are not self-contained but must be used in connection with the general rules for entry and heading in the first part of the code.

The rules for manuscripts are a major addition to the body of published rules; they cover both single manuscripts and collections. The rules for the other media have been rewritten and expanded on the basis of the experience of Library of Congress catalogers in handling these materials since previous rules were issued. There are a great many changes in the descriptive rules for maps and atlases, both in the form of deletions and additions. The same can be said of music. The rules for the cataloging of motion pictures have had numerous additions. Those for phonorecords have been extensively revised and now cover both
processed and non-processed records. The rules for pictorial works are so largely revised that little of the original remains. Catalogers of these special types of material will need to study these chapters carefully. The general intent of the revised rules is no different from those in the various preliminary editions; but they are more inclusive and will, therefore, answer many more problems than the present rules do.

BROADER SCOPE OF THE NEW CATALOGING RULES

The introduction to this paper states that the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules include rules for entry not covered in any previously available cataloging code. This statement is true in two ways.

First, there are rules in the new code that are not found in the ALA rules and other cataloging codes. Examples are the rules for uniform titles, which, except for anonymous classics, are entirely new; many additional rules for legal publications; rules for papal diplomatic missions and theological creeds that have been accepted by more than one denomination; rules for names in additional languages; an extensive section on choice between alternatives of entry under persons performing different functions, such as biographer-critic or author, calligrapher or author, etc.

But, second, and even more important than the additional rules, is the broader scope of the rules in the new code, which results in a wider coverage of cataloging problems. Whereas an ALA rule deals with a specific type of material or a specific class of persons, and information on similar problems is frequently found in several different rules, the corresponding rule in the new Anglo-American code approaches the entire problem of which the several ALA rules are parts. Thus one can see the problem as a whole, relate the different aspects to each other, and recognize a basic principle of entry which will apply to any new problem in the same category that may arise in the future. Furthermore, the organization of the new rules brings like problems together so that similarity of treatment becomes natural rather than difficult. These basic characteristics of the new code make the new rules logical, more comprehensive, and easier to use and understand than present rules.

An example of this is the comprehensive rule for the entry of serials. The ALA code has separate rules for Periodicals and Newspapers; Almanacs; Yearbooks, etc.; Directories; and Series; but nowhere is there a general rule explaining the conditions under which a serial is entered under title or author. The new code, on the other hand, gives definite specifications for entering serials under title, under corporate author, or under personal author.

There is a comprehensive rule for choosing between a corporate and a personal author for the main entry of a work. Similar information can be found in the ALA rules only by checking eight different rules scattered under as many topics, and all of these together are not as inclusive as the rule in the new code. Furthermore, there is an entirely new rule dealing with choice between a corporate body and a subordinate unit as author.
The more one studies the new rules, the more pronounced the contrast becomes, until finally the piecemeal approach of the ALA rules and the realization of how long we have lived with this system cannot but make us think how fortunate we are that Seymour Lubetzky be-stirred the cataloging profession to long-overdue action on catalog code revision back in 1953 and the Cataloging and Classification Section of ALA initiated action on revision shortly thereafter.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the logical pattern of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules will make catalogs easier to understand, to explain, and to use than at present. The cataloging process will be more reasonable because the rules are based on principles that are clearly explained instead of on precedents; thus it will be easier for catalogers to decide on entries and forms of headings.

As stated above, the rules will require catalogers to re-orient their thinking toward starting with a basic, general rule for each category of authorship or name instead of specific rules for each type of publication or name. But the greater ease in applying the rules and in using the entries which will result from them will to a considerable extent offset the adjustments that librarians, and especially catalogers, will have to make.

The members of the two committees who have worked hard on the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules are confident that you will find them a great improvement over present ones and will be as happy with them as we are. There is no doubt that we are approaching a new era in cataloging and, we hope, a new attitude toward cataloging as a profession.
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DEWEY AWARD TO MORSCH

The Melvil Dewey Medal Award was presented during the ALA Conference in New York to Lucile Morsch for “distinguished achievements in behalf of libraries and librarianship.”
The Administrative Implications of the New Rules*

JOSEPH A. ROSENTHAL

Chief, Preparation Services
The New York Public Library
5th Avenue & 42nd Street, New York

MOST OF THE SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES which set off the soon-to-be issued Anglo-American Cataloging Rules from previous cataloging practice apply to the rules for choice of entry and form of heading, although there are marked improvements relating to organization, rules for descriptive cataloging and those for cataloging of non-book materials. Libraries and other institutions which seek to attain bibliographic control of material will be faced with several choices when these new rules are issued. They may continue to use the 1949 rules for choice of entry and form of heading; they may start a new catalog and utilize the new rules for items recorded in it, meanwhile closing the old catalog as a dead file; they may adopt the new rules completely while maintaining the old catalog and interfiling old and new headings—in this case, they may connect old and new headings which conflict with appropriate “see also” references and notes indicating the entries used before and after adoption of the new rules; or they may decide to use the new rules for headings that are newly-established and continue to use old forms when already established, even though the latter may conflict with the new rules.

In making these decisions libraries will be enormously influenced by the policy of the Library of Congress, since LC cataloging data are utilized extensively in this country and elsewhere, and since these data are expected to be available much more promptly than before and on a vastly increased scale under the Title II program whereby LC expects to acquire and catalog within a matter of weeks most publications of research value wherever issued. It is already clear that the policy of the Library of Congress will be that of superimposition, or the last course mentioned above. In other words, LC will be very restrictive indeed about recataloging items already in its files, even though the form or choice of heading may differ from that called for by the new rules. In most cases changes in entry will occur only when there are but a few items already in the LC catalogs and where change would result in substantially improved organization as anticipated for the future. LC might change an already-established heading if a large number of entries were

* Paper presented at the RTSD-CCS program meeting during the ALA Conference, July 14, 1966.
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expected and if these would be definitely more useful under the new form of heading. In a few cases, such as the headings involving treaties, the new rules will necessitate change, and here the LC files will probably be split after adoption of the new code.

What are the practicalities which libraries must face in evaluating the choices mentioned above? If a library should elect to continue using the “Red Rules” (i.e. the 1949 ALA Rules) for entry, it would avoid having to retrain catalogers in applying the new rules, although those catalogers would experience the same difficulties that are now found in applying the 1949 code—difficulties such as the ambiguous distinction between societies and institutions.

The Red Rules have been raked over the coals far too often, and by authorities much more competent than myself; but at the risk of injecting a lugubrious note I would like to mention one of my favorite examples: Rule 148, “Cemeteries”:

Enter local cemeteries under place. Enter city cemeteries located at a distance from the city under the name of the cemetery adding the name of the city. Just what is the difference between “local” and “city” cemeteries? How far is “at a distance,” and how does the cataloger determine it? Still, if the Red Rules were to be retained, original cataloging could go on in much the same way as before; but if the library tried to avail itself of any LC copy, it would have to check all such copy and decide whether or not the entries agreed with the Red Rules. In time, of course, the number of headings established by LC under the new rules will increase, and this would correspondingly increase the number of items which the library would be forced to recatalog using the old rules. Reference work would presumably be affected by the fact that the National Union Catalog and other publications employing the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules would have entries differing from those in the institution's own catalog. Here again, the number of such differences will undoubtedly increase in time, as LC catalogs more and more items under the new rules. In all these comparisons, however, we must not forget that a large bulk of personal name entries will remain relatively unaffected by the change in rules.

Under the second choice, that is, if a new catalog were to be started and the new rules applied to every item designated for inclusion in it, catalogers would have to become well-versed in the new rules as well as the old. Also, LC copy would have to be examined to see whether the Library of Congress had used the old or new rules in choosing entry and formulating headings. If LC had retained a previously-established heading, and if this heading were in conflict with the new rules, the library choosing to split its catalog on this basis would have to revise the LC copy in terms of the new code. This scrutiny, of course, would extend to added entries as well as to main entries. Reference work would be affected in much the same way as in the first procedure; there would be differences between practices at the national level and the library's own catalog. However, these differences would decrease rather
than increase in the course of time as LC's new cataloging work tended to embody the new rules.

Turning to the third scheme, whereby only one catalog would be maintained but the new rules adopted for all publications received after a certain date, we find it evident that much the same process would go on as in the previous alternative: catalogers would apply the new rules to all original cataloging, but they would have to examine all pertinent LC copy for possible conflict with the new rules and change it where such conflict existed. In doing so, the cataloging staff would have to construct a careful scheme of "see also" references to guide the user back and forth between two versions of the same heading when the new rules call for change. Whether or not the reader would be infallibly directed to all the library's holdings involving a given entry through the directions given in the cross reference scheme must be considered at best a moot point. Nevertheless, he would be using only one instead of two catalogs as under the previous alternative.

Before considering the policy of superimposition, it might be well to emphasize the common effects that the above choices would have on cataloging workload. In no instance would a library be able to obtain the maximum utility of LC printed cards or proof even though in the vast majority of cases (perhaps from 75% to 90%), entries prepared under the new rules would not differ from those prepared according to the old. Any library desiring to use LC copy would have to examine all such applicable copy to see if it conflicted with the scheme employed locally. This examination, involving detailed knowledge of two complicated sets of cataloging rules, to say nothing of the changes found to be necessary, would result in a not inconsiderable amount of staff time. The effect will be even more keenly felt as LC data becomes available for a greater and greater percentage of the world's publishing output.

To superimpose new headings established under the new rules in a catalog containing headings prepared according to the old rules will allow for utilization of LC copy without change. This will be possible when the local library already has entries in its catalog under the old form or has not, prior to receiving the new LC copy, established a heading in a conflicting form. Integrating entries prepared by the two sets of cataloging rules may affect our esthetic sensibilities but should not seriously hamper catalog use. To quote Lucile Morsch:

If the works of a given author are kept together in the catalog under a single form of heading, it should not be a cause for concern that another author's works are to be found under a different form of heading. Few catalogers and many fewer reference librarians and other users of the catalog are sufficiently knowledgeable of our present complex cataloging rules and their many exceptions to be able to go directly to all types of headings in the catalog. We are all dependent . . . on cross references.

Most use of the catalog involves the search for a single heading, not the class of headings in which that person or corporate body falls in the cataloging rules. For example, if you are looking for an institution under its name and you find it there, you are not concerned that for another institution you will be
referred from its name to the place in which it is situated or to the name of a parent body which the name of the institution you are seeking as a sub-heading. If this were not true, we could not be getting along as well as we are now with the extensive inconsistencies that exist in our catalogs.*

Libraries throughout this country and elsewhere where LC copy is to be utilized will be more dependent than ever on the speedy distribution of such copy, and upon the acquisition by LC of the bulk of research materials published throughout the world. The extent to which LC accomplishes these worthwhile goals will minimize the conflict resulting from original cataloging on the local level which differs from the decisions LC makes when it catalogs the same items.

There are other ways in which the Library of Congress can aid libraries which choose to follow the policy of superimposition. The ordinary assumption will be that if a heading is established in one of the book catalogs issued by the Library of Congress, there will be no departure from this form. Therefore, local catalogers' major difficulties will be apt to occur when they unwittingly use a heading already established by the Library of Congress and fail to realize that for one reason or another LC has decided to change that heading to conform to the new rules. One possible method by which LC could call the attention of others to such changes would be to start including cross references in its distribution of proof and printed cards, and to designate by a symbol (such as an asterisk) those cross references which reflect changes in previously-established headings. Local libraries could then easily devise routines to guard against further cataloging of items under the heading no longer used by the Library of Congress, and if necessary to recatalog any items in the institution’s files under the old heading. Along these same lines, there is some reason to believe that it would be helpful if LC could provide as part of its proof-slip service or even as a separate service the distribution of copies of its authority cards. Obviously, catalogers will need to be aware of the different practices embodied in the two codes, and this implies that for the indefinite future library schools must at least expose students to the old rules and the major areas of difference between old and new.

All this is not to say that every problem will be solved if we simply await the dicta from Capitol Hill and relax in the confident expectation that professional cataloging at the local level will become a thing of the past and that we can afford to let our cataloging staff diminish by attrition. The maintenance of any growing catalog demands some continuous recataloging, most often involving only one or a few entries, but sometimes affecting a relatively large number such as the changes LC made not long ago with regard to Latin America and Helsinki. In one or two instances, I believe, local libraries have not totally agreed with past LC cataloging practice, and may find that if they now wish to follow the policy of superimposition with the new rules, some revision of their own cards will be necessary. To expect that LC will achieve over-

* Letter from Lucile Morsch to David M. Kaser, April 5, 1965.
night instantaneous acquisition and cataloging of material published throughout the world may be just a shade optimistic, although it is indeed fortunate that the Title II program and LC’s tremendous efforts to implement it have come at a time when its strategic effects will be doubly valuable.

Catalogers throughout the country will need to know when LC intends to switch to the new rules; more than that, they will need to know the very content of these rules. Despite the great faith which we may hold in the quiet or not so quiet efficiency of our cataloging staffs, something less than total harmony may result if we simply place a copy of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules on each cataloger’s desk some bright Monday morning and say “go to work.” Theoretically, the new rules should result in easier application than the old since they are rules based on conditions rather than specific cases. However, the logical orientation of the new rules, although theoretically valid, is not something which becomes part of a cataloger’s second nature merely by being told that they are based on a logical framework, and perhaps not even by a close examination of the rules themselves. It could be an act of foresight for regional technical service groups or libraries with sizeable cataloging staffs to organize formal classes or workshops in the application of the new rules. The work of even senior catalogers may quite possibly have to be revised or reviewed for a period of time in order to overcome the natural tendency to rely upon rules that are familiar. And even if this kind of formal training is made available, there will be more than a few cases, I suspect, where a local cataloger will compare a piece of LC copy with a book in hand and say to himself “so that’s what Rule 89C means.” Under these circumstances library administrators may be forewarned to avoid the expectation of a sudden spurt in cataloging productivity with the publication of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. There will be of necessity a period of learning, of trial and error, and of adaptation; but then we always have realized that catalogers are infinitely adaptable.

I would like to mention one aspect of the new rules which seems to present potential difficulties for those who are guided by them. In certain areas the new code would appear to be well-designed for application to material where any given personal author or corporate body is already represented by a relatively extensive or complete corpus of published work; they may be less successful with new authors and developing situations. For example, in the rules involving pseudonymous authors, how do you know when an author is or is not going to continue to write under a particular pseudonym? In the rule for form of heading of provisional governments, at what point is it possible to decide whether a government is insurgent, or whether it will be eventually considered as legitimate? These problems and others of this type do not manifest themselves exclusively in application of the new rules. They may be insoluble, the inevitable accompaniment of attempts to organize for all time recorded knowledge produced by a world in flux.

Under a policy of superimposition reference work should be rel-
atively unaffected, and perhaps made easier than before. Entries established under the new rules should be, in general, those to which common sense will lead both reference librarians and library users, and these groups may find themselves less dependent on a knowledge of cataloging rules than is now the case. The logical pattern of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, we hope, will make catalogs easier to understand, to use, and to explain, and will make the cataloging process more reasonable and understandable. Perhaps of more tangible value will be the increased number of references to lead users of the catalog to the material they desire. I am told that within the Catalog Code Revision Committee the hope has been voiced that the clarity of expression and easily grasped structure of the new rules may attract newcomers to the profession to careers in cataloging. Acting on this advice, I have just sent a memorandum to our Personnel Office warning them of the stampede that may ensue!

However logically consistent the new rules may be in substance, a fair amount of internal evidence suggests they will not clear the road for machine applications in cataloging. (This, of course, was not a primary consideration in the development of the new code.) Non-filing words remain interspersed in the entries for British titles of nobility, for instance; there is little or no provision for spelling out of all abbreviations; and, depending on the particular entry, classes of headings involving numerals may be expressed in either Arabic or Roman characters or sometimes a mixture of both (as in the case of army units). These provisions as well as instructions calling for descriptive designations such as died and fl. to be placed before dates pertaining to a given personal author will hardly simplify the task of machine sequencing of catalog entries. Similar difficulties may be expected in application of the rules calling for distinct entries when the same geographical area has undergone changes in government, or when the same geographical name, such as Mexico, stands for differing jurisdictions, each of which demands a separate catalog entry. Data processing applications to bibliographical control, such as the Library of Congress's MARC project itself, may find it necessary to call for revisions in catalog entries when bibliographical data are put into machine-readable form. There are indications that the new filing code, which is being prepared to accompany the issuance of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, will reflect considerations of machine sequencing, at least in its tendency to work toward strict alphabetical filing. Naturally, the greater the extent to which this tendency is followed in the filing rules, the more easily can machine programs be devised which provide for the proper sequencing of bibliographical data.

While the compatibility of the new cataloging and filing rules with computer hardware and software capabilities is certain to have an important long-range effect, the policies of certain commercial organizations, such as Bowker and the Wilson Company, may be of more immediate relevance. Citations in Bowker's American Book Publishing Record and the listings in Publishers' Weekly will reflect the superimposition policy of the Library of Congress, since the cataloging data...
in these publications are derived from LC. The new rules will have little effect on listings in the Library Journal, since Lj's entries are designed primarily for ordering purposes rather than for bibliographic control. In the main, those entries consist of personal authors, the rules for which are least affected by the new code. With respect to the card services provided by Lj and the Wilson Company, here again the great majority of entries are for personal authors. To a certain extent, such as entries for pseudonymous authors, Wilson cards already reflect the practices which the new rules embody. In the case of publications such as the Book Review Digest, the Standard Catalog, and CBI, the Wilson Company may base its decision as to whether or not to adopt the new cataloging rules on the type of library which most heavily uses these reference works, and the extent to which Wilson anticipates this library public will change to the new rules. The Cumulative Book Index, for example, is considered a research-oriented bibliographical tool, and the publisher feels that it should give careful consideration either to changing to the new rules or to following the LC practice of superimposition.

It may be of some interest to examine briefly the approach of an admittedly atypical institution, the Reference Department of The New York Public Library, to the publication of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. While the Reference Department has followed the ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries in many respects, there have been important divergences, notably in the area of corporate entries. The revision of the cataloging rules coincides with an imminent decision by the Reference Department to close off its catalogs—a decision based primarily not upon the superiority of the new code but upon the necessity to preserve (probably in book form) the Reference Department's eight million card public catalog. The cut-off of the existing card catalogs and the beginning of a new catalog will enable the Reference Department to follow national practice, and for the sake of handling the cataloging workload most efficiently while maintaining what we believe are high standards of bibliographical information, we feel that a clear case exists for the acceptance of the data issued by the Library of Congress. Certain headings, it is true, will undergo a change when they reappear in the new catalog. We will attempt to guide the user through the use of cross references and instructions in the organization of the catalogs, but it may not always be possible to convince him that our cataloging practice does not stem from a calculated attempt to induce frustration. Nevertheless, the benefits to be derived from the full utilization of Library of Congress cataloging data clearly outweigh the disadvantages, for both the library's technical service and reference staff and the user for whom the catalog is ultimately designed. An added advantage will be the increased delineation of rules for the cataloging of non-book materials; we hope that the application of these rules to the vast array of maps, manuscripts, music, phonorecords, prints, photographs, and the like will introduce a measure of conformity helpful to the library user whose research directs him to information contained in various media.
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I am not sure what moral can be extracted from these comments. I had thought of beginning with a paraphrase of Marc Antony to the effect that we are not here to praise the Red Rules. The last few paragraphs, however, seem more to reflect the old aphorism, "If ya can't lick 'em, jine 'em." The new rules are not perfect, and their application will call for intelligence and training. They represent, however, a healthy advance for the profession, one which should serve both librarians and the public in good stead.

A Program for a Public Library's Adapting to the New Code*

MARIAN SANDER, Head, Catalog Department
Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Md.

THIS PAPER is to be concerned primarily with the new Code and plans for its adoption, but because Pratt's situation at present is unique I feel that I must give you, first, some background information about the changes we have made or will make in the near future.

The Enoch Pratt Free Library is in an ideal position to adopt the rules in the 1966 Catalog Code because we started a new catalog in May 1965. At that time we changed to the Library of Congress Classification from a system based on LC, but with many modifications and deviations. The most striking was the use of different letters for the main classes, and the modification we were finding most critical was the substitution of whole numbers for all of the decimals in the LC schedules. This latter change meant that in numerous places throughout the schedules, Pratt's numbers and LC's numbers were very different. There were areas in which we had run out of numbers and had no way to expand the classification for new subjects and new specializations.

There were several reasons why we decided to change to LC rather than to the Dewey Decimal Classification. First, the LC Classification is not a system based on logic, so it is possible to revise it and make provision for new subjects without changing its structure. Also, it is possible to classify a highly specialized aspect of a subject without using a number composed of fifteen or more digits as is necessary with Dewey. This is an important factor because our collection is growing continually in depth and specialization.

* Revision of a paper presented at a workshop on cataloging problems held at Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, April 14, 1966.
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The third, and probably the most important, reason for adopting the LC Classification is our belief that libraries are going to become increasingly dependent on the Library of Congress for assistance in cataloging the growing number of publications which all libraries are acquiring today. The LC proof slips provide more help with the LC Classification than with Dewey, and this assistance will increase as the Library of Congress expands its acquisition and cataloging programs under the provision of Title II of the Higher Education Act. Although the LC Classification was not intended for an open-shelf collection with reader-access to the shelves, how many libraries can provide this ideal situation today? Pratt, which was designed as an open-shelf library, now has the larger percentage of its collection shelved in closed stacks. Even with the heavy discarding of duplicates and the more ephemeral titles, as goes on continuously in a public library, we are outgrowing our space. As collections continue to grow, and as the disciplines become increasingly intertwined, readers must depend upon the catalog for access to the collections—and these conditions will not diminish in the future. We feel that adoption of the LC Classification was a commonsense course for Pratt.

The decision to start new catalogs with the change in classification was based on three factors: (1) Pratt's classification looks like the LC Classification but the letters mean entirely different things, and it would have been confusing to the catalog user to find a card for a collection of literary essays with a D classification standing, perhaps, next to a card for a book on European history with a D class number. (2) Pratt had not used LC's subject headings consistently. In some cases an LC subject heading was used as a cross reference to some other term; some headings which LC uses in direct form, Pratt inverted—and vice versa. We wanted to begin to use LC's subject headings as they appear in the list, and a new catalog was the simplest way to make this change. (3) Pratt is preparing to change from a card catalog to a book catalog. We hope to issue our first one during the fall of this year, and it will include all of the titles we have cataloged since May 1, 1965.

We are using the LC Classification for all new titles, and we are using it also for all titles going into one of our new major branches which is scheduled to open in January 1967. Shortly thereafter we plan to reclassify these titles throughout the system. Then we will begin the project of reclassifying our entire collection of about one and three-quarter million volumes. As titles are reclassified they will be entered in supplements to the book catalog. Our plans for the book catalog include a production schedule of monthly or bimonthly supplements with annual or biennial cumulations. As we prepare entries for the book catalog, all headings will be examined, and entries will be established according to those rules in the new Code which Pratt has decided to adopt.

The new Code, which has been so many years in the making, is not quite the revolutionary instrument we thought it was going to be after seeing the early drafts prepared by Seymour Lubetzky. You will recall that the major discontent with our cataloging rules was with the rules for corporate entries. The provision of separate rules for societies and in-
stitutions and the many inconsistencies and anomalies within those rules have made cataloging exceedingly expensive and the results of application of the rules have made the use of the catalog difficult and time-consuming. Lubetzky's Cataloging Rules and Principles, a Critique of the A.L.A. Rules for Entry and a Proposed Design for Their Revision (issued in 1953) really was responsible for getting catalog code revision under way, and his early drafts gave promise of great things ahead in cataloging. Little by little, as drafts were discussed and revised, those rules which many of us considered so highly desirable were whittled away—and the crushing blow came when ARL libraries announced that they could not accept the principle of entry for all corporate bodies under their names. Representatives from the United States had participated in the IFLA International Conference on Cataloguing Principles held in Paris in October 1961, and the Statement of Principles adopted at this Conference closely paralleled—were, in fact, influenced by—the Lubetzky Code. Countries which had never accepted the corporate entry principle, agreed to the entry of a corporate body under its name—and now our Code is coming out with provisions for excepting a great mass of corporate bodies from this principle. Of course, individual libraries may elect to ignore the exceptions, but if they do so, this means they will not be able to use Library of Congress cards for these entries without changing them. This is most unfortunate because, with the terrific explosion in publishing and the nationwide shortage of catalogers, libraries need to take advantage of all of the cataloging assistance available. Although we would like to establish all entries for Pratt's new catalog according to the rules of the new Code, this would not be economically feasible. If LC cataloging is available, we will use their form of entry except that we will prefer English rather than the vernacular; when we do original cataloging, we will apply the rules of the new Code in establishing entries new to our catalog.

We, at Pratt, are pleased that the rule for serials provides for cataloging each changed title and each changed name of a corporate body as a separate entity. We have been doing this for the past ten years or more and have found it most satisfactory. Our periodicals are cataloged but not classified; they are assigned to our subject departments according to the LC classification, and within each department they are shelved alphabetically by their catalog entry. Treating each changed title as a separate entity means that the periodicals are shelved under the titles they bear at time of issue—the same titles under which they are referred to in the periodical indexes.

Many of us on the Catalog Code Revision Committee were in favor of entering all serials under title. However, as finally approved, the rule provides for entry of a serial issued by a corporate body under its title unless "the title (exclusive of subtitle) includes the name or the abbreviation of the name of the corporate body, or consists solely of a generic term that requires the name of the body for adequate identification"—in these cases the entry is to be under the corporate body. This exception will mean that the ALA Bulletin will be entered under the American
Library Association, and the University of London Historical Studies will be entered under: London. University. Pratt may ignore this exception and enter serials under their titles, with added entries under the corporate bodies—certainly we will enter under title those serials whose titles are at all distinctive, such as the two I have just mentioned.

The indicated preference for the English form of name in various rules throughout the Code will surely be pleasing to public libraries. For the past few years, Pratt has been using English for the names of most foreign corporate bodies with a cross reference from the vernacular form. I am sure catalog users will be pleased to find entries under “Horace” instead of “Horatius Flaccus, Quintus” and under “Francis of Assisi” instead of “Francesco d’Assisi.” There is even an alternative rule for names not in the Roman alphabet which tells us that “in any library when it is considered to be better suited to the needs of the clientele [we may] use the form most frequently found in English language translations and reference sources.”

The rules governing entry under pseudonym will be acceptable to public libraries. The rules provide for entry under pseudonym if the author writes only under one pseudonym, but if he writes under several or under real name and pseudonym the rule tells us to “enter him under the name by which he is primarily identified in modern editions of his works and in reference sources.” This would not be acceptable to us at Pratt, but there is an alternative rule which reads: “If the works of an author appear under several pseudonyms or under his real name and one or more pseudonyms, enter each work under the name he used for it.” This is fine because we now have a rule which makes legitimate a practice Pratt has been following for a number of years.

The wider application of uniform titles in the new Code should prove most acceptable to catalog users. A uniform title for Shakespeare’s Hamlet, Swift’s Gulliver’s Travels and other works which have been published under numerous title variations will bring all variations of a title together, and for the reader who is looking for a specific variant title, a cross reference will lead him to the uniform heading. Pratt has been using uniform titles for many of these title variants for years when we found how successful they were with music entries.

From the foregoing, it can be seen that Pratt will now be able to follow much of the cataloging code more closely than it has in the past. The policies we had adopted, many of which are now a part of the new Code, developed from our desire to give better service to catalog users.

During the years that code revision has been in progress, Pratt has been giving a lot of thought to implementing the Code in our catalogs. Of course, we didn’t know until last year that we would be starting new catalogs, so we were making our plans for applying the new rules in our existing catalogs. For the information of those of you who will be continuing your present catalogs, I should like to share with you some of our thinking.

First, our plans for applying the rule for entry of a corporate body under its name rather than under place as the old rule for institutions re-
quired: We were going to have stamps made with the new entries for state universities, stamp the cards, move them to their new locations in the catalog, and make cross references from the previous entries. Other entries which appeared in the catalog in lesser numbers would have remained unchanged until it was necessary to use the entries for new material being added. At that time, we would have changed the old entries, moved them to their new location in the catalog, and filed a cross reference from the old form. If we had an entry for “Baltimore. First Baptist Church,” the entry would have remained as it was established until we added a new publication by, or about, the First Baptist Church. In the meantime, if we had received a work about the First Methodist Church in Baltimore, and if this church had never been represented in our catalog, we would have established the entry as “First Methodist Church, Baltimore,” and would have filed a cross reference under “Baltimore. First Methodist Church.” It would not have disturbed us to have an entry and a cross reference from a similar type of entry side by side in the catalog. Nor do we believe that it would disturb the catalog user. We have been unable to understand why research libraries have felt that they could not live with this kind of situation in their catalogs. There have been many changes in rules over the years, and all catalogs which extend back for fifty or more years have similar types of entries established according to different rules.

There has been a lot of discussion about the expense and the tremendous amount of work which would be involved in changing book numbers if the entries are changed. At Pratt, we have never for a moment considered changing our book numbers when we changed our corporate entries. We have made changes in corporate entries for years without changing our book numbers and it has presented no problems. The call number is a locating and identifying device which the user obtains from the catalog. What difference can it make to him if a book about the First Baptist Church has a book number which begins with the letter “B” for Baltimore or “F” for First? As long as he has a number which identifies the book so that he or a staff member can locate it on the shelf, I don’t believe he cares what letters are included in that number. It seems much more important to provide the catalog entry in a form which is easy for the user to find than to worry about the book number which few users understand anyway—even in a research library, I dare say. As I mentioned earlier, our periodicals are not classified, so we have no problem with book numbers for this large category of material.

As for new editions of titles, we would have entered them according to the new rules and would have left the old editions as they were. They would have been connected by author-title references or added entries.

Most of our catalogs were refiled some years ago according to the ALA filing rules, and we find that interfiling main and added entries solves many problems. One thing which we did when we refiled our catalogs, and which we found very helpful, was to add to official and subject entries for cities the abbreviation of the state for U. S. cities, and of the country for foreign cities, e.g. Baltimore, Md. and London, Eng. We ob-
served these geographical designations in filing, which prevented titles and non-official entries from interfiling in the official file. Many of us were most anxious to have this a provision of the new Code—and it was considered, but was voted down by the Code Revision Steering Committee. The Code provides for addition of the larger geographic entity only when it is necessary to differentiate two or more places with the same name. As more libraries change to filing rules which provide for a stricter alphabetical arrangement of entries, we feel that there will be widespread regret that this simple filing aid was not included in the Code.

Throughout the entire period of Code Revision, some of us pleaded that the filing of entries be taken into consideration while providing for the form of entries, but those who disagreed with us were more influential. Now, as libraries are starting or considering computer-produced catalogs, some of the rules may have to be changed. How are computers to be instructed to file “U. S. 88th Congress” as “U. S. Congress, 88th”? Entries such as this have provided problems for manual filing; the problems will be compounded in computer programming, and coping with them will add increased costs to a computer program.

The changes required by the new Code will not be as many for Pratt as they will be for those libraries whose cataloging has not deviated from the “Red Book,” and we will take advantage of those alternative rules which will result in more acceptable entries for the clientele of a public library. For economic reasons, our catalog will be a blend of the old and the new. To us, at Pratt, this seems the sensible approach.

IN THE MAIL: FILING PROBLEMS

The commentary on filing problems in the excellent articles by Paula Kieffer (“The Baltimore County Public Library Book Catalog”) and Phyllis A. Richmond (“Note on Updating and Searching Computerized Catalogs”) in the Spring issue brings up those matters which are of niddling detail only, but which constitute serious problems too seldom discussed in the literature.

To meet filing problems like those noted in the Baltimore County catalog article, Documentation Incorporated, after first assuming the ALA alternative rules could be programmed, then derived a series of rules to deal with the situation. Some of the solutions proposed closely parallel some of those which appear in preliminary material LC has produced on machine-readable catalog copy, or in the code written by us here at Columbia, indicating, it seems to me, that they all derive from basic principles inherent in the situation.

The code we have produced here at Columbia deals (we think quite satisfactorily) with all the situations mentioned by Miss Kieffer, as well as many others which do not appear in her brief article. It has been programmed and tested on two published book catalogs, totalling over 50,000 entries (not titles), as well as on all of the extended example in the ALA filing rules plus all of the Shakespeare and Bible entries, and the New York and U. S. entries. A sample (over 10%) of all of the subject headings in the L.C. list has been checked as well.
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We have also been bothered by punching errors. The code we have does, however, lessen the problem somewhat for filing (but not for the searching situation so cogently set forth by Dr. Richmond) by ignoring signs and symbols as filing elements. They may of course appear in printout.

Uniformity in filing is most desirable, and it is certainly to be hoped that standard rules suitable for both machine and manual filing will be generally adopted fairly soon. Both ALA and the American Standards Association have work underway in this field. Comments, problems, and suggestions on filing or on our code would be most appreciated by us.—Theodore C. Hines, School of Library Service, Columbia University, New York.


2. Editor’s note: Inferonics, Inc., under contract to the Council on Library Resources, is also studying the mechanization of filing, based on the LC rules.

LTP

As of July 1, 1966, the name of the Library Technology Project of the American Library Association was changed to LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.
ALTHOUGH GENERALIZATIONS may be somewhat dangerous because they are seldom quite accurate, it might be suggested that to the two principal traditional functions of the book cataloger, i.e. (1) maintenance of bibliographic control and (2) satisfaction of the users' convenience has, in our "modern" age, been added a third: (3) development of international bibliographical standardization.

The cataloger's methodology has always and does still involve a process of identification. In order to achieve a mutual exclusiveness of catalog references, and thus indicate a one-to-one relationship between reference and material referred to, identification was and is attempted by: (1) description of the material, and (2) differentiation of one description from all others. By developing first (in time) a technique for description and differentiation, the cataloger accomplished his then primary goal: maintenance of inventory record, i.e. bibliographic control within his own library.

As the technologies of communication and transportation developed, some degree of standardization of the techniques of description and differentiation evolved—not on account of a recognition of a desirability of standardization as such, but on account of individual recognition of "better" (i.e. easier or more efficacious) techniques and rejection of "poorer" (i.e. more difficult or less efficacious) techniques.

As the technologies of book production developed (printing press, paper manufacture, etc.), the volume of book materials increased and the value (or cost) of book materials decreased. Concurrent with the development of the technologies (of transportation, communication, book production) developed "cultural advances" including increase of literacy among peoples (through education) and increase of leisure time among peoples (primarily on account of industrialization). At the point in time when comparatively inexpensive books and a comparatively literate population with leisure time coexist, the cataloger (who formerly had only to satisfy himself, or his superiors which is the same thing) becomes confronted with a new "problem": users' demands.

When he can no longer ignore this confrontation (although he succeeded?) in ignoring it for perhaps a hundred years, more or less), he begins to evolve a cataloging technique which will satisfy users' demand. He codifies practice into rules, which rules elucidate cataloging practice for the user, justify that practice, and suggest that users' demands are in fact being satisfied. Again in time, the cataloger comes to
place primary emphasis on satisfaction of this demand, and recognizes as his primary function "satisfaction of users' convenience."

By now, the codes of the catalogers—Panizzi, Jewett, Cutter, Delisle, Seizinger, Ebert, Steiff, Mecklenburg, Dziatzko—have, by accidents of accretion and synthesis and by the irrelevancies of pecuniary interest and human laziness, evolved into "Schools of National Practice." So long as "national autonomy" and "national self-interest" are conceived to be the ultimate sanction of a culture, differences between "Schools of National Practice" (whether of cataloging, school teaching, practicing medicine, or what else) are not only tolerated, but are likely to be matters of national pride.

Opposing the differences between the Schools of National Practice, and operating toward a more uniform methodology are: (1) the tendencies toward likeness within linguistically-like or similar Schools, caused by the same "accidents" and "irrelevancies" which created the National Schools themselves, and (2) a universal allegiance (acknowledged although certainly not universally implemented) to the "users' convenience" concept.

"Users' convenience," because it is an abstraction, may properly be termed "universal." In other words, that which is convenient to a user (abstract) in Russia, India, or Italy is also convenient to a user (abstract) in Germany, France, or England. The user wants material—apart from the "subject approach," which is something else again, and properly apart from this discussion of "corporate authorship"—because he has been told about it (verbal reference) or has read about it (written citation) formally (lecture-type instruction or bibliographic citation) or informally (casually cited, in conversation or in text). The cataloger provides the device which will most conveniently lead the user to the material cited. The cataloger's first concern in this user-approach to the catalog is, universally, the character of the citation. The description-differentiation of the material which, let us presume, occurred prior to the inquiry for the material must, according to the universal acknowledge-ment of the concept of users' convenience, have had as its first priority the provision of access to the material through the assigning of the "tag" most likely to suit that convenience. If the Code used in the tagging process has as its first priority the description-differentiation of the materials for bibliographic control, the coincidence of that tag with the user's citation will be accidental. As Codes more universally reflect user-convenience, on account of user-demand or of compliance to the user-convenience concept, accidental coincidence tags will be displaced by user-convenience tags, and the Codes thereby will become more uniform.

Acquiescence to user-convenience and the levelling influence of "accidents" and "irrelevancies" had, through the first half of the twentieth century, reduced differences between linguistically-related Schools of National Practice. Between such "National Codes" there remained differences of detail, which differences were held to on account of the irrelevancies of pecuniary interest and human laziness (the same irrelevancies which had been factors in the creation of the Schools of National Prac-
tices in the first place), defended on the ground of user-convenience, and justified on a plea of "what our users are used to." Moreover, inconsistencies within a single School of National Practice existed which were/are of the same character, and, in addition, reflect (historical) accidents of accretion and synthesis.

Proposals which would eliminate differences between Codes and inconsistencies within Codes are advanced by a new—the current—generation of catalogers, which proposals reflect, whether or not they recognize explicitly, the universality of the user-convenience concept, and the correlative international bibliographical standardization. Before the attempt will be made to implement the proposals, and apart from the question of, for example, whether Ranganathan or Lubetzky, there must be a willingness on the part of catalogers themselves (1) to recognize a higher cultural sanction than national self-interest, (2) to accede to the user-convenience concept in practice as well as in theory, and (3) to overcome the irrelevancies of pecuniary interest and human laziness.

Despite the seeming unlikelihood of the accomplishment of such tasks, there is some (perhaps one should say considerable) ground for optimism that such tasks may, indeed, be achieved. Four occurrences can be noted as evidence to support the optimistic view; one will be mentioned as contrary.

After wrestling with the problems of anonymous treatment of works of "corporate authorship," the French School, primarily in order to satisfy user need-demand-convenience with respect to these materials (and despite national pride, pecuniary interest, and human laziness) finally (as of January 1, 1952) put into effect a Code recognizing the concept of authorship by a corporate body. With good reason, the new Code avoided the society-institution differentiation, recognizing that that differentiation, even if it could or should be made, which is unlikely, is not relevant to user satisfaction. The Bibliothèque Nationale, which, because of size and "tradition" might have been expected to "drag its feet" (perhaps not an apt figure of speech), was the first state library to put into effect the new Code. (The new Code unfortunately specified entry under legal name of the corporate body, but such an ill-advised process, because it will cause inconvenience to users, will eventually be eliminated.)

Similarly, at the IFLA International Conference on Cataloging Principles (Paris, October 9-18, 1961), representatives of only three nations (Sweden, Denmark, and Finland) cataloging under the "Prussian Instructions" protested the introduction of the corporate authorship concept into the Conference's "Statement of Principles." A major difference between non-linguistically-related Schools of National Practice, and one of so long standing, which might have been feared as insurmountable, was, in fact, resolved.

And thirdly, the Statement of Principles of the Paris Conference was acceded to and accepted by a majority of the participants, representing fifty-three countries. This concurrence of opinion on cataloging principles was a landmark in the endeavor of catalogers to achieve fulfillment.
of what was suggested above as their third, and newest, function: Development of international bibliographical standardization.

Fourthly and most recently, the new Anglo-American Code potentially provides for the elimination of the archaic “institution-society” differentiation. A general rule has been introduced into the Code which specifies entry under best-known or most-used name of a corporate body, rather than place name. Thus the Code does, again potentially, recognize the obligation of catalogers to the users, and to international bibliographical standardization.

However, on the negative side must be mentioned the failure of the new Anglo-American Code consistently to commit American catalogers to the elimination of the artificial, inconvenient, internationally inappropriate place-name entry. By allowing an optional exception to the general rule, the new Code, in effect, allows the perpetuation of the American practice of entering certain “institutions” under place names. As a matter of policy, a library may choose to catalog by the exception, rather than by the rule. It appears not unlikely that cataloging by the exception will predominate.

At the risk of repetition, it can be said that, with respect to the perpetuation of place-name entry in the transparent guise of an “exception,” American catalogers, in the new Cataloging Code, have failed: (1) to recognize a higher cultural sanction than national self-interest, (2) to accede to the user-convenience concept in practice as well as in theory, and (3) to overcome the irrellevancies of pecuniary interest and human laziness.

**CCS BYLAWS, PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

Article VI. Nominations and elections

Sec. 2. Nominating committees

(a) Composition. The Nominating Committee consists of five members at large of the Section, no one of whom shall be a member of the Executive Committee

Submitted by the Bylaws Committee:

Marquerite C. Soroka
Jack King
Arline Custer, Chairman

**MANN AWARD NOMINATIONS SOUGHT**

Nominations for the 1967 Award of the Margaret Mann Citation are invited from all readers of *LRTS*. Please do not hesitate to repeat the nomination of names formerly submitted.

Nominations should be sent (by December 15, 1966) to the Chairman of the Award Committee: Ruth French Strout, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637.
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*Library Resources & Technical Services*
IN MARCH, 1963, the Children's Book Section was established in the Reference Department of the Library of Congress. The Section was created to serve as a center to which illustrators, writers, publishers, librarians, and others who work with children could write, telephone, or come in person for research and reference service. The Head of the Section was given specific responsibilities for recommending children's literature to be acquired by the Library, preparing bibliographies of works relating to children's literature, and for assisting in other library activities connected with children's literature.

Prior to this time the Library administration was already of the opinion that the Library's substantial collection of children's materials should be made more readily available and useful to specialists in this field. On March 7, 1957, the Processing Department issued Departmental Memorandum No. 90 establishing a catalog of juvenile books to be located in the Union Catalog Division. This card file indicated books written for children below the high school level, the cards arranged in the order of the LC classes to which the books were assigned. By 1960 it had become evident that this catalog failed to meet fully the requirements of its users and discussions were begun about changing the emphasis and structure of the catalog.

The catalog, by now shifted to the Main Reading Room, was again moved, in 1965, to the Children's Book Section. As the catalog became subjected to greater use, its deficiencies became increasingly more evident.

At the same time that expressions of concern about the need for a more useful catalog for the Children's Book Section were being voiced, the need for a different catalog card, more suitable for the general library serving children and young people was also being expressed by book distributors participating in the "Cards With Books" program. In 1961 the Card Division of the Library of Congress, striving to improve its service to the libraries of the country and at the same time attempting to serve the needs of those who work with children, undertook the task of creating Library of Congress Annotated Cards for Children's Literature. This article has been in the Editor's hands since early Spring (1966) but was held up because of the magazine's shortage of space and prior commitments. LC has been criticized for not releasing the information sooner; the Editor is solely to blame and regrets the unfortunate circumstance.

* Editor's note: This article has been in the Editor's hands since early Spring (1966) but was held up because of the magazine's shortage of space and prior commitments. LC has been criticized for not releasing the information sooner; the Editor is solely to blame and regrets the unfortunate circumstance.
to hold to a manageable level the number of individual card orders that it had to handle daily, inaugurated the distribution of sets of LC cards on a wholesale basis to publishers and book distributors to be made available along with the books they sold. Now the participants in this new program also urged specialized and comprehensive cataloging coverage of currently-issued children's literature.

The idea that the Library might produce a different catalog card more particularly suited to the smaller library was not a new one. On April 10, 1940, the Librarian announced the appointment of a committee of distinguished outside librarians "to examine and report upon the processing operations of the Library of Congress and certain related matters." The Committee, composed of Paul North Rice, Andrew W. Osborn, and Carleton B. Joeckel, Chairman, issued its report on June 15, 1940. On page 105 of the report they made the following observation:

... are simplified or changed forms of cards desirable for the use of small libraries? Since the smaller libraries now account for a relatively small proportion of card sales, it may be that they require a different type of cards and service. To provide such service would involve an important change in the present policy of the Library. Cards would not be sold as by-products of the Library's own cataloging but would be printed for the use of certain classes of libraries. If undertaken, this service might be carried on as a part of the cooperative cataloging function.

In his budget request to Congress for the fiscal year 1966 the Librarian included a request for the establishment of a Children's Literature Cataloging Office. The main responsibility of the Office would be to adapt cataloging already done for the Library's general Card Catalogs in order to provide appropriate cards for children's libraries and at the same time a comprehensive catalog of children's literature needed in the Children's Book Section. Congress recognized this need and authorized two professional positions for fiscal 1966. Mrs. Patricia S. Hines, a Senior Subject Cataloger in the Subject Cataloging Division, was placed in charge of this office on November 22, 1965. Her initial responsibility was to assure cataloging coverage of currently-issued children's literature, and her second responsibility was to adapt existing LC printed cards to assure coverage of earlier, in-print children's books.

Although the descriptive cataloging of these books remains the same as for adult material, children's books require specially-selected subject headings designed to be specifically helpful for a children's collection. In addition, a brief annotation describing a book's contents simply and concisely, adds to the effective use of the materials for educational and developmental purposes.

These cards provide an author, title, subject, and shelf list approach. Dewey Decimal Classification numbers applied by the Dewey Decimal Classification Office are also being adapted by the Children's Literature Cataloging Office to provide a classified approach that will be most familiar and serviceable. This includes stipulating "E" for easy books and "Fic" for fiction when appropriate.
Changes in the application of LC subject headings have been made with the purpose of insuring greater utility for the Children's Literature Catalog and for other potential users of these cards. Specific and technical headings appearing on the regular LC card and required for the Library's vast general card catalog, are examined for suitability for the smaller library. For example, while a serious book on fossils directed at the younger reader may be assigned the heading PALEONTOLOGY, a simple, non-technical children's book will be subject headed FOSSILS. This may be said to represent not an adaptation of LC headings, but a difference in application and will, hopefully, provide a means of progressively educating children in the use of library catalogs.

A considerable amount of interest in these cards has been voiced. The Library is providing sets to wholesale book distributors, in line with existing procedures for regular LC cards now being distributed under many "Cards With Books" programs. Direct sale by the Card Division of "3sat" sets of cards to individual subscribers was announced in Cataloging Service Bulletin 74, April, 1966. Costs to individual subscribers are 27¢ a set if ordered by author and title, 22¢ a set if ordered by card number, and 20¢ a set if ordered by standing order. Sets of cards are prepared with over-printed headings and annotations, a departure from past LC practice but one that seems of particular value in view of the differences in size of staff among potential users of these cards.

There is considerable promise for the future in this program. A new level of standardization of entry, of full descriptive elements, and of subject headings may be expected, as well as the attainment of comprehensive cataloging coverage for the current American output of children's literature.

Addendum to Article on Library of Congress Annotated Cards for Children's Literature

Patricia S. Hines, Head
Children's Literature Cataloging Section
Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

There have been many questions on the philosophy and policy underlying the application of subject headings for the annotated cards for children's literature prepared by the Library of Congress; therefore, some statement is necessary.
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The annotated card, in style and presentation, is the direct result of the need of the Children's Book Section of the Library of Congress for better control and use of its juvenile collection for research and bibliographic purposes and of the attempt to provide more adequate service to the reading public and to those who use and/or work in the field of children's literature.

The subject headings provided are Library of Congress subject headings with the exception of a precious few purposefully created for the material to be cataloged. (Out of 950 headings used, 7 are not on the list of LC subject headings). The difference, then, is not in terminology, but rather in application. It is not necessary, therefore, for the Library to consider publishing another list of subject headings used only for children's books.

Specific examples of application of headings are:

1. Fewer subdivisions. Obviously, such sub-divisions as —JUVENILE FICTION; —HISTORY, JUVENILE; —JUVENILE LITERATURE are not used, since all the material for annotated cards is for children and designated by an “AC” in the card number. However, where specificity of subject content or form can be given only through the use of a subdivision, it will be retained; for example: ENGLISH LANGUAGE—DICTIONARIES, or FRANCE—HISTORY—REVOLUTION, 1789—FICTION.

2. Subject headings will be used for fiction in cases other than those limited to historical fiction. If a story portrays accurately and well a particular country, or adds to the reader's information about the way of life in a particular country, a heading is given; for example: SPAIN—FICTION, SPAIN—SOCIAL LIFE AND CUSTOMS—FICTION, CHILDREN IN NORTH AFRICA—FICTION. This approach places the book in a position to be used for curriculum enrichment.

3. More generous use of subject headings. For example, the book, The World of the White-tailed Deer would have as subject, 1. WHITE-TAILED DEER and 2. DEER—HABITS AND BEHAVIOR. The book can be located either through the specific name of the animal or through a more general heading.

4. Use of headings denoting form or kind. Here, in many instances headings have been created in order to group together material alike in kind or form: JOKE BOOKS, COUNTING BOOKS, COUNTING GAMES, FANTASY, DETECTIVE STORIES, MYSTERY STORIES, etc. This type of heading has a practical use as it helps the reader or the researcher, or the librarian to see quickly the holdings of the library in a particular kind of book.

In summary, and in simple terms, the basic policy is to make the book as available as possible by the wise use of appropriate subject headings.
Beeler, Nelson Frederick, 1910–
Experiments in optical illusion by Nelson F. Beeler and Franklyn M. Branley; illustrated by Fred H. Lyon. New York, Crowell 1951
114 p. illus. 21 cm.

1. Optical illusions. r. Title.
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Beeler, Nelson Frederick, 1910–
Experiments in optical illusion by Nelson F. Beeler and Franklyn M. Branley; illustrated by Fred H. Lyon. New York, Crowell 1951
114 p. illus. 21 cm.

Enjoyable experiments which show how the eye works and why seeing is not believing.
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Bixby, William.
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New Annotated Cards Compared with Regular LC Cards
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**Bixby, William.**  

x, 182 p. ports. 21 cm.

Dramatizes the life, work, and contributions of great experimenters in science: Isaac Newton, Michael Faraday, Joseph Lister, James Watt, Thomas Edison, the Wright Brothers, Ernest Rutherford, and Enrico Fermi.

1. Scientists. i. Title.

Q141.B34        920        A C 66–245

**Braenne, Berit.**  

128 p. illus. 21 cm.

Translation of Tai-Mi Tamars og Trines søster.

i. Title.
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**Braenne, Berit.**  

128 p. illus. 21 cm.

The adventures of a Norwegian girl and her adopted Arabian brother, who travel by freighter to Korea, where they meet and add to their family a little orphan girl.

Translation of Tai-Mi Tamars og Trines søster.
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Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study: A Summary*

SARAH K. VANN, Surveyor, 1965-66
(Currently with the School of Graduate Library Studies
State University of New York at Buffalo)

THE PENNSYLVANIA STUDY has had as its major purpose to determine the feasibility of recommending the establishment of a processing center for the Philadelphia District with its possible implication for the State as a whole. The Study was initiated by the Free Library of Philadelphia with the guidance and financial assistance of the Pennsylvania State Library.

As a preliminary to the Study it was decided that an appraisal of known existing centers might well be made. Thus the assignment was approached in two ways:

(1) Through a study of known existing centralized processing programs or centers with data based on correspondence and documents available and through visits to centers in several states. An additional and valuable source of information was the nationwide questionnaire addressed to processing centers by the Missouri State Library. The responses were entrusted to the Pennsylvania Study for coding by Charles O'Halloran, State Librarian, and generous use has been made of the findings. In total the data in this part of the Study are based on contributions from almost 60 centralized processing programs known to be in existence at the time of the Study.

(2) Through a study of the Philadelphia District which encompasses about fifty small libraries. The findings are based, in part, on:

a. An initial questionnaire to the libraries to elicit facts and opinions and to learn of their readiness for a processing center should one be recommended as feasible.

b. A study of annual reports; study of reports of the Coordinator of District Library Services.

c. A survey of the literature; use of profile studies which had been made of Delaware and Montgomery Counties and their libraries.

d. Visits to some of the member libraries.

* Extracted from the Final Report transmitted to the Pennsylvania State Library; presented at a meeting on "Centralized Processing: A Practical Approach," co-sponsored by the Resources and Technical Services Division, the RTSD Regional Processing Committee, and the RTSD School Library Technical Services Committee, during the ALA Conference in New York, July 15, 1966.
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e. Questionnaires to furnish data on such topics as: titles considered significant which were acquired in 1965; pattern of duplication of holdings of those titles by all district libraries; variations in cataloging and classification policies; use of the Book Catalog and the resources of the Free Library of Philadelphia; level of satisfaction with procedures within the District libraries.

This report concentrates on the findings as they relate to the first part of the assignment and concludes with the three major recommendations made to the Philadelphia District.

**Definition and Types of Programs**

The term “Centralized Processing” as used in the Study encompasses one or more of the following services: (1) ordering, (2) cataloging and classification, (3) physical preparation of materials. Since the early 1950's the term has been broadened in scope to include libraries which, as separate administrative units, agree to accept the services of a central agency. In some processing programs the services have been extended to include book selection guidance, delivery of materials, and billing.

It would have been possible to group the centers by the levels of service offered, for example: (1) cataloging and classification only, (2) cataloging, classification, and physical processing, (3) complete technical services programs. Instead, the Study groups them into the following three arbitrary types: (1) the autonomous, (2) the neo-departmental within an existing agency or associated with it, (3) the multiple service encompassing processing.

**The Autonomous Type.** The autonomous center is directed by a board of trustees representing member libraries and is fully supported by its membership. The center may be cooperative in that the budget is divided among its members or in that member libraries contract to pay a certain fee.

Examples—
Colorado: Northern Colorado Processing Center.
Missouri: Southwest Missouri Library Service, Inc.
Ohio: Library Service Center of Eastern Ohio.

**The Neo-departmental Type.** The neo-departmental processing center functions within an existing local, county, or state agency which assumes administrative and, in large part, financial responsibility for the service. “Neo-departmental” indicates that, while the center functions within the administrative confines of the agency, its responsibilities exceed those of other departments since the needs of the members of the center must be considered in a perspective broader than that of the needs of the specific library with which it is associated.

Examples—Within a local library
Florida: Book Processing Center, Orlando.
Illinois: Book Processing Center, Oak Park.
Indiana: Crawfordsville Purchasing and Processing Center.
Examples—Within a county library
California: Numerous programs have developed within the county library structure which flourished early in California. The centers serve either a single or a multi-county unit. Among these are processing centers in Monterey and the Black Gold Cooperative Library System in Ventura.
Maryland: Eastern Shore Book Processing Center.
Minnesota: Anoka County Library, Minneapolis.
Oregon: Public Library of Medford and Jackson County
Examples—Within a state library
The range extends from the absence of such programs in some states to the recently-launched ambitious programs of the Hawaii State Library and the Texas State Library, both glistening in their automated splendor. At least twelve state libraries are offering some level of centralized services. Each state library towers currently as a centrifugal force in coordinating a processing program with a potential scope extending from the vast card distribution services of Georgia, Michigan, and New Hampshire to the full processing programs of California, Nevada, and North Carolina.

The Multiple Service Type Encompassing Processing. The multiple service program usually functions within a federated or cooperative structure and offers such services as advice on budgeting, building, and staffing; guidance in book selection and weeding; and processing. Such a program, while long demonstrated, in part, within the federated structure of the Wayne County Library System in Michigan, was too much of an innovation for ready adoption into the traditionally-autonomous local pattern.

As the library systems or district library programs emerged, strengthened by timely grants of federal and state aid, centralized processing has symbolized a cohesiveness and a measure of progress. New York State, with its 22 systems, represents the most highly organized public library at present. Activity, some to be watched with concern, however, can be seen in California, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

Proliferation and Some Re-evaluation of Existing Programs

In the last decade there has been a proliferation of centralized services throughout the country. This proliferation has been encouraged, in part, by:

(1) Minimal standards endorsed by the American Library Association in Public Library Service (1956) which are now being revised.
(2) The public library systems program of New York.
(3) Initial descriptive reports of center activities which have been rarely supplemented by critical self-appraisal after an experimental period.

Volume 10, Number 4, Fall 1966
(4) Library surveyors whose studies, within similar milieus, tend to be somewhat repetitive.
(5) The avalanche of federal monies which all libraries strive to justify receiving.
(6) And—perhaps—the elusive and continuing search by librarians for the bibliothecal Nirvana.

Yet, even while the centers proliferate, there is evidence of discontent, of re-evaluation, most notably in Missouri and in New York.

In Missouri. Since 1960 the state of Missouri has been supporting two small autonomous centers, quite similar in purpose though not in financial structure and in scope of service: the Southwest Missouri Library Service, Inc., established in 1957, and the Library Services Center of Missouri, established in 1960.

Continuing questions about the centers and administrative changes in the Missouri State Library prompted action, with the result that in December, 1965, it was recommended that a single processing center for Missouri libraries (excluding the large metropolitan libraries of Kansas City and St. Louis) be created under the administration of the State Library. The recommendations, made by Orcena Mahoney Peterson, further advised the immediate dissolution of the autonomous status of the Library Services Center and added that, after operations were improved under the State Library, the other center should be encouraged to join.

As of February 1, 1966, the State Library assumed management and operation of the Library Services Center and is now giving attention to some of the unsolved problems, one of which relates to operating on too limited a budget. The former administrator had long been familiar with that! Perhaps the Center, bred in penury, will now thrive, for its members were seemingly unwilling or unable to increase the 75¢ charge per volume, whatever the consequences.

Thus it would appear that the cooperative, autonomous concept was vividly but briefly illuminated in Missouri. Meanwhile such questions as these await probing: (1) Should a second center have been established so soon after the first? (2) Would the second center have been established had federal funds not been available? (3) Was (is) the cooperative concept thus illustrated doomed because of its emergence at a time when libraries were contemplating systems and district structures, largely underwritten by federal and state aid?

In New York. In New York, decisions made not so long ago are being reviewed, and new recommendations are emerging for its complex of 22 public library systems. The systems are highly individualistic; among the divergencies in processing are these:

(1) Variant emphases on concurrent and duplicative ordering.
(2) Variant cataloging and classification policies.
(3) Including processing of non-book materials.
(4) Including school libraries as non-members—at a price.
(5) Including services to colleges and universities—at a price.
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(6) Using an outside commercial agency for the preparation of a book catalog.
(7) Using data processing techniques.
(8) Permitting individualism in routines.

Thus it appears that standardization, particularly in cataloging and classification, desirable or not, is as elusive on a systems plan as it was on a local level. Such a disparate pattern could only invite a review of centralized processing within the Systems structure. It compelled the attention of the State Library which contracted with Nelson Associates to make a study. One of the two fundamental questions probed and the answer thereto indicates a continuing search for standardization. The question:

What is the optimum number of processing centers which should be operated for the public library systems of the state?

The answer:

For cataloging and acquisitions, one center is proposed to meet all the public library needs of the state, including those of New York City.
For physical processing, three centers are proposed to meet upstate needs; for New York City, it is suggested that physical processing not be further centralized for the near future.

Further details about the proposals which have been made for New York may be found in:


In Idaho. In contrast to New York which, having dispersed processing responsibilities among its systems, now seeks a solution to excessive fragmentation, the State Library of Idaho has phased out its book processing program which had been available to 21 libraries. While the immediate reason was that the State budget could not sustain both the processing and the field work, the State Librarian indicated as a second reason:

We are working toward six regional library systems to cover the State. . . . Processing should be one service of the systems center and perhaps the easiest to sell to the local trustees and librarians.

Other Centers. Other centers have encountered crises which have threatened their survival, but most have endured. Of these the Book Processing Center in Oak Park, Illinois, made a courageous and pro-
ductive self-appraisal. As a result, the Center has regained its financial and service equilibrium after a near disastrous experience. In another center the cost per volume increased from 70.5¢ in 1963 to 79¢ in 1964, though the standard charge per volume remained 75¢. Another program survived its perilous first year and ruefully acknowledged in a 1965 report that:

Many of the problems encountered in the first year could have been avoided by a longer planning period . . . and a better preparation.

Some guidelines, synthesized from the frank appraisal in the report, caution against similar mistakes; one of them warns:

Do not accept processing idiosyncrasies of each library; urge standardization.

Reference to these centers and programs does not imply that all others have solved their problems but rather that the reappraisals now under way signal a need for more preliminary planning and deliberate speed in decision making.

Characteristics of Existing Centers

From the full Study, brief comments on the following characteristics of existing centers have been extracted: (1) legal structure, (2) governing bodies, (3) financial structure, (4) volumes processed, (5) membership, (6) location and quarters, (7) equipment.

Legal Structure. The legal structure of centralized processing programs must conform to the laws of the state or the governmental unit in which it is located and/or the library with which it is associated. The range is from the autonomous body, incorporated under state laws as a non-profit, self-supporting corporation with power to engage in business with libraries to phrases in state library laws, such as “to foster library development,” as being permissive enough to include processing services. One center acknowledged with seeming unconcern:

Legally we don’t exist; we function via contractual agreements and legislative approval of the State Library funds.

While an atmosphere of casual informality may prevail, it would appear that a knowledge of library laws and of the limitations of contractual and agreement powers must be presupposed.

Governing Bodies. No matter the type, each centralized processing program is responsible to a governing body as is a local library. In some agreements the governing body of a local library assumes responsibility as with the Book Processing Centers in Orlando, Florida, and in Oak Park, Illinois.

The arrangements differ, however, in the autonomous and the multiple service types. The Library Service Center of Eastern Ohio has a cumbersome structure in that its board is composed of every contracted member librarian. In 1965 the board numbered 19. In Wisconsin the Public Library Service Center of Southwest Wisconsin is governed by a
Joint Library Board composed of the chairman of the county library committees appointed by the County Board of Supervisors in the five counties. In New York the Systems structure may be consolidated, federated, or cooperative, though centralized processing programs in the latter two are more similar to the definition as used in this Study than are those in the consolidated structure.

A sampling of comments, both from administrators and from participating members of centers, revealed that though the boards have similar functions, sharper criticism was directed toward those on which librarians were serving than were made of library trustees representing other professional interests. The evidence tends to be that librarians have not demonstrated extraordinary skill as board members nor have they as board members supported standard procedures earlier endorsed.

There was little criticism of the neo-departmental relationship except in one instance where one administrator advised that an entangling alliance with a large library should be avoided and that an independent or autonomous status would be more satisfactory. The availability of the bibliographic resources and the guaranteed percentage of the budget of the large library might, in some instances, offset minor manifestations of intrusions unless the corrosive relationship were irreparable.

Financial Structure. The centers or programs, other than those which are fully subsidized as in the New York Systems, are supported by their members or, increasingly, in part by subsidy. Among the ways of deriving income are these:

1. To pro-rate the center’s budget among its members on the basis of their budgets or population.
2. To contract that a percentage of the member’s book budget is to be spent through the center.
3. To charge a specific amount for each volume processed.
4. To utilize subsidies.

Of these, pro-rating the budget has received popular support in the Southwest Missouri Library Service, Inc. The method, however, has not been widely imitated. Inequities occur, for example, when libraries with relatively fixed budgets decrease their book allocations to expand reader services but continue to pay on the same pro-rated basis.

To contract that a percentage of the member libraries’ budgets be spent through the center—usually 75%—was an attempt to insure work volume for the center. There is disquieting confirmation that some are not fulfilling that percentage agreement; for example, one library reported only 60% of its budget had been routed through the center instead of the 75% agreed to. Members who disregard the terms of agreement might offer to withdraw on their own initiative or seek new terms of agreement. Despite the known violations, no member, as far as was reported, has as yet been asked to withdraw from a center.

In contrast to the pro-rating technique is the plan of charging a specific amount for each volume processed. A problem early encountered
in this procedure was the freezing of the cost at a minimum level. It seems imperative to include in the contract the requirement that a review of the basic cost per volume processed shall be made annually and shall be increased when necessitated by the budgetary demands of the center.

The figure of 75¢ per volume processed was adopted originally by several centers; however the costs now vary; for example, in the North Carolina State Library Processing Center, $1.00; in the Book Processing Center, Orlando, Florida, $0.80; in the California State Library, $1.40. At least two centers reduce the charge per volume for duplicate copies: the Crawfordsville Purchasing and Processing Center, Indiana, reduces the price for an added copy from 90¢ for the first copy to 80¢ for an added copy; the San Mateo County Library Processing Center, California, charges $1.40 for the first copy, 70¢ for an added copy.

Of the 23 respondents to the Missouri questionnaire, 18 indicated that they had received at one time, or were still receiving, state and/or federal aid for the continuance of their program. Whatever the method of securing funds, survival by subsidy characterizes generally the financial basis of many of the programs. The test for survival lies in the continuity and broadening of membership and quality of service when and if subsidies ever cease. It is less than reassuring that some personnel associated with centers predict that centralized processing would be abandoned in those areas where it now appears to flourish if the local library had to assume full financial responsibility.

_Volumes Processed._ In the data for type of library there is a wide range in the number of volumes processed, from a low of less than 20,000 to a high of about 200,000. The range on the Missouri questionnaire for its 23 centers was lower, from two centers processing less than 5,000 volumes to one center processing between 80,000 and 90,000 volumes. These two ranges strongly suggest that many of the programs which, without question, may well be making an immediate contribution, are too small. Of the five programs which have surpassed the 100,000 volume mark, three are in New York State, one in Florida, one in Hawaii. Several other centers have indicated, however, that they expect to exceed that mark within the present year. The Hawaii State Library anticipates full processing of about 400,000 volumes. Just what the minimal optimum mark should be, in terms of cost, efficiency, and quality, remains speculative, but it will continue to be an escalating figure as newer technologies make procedures more effective.

_Membership._ The centers vary both as to number of members and kinds of libraries included in membership. Of the centers which responded to the Missouri questionnaire, 10 centers had 10 or fewer members; 4 centers had from 11 to 20 members; 6 centers had from 21 to 30 members. Only one had more than 60 members, that being the Michigan State Library. Of those identified in the Study, the autonomous centers had from 12 to 28 members; the neo-departmental centers had from 4 counties to 40 members and of those within State Libraries, from 10 to 295 members. The multiple service centers had a
range in membership of from 5 to 69. While statistics on membership can be regarded as merely indicative, participation by more than 1,000 libraries implies more than an experimental involvement of the member libraries.

The profiles of membership represent various kinds of libraries: yet an uncertainty manifests itself in terms of the kinds to include in one center: All of one kind? Or a mixture such as public and school, college and university, public and academic? All kinds? Of the 23 respondents to the Missouri questionnaire, 13 of the 23 included public libraries only; 4 included public and school; 6 had variant membership.

Though, according to Public Library Processing Centers, by Mary Lee Bundy (Troy, N. Y.: 1962), 18 out of 29 centers felt that it was “feasible to combine processing for school and public libraries in one service,” less enthusiasm for combinations was expressed in New York State. In the report for the New York State Library, Feasibility of School and College Library Processing Through Public Library Systems in New York State, it is noted that of the 43 school systems expressing a preference as to type of processing facility, 33 or 77% chose one for schools alone; of 40 colleges expressing a preference, 33 or 82% preferred one serving college libraries only. The impact of these views can be seen in the recommendation for one cataloging and classification center for public libraries in New York.

As one state expresses preferences, another has moved boldly toward a statewide program of school and public library processing. In Hawaii the State Library, serving 45 public libraries, recently extended its program to include about 250 schools. An assessment has not been made thus far of the services which represent the largest full processing program yet undertaken.

On a smaller scale, other centers have invited school libraries to participate, among them:

- Arizona: Pinal County Free Library.
- Indiana: Crawfordsville Purchasing and Processing Center.
- Michigan: Wayne County Library System.
- Ohio: Library Service Center of Eastern Ohio.

Both the State Libraries of Michigan and Wyoming have noted that extension of service is under consideration. Meanwhile the Ohio State Library has already extended its cataloging and processing services to school libraries.

The extension of service to more than one kind of library does indicate some bibliographical concern for institutions; at the same time, as of this date, it may be tinged with concern for financial security. Some centers have stated frankly their need for more funds, among them the Southwest Missouri Library Service, Inc., which undertook a project for the Missouri State Library.

In New York, the Nioga Library System contracted with two academic institutions and endorsed a policy that differs from regular routines for a special charge of $1.55 per volume processed. The Ohio State Library offers its services to all college libraries. In contrast, the
Monterey County Library, California, was advised that the efficiency of its program would be increased significantly if, among other things, it would exclude special purpose libraries, such as the Monterey Peninsula College Library from its system. Seemingly no action has been taken.

Amid the uncertainties, the following alternatives concerning the kinds of libraries to include within a centralized processing program in a given geographic area are suggested:

1. To create one processing center to serve all kinds of libraries or at least more than one kind.
2. To create one center with divisional sub-structures by kind of library.
3. To create centers by kind of library.
4. To create within a state one cataloging center with strategically located book depots for ordering and final preparation for each kind of library, for more than one kind, or for all kinds.
5. To create within a state one ordering and cataloging center with strategically located book depots for final preparation for each kind of library, for more than one kind, or for all kinds.

Thus far, centers that have attempted to encompass more than one kind appear not to have been too successful. It must be recognized, however, that expedient strategy or demands of the moment, rather than purposeful planning, fostered some of the present extensions of service. Such action should not deter further experimentation.

Location and Quarters. The type of center tends to predetermine its location. Of the three types identified, the autonomous is less obligated to be located near a large library. For instance, in New York several of the Systems' Headquarters are somewhat removed from their membership. While these centers have had more freedom of choice in the selection of their locations, that choice, accompanied by an economic restraint, has occasionally led to the selection of barren and isolated areas where rents and labor were less. One administrator of such a center commented that:

The center is remote from any cultural area and thus, I think, it offers little to attract most professional librarians.

The neo-departmental type is generally within the same building as the library with which it is associated or in a building nearby. At least one is several miles away from the main library in a shopping district.

The quarters include remodeled or adapted structures such as former theatre buildings or a former ice cream factory as well as the modern, efficiently-designed buildings of the Wayne County Library System in Michigan and of the Suffolk Cooperative Library System, New York, soon to be completed. Some centers occupying quarters not expressly designed for their purposes have shown ingenuity in adapting to space limitations without radical adverse effect on their productivity.

Equipment. While much of the equipment is not unusual, the equipment for reproducing cards, if the card catalog structure is to be retained,
should be appraised thoroughly before purchase. While it may seem extraordinary to find cards still being typed in a processing center, some responses to the Missouri questionnaire indicated that such was true. Among the equipment identified were these:

Addressograph 5000
Ektaith (plus offset)
Gestetner
Multilith model 85

Multilith 2550 and A-M 705
Photo Direct Camera Processor
Thermofax "Secretary" and Ektafax model 10
Xerox and Multilith

Some criticism of equipment currently being used, which supplement those in published sources, were:

(1) an inordinate number of breakdowns.
(2) no really efficient method of producing masters from cards already in catalog possible.
(3) cleaning of camera equipment.
(4) limitations in handling single order items.
(5) dearth of trained operators.

In estimating budgets, not only must operating expenses be included, but also maintenance costs. The vulnerability of the equipment or unreliability of man's estimates can be noted in that one center, in less than one year, spent $160.00 above the annual maintenance agreement of $400.00.

No recommendations on equipment are made other than that the admonition caveat emptor should be heeded whatever the personal or, indeed, the LTP evaluations might be.

Meanwhile the move is toward automated equipment. There have been, however, at least two deterrents: (1) the vast financial barriers created by the costliness of data processing and computer equipment; (2) the overemphasis on the machinery and its immediate capabilities which, when tested, seemed not always so immediate. This response has been due in part to the inherent traditionalism of librarians and in part to the dismay furthered by the readiness of some who appeared too willing to denigrate the bibliographical heritage of American librarianship. The temperate merging of rash experimental and precautionary excesses seems to be a likely next step continuing the revolutions wrought earlier in library technology by such innovations as the telephone and the typewriter.

Few processing centers have installed the necessary equipment for an automated program; however, two extremes in response have been expressed: from Oak Park, Illinois, disillusionment; from Texas and Hawaii, fresh enthusiasm. Other centers experimenting with data processing equipment are the Wayne County Library System in Michigan and, in New York, the Nassau Library System and the Suffolk Cooperative Library System.

A decisive factor in attaining utmost productivity from and financial
justification of investment in such equipment is the potential expansion of services, ordering and cataloging, but not necessarily preparation of the volumes. This implies inevitably larger centralized programming and a movement toward the book catalog.

**Within the Centers**

While the full Study includes data on selection guidance, ordering, cataloging, classification, preparation of materials, delivery and billing, comments are limited to only three of these, in the following order: (1) preparation of materials, (2) ordering, (3) cataloging and classification, including the book catalog.

**Preparation of Materials.** Preparation of library materials has been a service of most of the existing centers though its details vary. Of the 22 centers which identified their processing service in the Missouri questionnaire, the following variations were noted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Performed by no. of centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adding copy number</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including pocket and book card</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasting something somewhere</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking spine in any way</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reluctance to abandon any detail can be seen in the additional processing performed by a member library of a center offering rather detailed services. For each book received from the center the library's supplementary tasks were to:

1. Stamp accession number on pocket and under call number on verso of title page.
2. Type accession number on book cards.
3. Type the following on shelf list card: accession number, date of invoice, center initials as source, cost, and age symbol.
4. Trim blurbs on books not in plastic jackets and tip in book.

The following lament from a center depicts the chaos which can be created if uniformity of detail is not adhered to:

We agreed to accept all processing idiosyncrasies of each individual library. As a result the automation of routines in the preparation of the book itself was virtually impossible. Instead, 18 or more different routines had to be developed.

A further devastating experience was that:

Center personnel soon found that variations in classification and cataloging might pass unnoticed, but if the book pockets were half an inch out of specified position, a letter would be received immediately.

Perhaps wistfully this center noted that:

An increase in book production could be achieved if standardization of simple matters, such as pocket placement, could be initiated.
Additional evidence would be repetitive and is therefore unnecessary. One can only mourn this evidence of myopia among member libraries which in preserving the past petrify the future because of presumed sacrosanct routines.

Ordering. Centralized ordering is an activity of many processing centers though not considered essential by others. Centralized ordering programs, however, have never been completely centralized. Actions taken both by the centers and by the member libraries divide the responsibility and thereby duplicate procedures. Orders from member libraries may duplicate orders made by the center for other members; the exclusion of certain types of materials by the centers in their ordering fosters the existence of individual ordering units. The book percentage quota, still used by many, stimulates individualized buying sometimes beyond the quota and minimizes the functions of a center.

Administrators of existing centers and those anticipating the creation of new processing centers might well review the intent and scope of ordering services. Among the alternatives to be considered are these:

1. Develop a completely centralized ordering program to encompass placement of orders, receipt, and physical preparation of all materials.
2. Develop an ordering program which requires that order data only be furnished by each member library for cataloging purposes and center information. Decentralize ordering, receipt, and physical preparation of materials.
3. Develop a centralized ordering program; decentralize receipt and physical preparation of materials.
4. Develop a semi-complete centralized ordering program with clearly-defined scope in the pattern of alternatives 1, 2, or 3.

While there is some evidence that the more nearly complete centralized ordering programs have satisfied their participants, this Study endorses the second alternative.

For each alternative, the following recommendations, when appropriate, are made for the center:

1. Urge maximum use of centralized ordering services.
2. Accept orders for all types of materials.
3. Encourage single title ordering.
4. Prepare book buying lists with deadline dates and with a scheduled program of review of buying lists at designated periods.
5. Schedule a replacement program within the structure of the classification system used.
6. Abolish the percentage quota.

Cataloging and Classification. Manuals and/or memoranda issued reveal a medley of variations in cataloging and classification. From these one can readily conclude that while processing centers have attempted to escalate patterns of standardization among their members, they have not, among themselves, attained standardization of policies. Though only
one center advertises widely its offering of custom and standardized cataloging, for example, there is evidence that some custom cataloging is being offered elsewhere.

Subject headings—All centers rely heavily on the subject cataloging represented by the subject headings appearing on cards from Library of Congress and Wilson and in printed sources such as the Publishers' Weekly. Some centers accept the headings without change; some delete, change, or add to. Some centers indicate the use both of Sears and LC lists. Many centers, however, have never assumed the responsibility of maintaining the integrity of the subject structure of the card catalog by relating the subject headings. Consequently, some centers, like commercial firms, catalog title by title—not within the concept of an integrated collection or collections. If this responsibility is not accepted, commercial firms might well challenge the effectiveness of some of the current processing programs.

Classification—Both the Dewey Decimal Classification and the Library of Congress Classification are used in centralized programs. The DDC is more widely used for public libraries, but there is evidence that the policies of the centers reflect continuing compromise among member libraries rather than a fresh appraisal of the latest edition and a deliberate abandonment of localized adaptations and misuse of numbers. There is also some evidence that the subject analyses of the Decimal Classification Office, Library of Congress, are not in accord with the pragmatic needs of the centers' membership. Because of the actual and potential services of that Office, processing centers might well be advised to discuss and review with the Office their decisions on the length of Dewey numbers. Otherwise the present analyses become more and more academic.

Cataloging within member libraries—Cataloging activities are carried on not only in the centers but in member libraries. Indeed the acquisition of materials not purchased through the center and gifts, which may or may not be cataloged by the center, contribute to some cataloging within the member library. Neither the actual scope of acquisitions nor of cataloging within member libraries is fully known.

Whatever the scope, it is obvious that some cataloging may be or is being done within the local library. What are not known is what cataloging policy is used and how much time is thus deployed from reader services. The cataloger or the person assuming local cataloging duties seems to have little communication with the center. With local cataloging, local policies may be relinquished uneasily or not at all. The question that may be asked, therefore, is to what extent does such cataloging encourage the retention of local procedures. Changes often are made on cards when they reach the local libraries. Three members of one center indicated that they: (1) changed classification and completed cataloging for each entry and added more subject headings; (2) usually changed class numbers to fit into own collection; (3) made occasional changes; (4) re-assigned numbers and corrected typographical errors. A fourth member grandly noted, "make changes that I desire!"
Such comments, even if hopefully somewhat atypical, show that the acceptance of standardization in cataloging and classification policies is more of a subterfuge than a reality and that a reappraisal is imperative. Yet the centers cannot be blameless if there has been too much of a tendency to deliver books with cards as an end in itself. Such criticisms as, "sometimes two books on same subject in same shipment will have varying subject headings," and "the center should undertake the development of subject & name authority files & maintain consistency in using them," jeopardize, if true, the basic merits of centralized cataloging and classification.

The present consequence is that some member libraries, however small, are still allocating time both for cataloging materials purchased directly and for tinkering with the cataloging from the center. Thus the time presumably relinquished for services to the public is diminished while hidden costs of cataloging increase. Moreover, however excellent the cataloging policy of the center, its use by member libraries and the individual patterns of subject references may not be consistent or competent in an environment lacking not only a qualified cataloger but a professional staff member as well.

It is not too late for member libraries or anticipated members to re-appraise themselves and their intransigent insistence on local policies and to ask such questions as these: To what extent is adhering to a local policy a fetish? Is there really any evidence that local changes improve the cataloging and the services? If they do, why are not similar changes made in bibliographic and biographic indexes, in vast encyclopedic indexes? Is a small collection of books to be equated with small needs or small mentalities? Is it possible to free oneself from local but perhaps too prideful manifestations of differences and view services for the reader as a prelude to the equally but more personally demanding one of service to the reader?

The card catalog within member libraries—Processing centers have not contracted thus far to maintain the card catalogs of member libraries, though some have offered guidance in the preparation of manuals for members. Among the responsibilities retained by member libraries are filing catalog cards, watching conformity of entry, revising subject headings, deleting old subject headings, and making cross references. Additional responsibilities of some member libraries include the correction of continuations records and, generally, making analytics.

It can only be regretted that the task of patterning subject interrelationships is being assumed by member libraries, some with a limited or no professional cataloging staff. Whatever the original state of the catalog, its syndetic character will erode unless its structuring is controlled. There is some evidence that cards have not been filed promptly into the catalogs, that references have not been made, and that some new cards have been used for notes. And so, the question: Is the book catalog the answer?

Toward the book catalog for member libraries—Thus far book catalogs have not been widely used to record the holdings of public library
members of processing centers or systems. Of the 23 respondents to the
Missouri questionnaire, only the Black Gold Cooperative Library Sys-
tem, California, reported that it had a book catalog for the use of its
membership. Currently, definite proposals have been made for book cata-
log programs for the public libraries of the State of New York and of
North Carolina.

That book catalogs cost a great deal in undisputed; how much they
cost or may cost is as yet undetermined. What can be learned from the in-
formation available, however, is convincing evidence that the transfer
from card to book format is a lengthy and major financial investment.
Prolonged consideration should be given to the practical inconveniences
and interruptions during the period of change as well as to the antici-
pated enduring benefits inherent in the book format and program.

It is not the concept of the card catalog that compels the current move-
ment toward the book catalog but rather the inadequacies long mani-
manifested in its structuring and maintenance. The near insurmountable
hindrances to standardization, the spiraling growth of collections, and the
 timely appearance of technical equipment with its potential for depth
analysis of content, intercalation of entries, and rapid output seem to
magnify momentarily the virtues of the book catalog. Nevertheless, if
the uniform provision of essential data in book format would lessen each
library's absorption in local policies, then the adoption of the book
catalog could be viewed as another thrust toward standardization and
centralization.

The book catalog is seemingly a temporary solution, for even now as
such catalogs appear, diversifications among them are striking both in
content and in form. At best the book catalog emerges as a cyclical phase
in the continuing and elusive search for the American bibliographical
dream of standardization.

Because of the impediments still being encountered in the search for
standardization in cataloging and classification, it is recommended that
processing centers and member libraries:

(1) Re-appraise the percentage ratio of the book budget which requires
and invites the continuation of some form of local cataloging.
(2) Consider cataloging and classifying all materials whether purchased
through the center or through the member library or whether re-
ceived as gifts.
(3) Formulate a descriptive cataloging policy in conformity with the
rules endorsed by the American Library Association.
(4) Adopt the latest edition or the latest refinements of the classification
system being used.
(5) Extend responsibility to developing the syndetic structure of the
card and/or book catalog.
(6) Create in each member library a liaison with one staff member
who could serve as the "cataloging consultant."
(7) Sponsor workshops in cataloging and classification policies of the
center, the use of card/book catalogs, etc.
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Appraise thoroughly not only the introduction of the book catalog but also its psychological deterrent to tinkering with catalog data which seems irresistible within the 3x5 complex.

**Three Major Recommendations Made to the Philadelphia District**

Two conclusions of the Study reflect an analysis of data relating to existing centralized processing centers and/or programs, an analysis of the responses to the inquiries distributed to the Philadelphia District libraries, an awareness of the present services offered by the District Center Library, recognition of the present legal structuring of the Districts in Pennsylvania, a hospitality to the discernible trends of the future, and aspects of feasibility. The two conclusions are:

1. That a centralized processing center should not be created for the Philadelphia District alone.
2. That a coordinated plan for a statewide centralized cataloging and classification program for public libraries should be initiated.

The three major recommendations, based on these two conclusions, are:

**I. That the Philadelphia District Library propose that the State Library:**

A. Create and subsidize two centralized cataloging and classification centers for public libraries in specified geographic areas, each to

1. Prepare and distribute a book catalog, with programmed supplements, representing all titles available but not identifying holdings of each participating library.
2. Furnish two catalog cards, for author and shelf list records, for each title ordered by libraries within Districts participating in the book catalog program.
4. Adhere to an authoritative and standardized policy for descriptive cataloging, subject headings, and classification.

B. Designate each District choosing to contract for the service, as an arterial unit of the cataloging and classification center, each to

1. Strengthen District acquisitions as part of total services within the District.
2. Centralize and routinize ordering of all materials on a District level.
3. Forward bibliographic data on each title to the cataloging and classification center.
4. Standardize circulation routines not only to simplify physical processing but also in anticipation of circulation records which may become mechanized.
5. Assume responsibility for completing the physical process-
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ing of all materials to be cataloged and classified within the District.
6. Distribute materials as rapidly as possible to member libraries.
7. Complete payment of all District encumbrances related to centralize ordering and physical processing.

II. That the Philadelphia District Library propose that its member libraries:
   A. Demonstrate to the libraries of the State the use of the Book Catalogs of the Free Library of Philadelphia as an index to each of their collections and as a bibliographic guide to the resources of all the District libraries.
   B. Take the initiative in creating a statewide cataloging and classification program by recommending to the State Library that the Free Library of Philadelphia assume guidance of one of the two centers.

III. That the Philadelphia District Library propose that the Free Library of Philadelphia:
   A. Include the Branch Libraries of the Free Library within the District library program.
   B. Incorporate the ordering and physical processing of District library materials with those of the Branch Libraries of the Free Library.
   C. Cooperate with the cataloging and classification center in the standardization of policies.
   D. Advise the center in the programming of the Book Catalog supplements and revisions.
   E. Acquire and retain each title included in the Book Catalog with re-evaluation of holdings at the time of the complete revisions of the Book Catalog.

PROCESSING SERVICE

A survey of commercial processing services is being undertaken by Barbara Westby at the request of the Resources and Technical Services Division of ALA. Miss Westby prepared the "Directory of Commercial Cataloging Services" which first appeared in the Library Journal, April 1, 1964. Publishers or jobbers who have entered the field since that time, and who should be included in any new listing of such services, are requested to write to Miss Westby in care of RTSD, ALA Headquarters, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago 60611.

Any library, large or small, which has purchased such a service, is asked to report to RTSD its satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the service. Without consumer opinion, the survey will be incomplete. The names of libraries will be kept confidential.
The story of the origin of the Oak Park Book Processing Center and of its difficulties during its first year of operation was reported in the November 1, 1965, issue of Library Journal. Technical descriptions of the Center's work procedures and processing methods were omitted from that presentation, however, and this article will outline the actual work pattern which was established and note some of the changes necessary to adjust the original plan to an efficient operation. This discussion of administrative structure and operating procedure at a newly-formed processing Center is intended to point out some important aspects of organization which bear close attention when a center is in the planning stage.

The Book Processing Center was organized during 1969 by a group of public and school libraries contracting with the Oak Park Public Library. Committee meetings were held during that year to discuss various aspects of beginning operations and to work out a proposed budget. Although the search for a suitable administrator was conducted throughout 1969, it was not until November that one was employed. The Administrator spent six months visiting established processing centers, investigating space and equipment layouts, reading the literature available on centralized processing, and working out a budget. In addition, planning for the contracts and for the catalog code to be adopted took place during this period. The contracts and the cataloging code were approved by the member libraries, and, after a month's trial in April, full operation of the Center began on May 1, 1964, with 35 participating libraries, including seven school libraries.

Problems arose almost immediately, and a processing backlog, insuperable except by extreme measures, quickly developed. Subsequent thorough study of each function in the operating procedure by the Director of the Oak Park Public Library, the Head Cataloger, the Processing Supervisor, and a management consultant retained on a temporary basis, resulted in identification of the chief areas of concern and in changes in the structure and procedures of the Center. Elements detrimental to operating efficiency were identified in the floor layout of the

---

* Mr. Hendricks' doctoral study (University of Illinois, Urbana) on the cost of centralized processing was supported by a grant from the U. S. Office of Education.
Center, in the administrative structure, in the agreement to process school library as well as public library materials, and in the work flow.

Floor Layout

Since its beginning, the Center has been housed in two separate areas within the Oak Park Public Library, encompassing approximately 5,000 square feet. The excessive area required by the present arrangement results from the inefficient layout of operations. The present area for shipping books is not near an exit, and materials must be moved across the entire room. Placement of the Cataloging Department two floors away from the processing area resulted in extra transportation of books and made communication and supervision difficult. Plans have been drawn up to consolidate and reorganize the present physical layout. These plans are shown in Figure 1.

Under the proposed arrangement, the Cataloging Department, now located on the second floor of the Library, will be moved into one end of the "L"-shaped basement room now occupied by the processing area, and total spatial requirements will be reduced to 3,644 square feet. If the proposed plan is adopted, the processing operation of the Center will fall into a natural order which will allow the work to flow between stations in a systematic manner. Simply by shifting the physical location of files, photo-reproduction machines, sorting tables, and by other rearrangements, the staff can organize the movement of materials and speed their transportation. The arrangement will also bring related functions as close together as possible, making repeated contacts between departments quicker and more efficient. Thus sections such as pre-search, shipping and receiving, bookkeeping, ordering and invoicing, which are not exactly “in line” on the processing work flow but require repeated contacts, will be located near one another.

Administrative Structure

The administrative organization of the Center was originally under the supervision of a Director, who was responsible for all areas of work; that is, there were no department heads or area supervisors as such. All problems were brought directly to the attention of the Director, so that the person filling this position had to concern himself with even the smallest operational details.

It has been recommended that the administrative structure of the Center be divided into three principal units: a clerical unit for acquisitions, a cataloging unit, and a processing (i.e. preparations) unit. This division would provide for clear-cut lines of responsibility as well as improved control and efficiency. Each department would be headed by a working supervisor performing an actual job in the department in addition to having supervisory responsibilities.

The Director would then be free to carry out the following duties:

1. Coordinate the work of the three units.
2. Maintain an even flow of work to and from each department.
(3) Investigate trouble spots and take steps to remove them.
(4) Recruit and select new personnel.
(5) Handle all important complaints and inquiries.
(6) Plan improvements in work methods and equipment.
(7) Conduct cost, time, and statistical studies.
(8) Hold weekly supervisors' meetings to discuss production, problems, improvements, etc.

The proposed administrative structure is shown in Figure 2. This change, as well as that concerning the spatial requirements, has been delayed due to the resignation of the first director and the difficulty in locating a qualified replacement. The present staff of the Center has been able to reduce the backlog and maintain a current status in book processing. However, long-range planning and evaluation is hampered by the lack of a person, free from concern about minor operational aspects, to review and improve procedures. Too, relations with member libraries have suffered without a person to establish liaison between them and the Center, discuss their problems, and inform them of progress and problems in the Center.

School Libraries

Besides contracting with 27 public libraries to provide a processing service, the Center signed contracts with seven school libraries. Several of these new schools mainly interested in obtaining a basic book collection of 3,000 volumes, ready to be placed on the shelves and used by the students in the fall of 1964. This was an attractive proposal when viewed by the Center, since the titles were likely to be basic works, readily available, and the cataloging would merely mean a transposition of data from a common source, such as the Standard Catalog for High School Libraries, to the card format. The Center was willing to undertake this agreement in the early part of 1964, because the plan appeared to provide a volume of materials which could be handled easily with a minimum cost outlay. This proved to be a miscalculation, however, because the volume of orders placed by the public libraries exceeded expectations. Since these orders in no way paralleled those of the school libraries, there resulted, in effect, the establishment of a separate processing operation to handle the school orders. The school orders were placed with a specific deadline in view, but any intensive effort to meet these deadlines diverted staff from the normal work of handling the orders for public libraries; this had the inevitable effect of increasing the cataloging backlog.

Some specific difficulties of school materials which impeded the work flow at the Center were in the following areas:

(1) Classification: Schools required the deletion of "J" markings and the addition of other symbols for special materials.
(2) Cataloging: Simplification was required; the rather elaborate code established by the Center was too technical.
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(3) Subject Headings: Simplified forms required changes from those used in public libraries.
(4) Processing: School requirements for plastic book jackets and for treatment of pre-bound books differed from public library requirements.

Such differences in the details of cataloging and processing led to confusion when interjected into the usual flow of work, and errors were common.

The school contracts for five of the seven schools were suspended by mutual agreement, and the Center continues to supply service to two local schools. Some caution seems to be indicated in planning a processing service to serve differing types of libraries. The idea is tempting since it appears that the accumulation of card sets or cataloging source data for an increasing number of titles will also logically increase the possibility that a newly-ordered title has been cataloged before and can be expeditiously and economically purchased and processed. However, in practice there may be a point of diminishing returns in mixing processing for two types of libraries because of the large proportion of material that is not duplicated, the differences in the requirements for the level of cataloging, and different billing arrangements that may offset the advantages of centralized processing, particularly in the initial stages of a center's operation. The consequences of these requirements in the flow of materials will become obvious in the subsequent discussion.

*Work Flow*

During the first year of operation, the member librarians assembled their book orders on three-part forms furnished by the Center. One form was submitted to the Center; the others remained with the initiating library. The ordering information was then key-punched on cards at the Center, and at this time a dealer code was added to indicate the source from which the book was to be purchased. The punched cards were sorted by dealer and a print-out was made of the order. The print-outs were forwarded to the proper dealer twice weekly. The punched cards were then filed by author pending the receipt of books and invoices.

With the arrival of the books, the punched cards were pulled, and the library number and the net cost on the punched card were checked with the invoice. The punched card then accompanied the book through the cataloging and processing routines until it was used for billing purposes at the end of the process. However, such chaos resulted from improper integration of the machines into the system that their use was discontinued. One specific, major problem was in the attempt to maintain an alphabetical author file of the punched order cards without equipment to perform a proper search for a given card. As a result, it was faster for a clerk to search manually than to perform the necessary passes with the machines before individual order cards could be retrieved. These problems, coupled with staff inexperience with the machines, necessitated drastic changes.

*Volume 10, Number 4, Fall 1966*
With discontinuation of the use of the punched-card equipment, a five-part order form was adopted. Member librarians retain two copies, and three are sent to the Center. One copy of the form, stamped with order number and date, is filed with other orders for the same title, and sets of orders for one jobber are assembled and mailed directly to the jobber with a covering form letter. The remaining copy of the order slip is used in pre-search for cataloging data.

While checking the incoming books against the order file and invoice, the clerk sorts the books into three groups: those for which a copy has been cataloged, those which have not been cataloged, and those in the process of being cataloged. The key to this sorting is called a regional card. Until one copy of a book has been received and cataloged, the order slips are assembled together in the outstanding order file. When a book has been cataloged and the cards are reproduced, one unit card is placed in the outstanding order file. On the back of this card a series of code numbers, one for each member library, has been printed. This card then becomes the guide to indicate which library has ordered the book and the location number of the extra card sets. Outstanding order slips for the book are clipped to this card. The location number, or batch number, is simply an accession number, and the extra card sets are filed numerically.

For those titles which have been cataloged, the batch number is indicated on the order card, and the book is routed directly to the point where the batches of previously-prepared catalog cards have been filed. If no copy has been cataloged, the book is routed to the Catalog Department, and an appropriate slip is placed in the order file to indicate that a copy is being cataloged. For books in the process of being cataloged, a notation of the library code is made on the work slip, and the book is sent to the duplicate shelving to await the completion of the cataloging and the preparation of the cards. It should be noted that the order file, formerly kept by author, is now being changed to file by title because the clerical staff finds this much easier to work with. The order cards were originally filed in regular catalog cabinets, but these cabinets are now being replaced with open bins.

Within the Catalog Department, the order slip is searched and compared with LC proof slips or Wilson Cards. If there are changes to be made in the copy, the printed material is covered with a white ink that does not show in the reproduction process, and the new material is typed on. This is especially important in the case of tracings, where, when changes are made, a great deal of print is often covered in order to get uniform typing in the tracings paragraph.

The changed copy, as well as those unit cards used without modification, is placed on a blank sheet, large enough to accommodate four cards. The blank sheet is prepared by typing added entries in the appropriate space. The tops of the unit cards are cut off and four cards are placed upon the sheet so that the typed headings show in the proper alignment. Some runs are made on blank sheets, to provide main entries and shelf list cards. The prepared copy is inserted directly into the
Photo-Direct Camera Processor, which is manufactured by the Robertson Photo-Mechanic Company of the Des Plaines, Illinois, and distributed by the Addressograph-Multigraph Company. This photo-operation produces a multilith master stencil, which is then run directly on card stock on a multilith offset. The resultant copy, in a four-up form, is cut by an automatic paper cutter. The Center is experimenting with the use of a Xerox 914 to reproduce catalog cards, especially those which require only a short run. The results to date have been promising, and the administration at the Center is seriously considering a complete changeover because the equipment is easier to operate and maintain.

Cards sets are assembled after cutting and are assigned batch numbers. The sets are filed numerically by the batch numbers, to be matched with books. The decision on how many card sets to produce for each title was formerly based on the Director's best judgment of how popular the book might be and how many libraries might purchase it. Card sets were over-produced in amounts of five, eight, or twelve sets. However, inadequate records were kept on the number of sets used and the proportion of duplicate titles ordered, and the accumulation of unused over-runs became a problem. These over-runs have been drastically reduced by adopting a ratio based on the year of publication of the book described. Three extra sets of cards are not made for books published in the current year, two extra sets for books published during the previous year, and one extra set is run for older books, up to five years. Established as an arbitrary measure, the production of a given number of sets for books published in certain years will provide a basis on which exact estimates of the needs for card sets can be formulated in the future. This change will eliminate the need for a great deal of storage space and search time, as it was becoming impossible to house the extra sets of cards for the entire series of titles cataloged during the year.

When the card sets are assembled, three extra unit cards are included for use by the individual library as shelf lists or other purposes. Another extra card is placed in the order file to indicate the batch number for appropriate catalog cards for incoming books. This directional card also now indicates if a “see” reference is needed. From the beginning, the Center undertook to supply these cross references but had no indication of which references had been furnished to an individual library, and this led to duplication. If a “see” reference is needed, it is pulled from the “see” reference file and placed with the card set. The regional card is marked to show which libraries have the “see” reference.

After the books are matched with the appropriate catalog cards, a book card, pocket, and spine label are typed and pasted in or on the book. The Center has not, as yet, attempted to print the book card and pocket at the time the catalog cards are reproduced. The use of pockets printed with the member library's name and circulation rules has been one obstacle to this conversion. If book pockets and cards could be printed simultaneously with the catalog cards by masking or otherwise blocking out the unwanted portion, a great deal of typing time could be saved. Some libraries using the Addressograph machine to reproduce catalog
cards print the body of the catalog card on the pocket, and this might be done with the equipment now available in the Center.

A plastic jacket is then applied, and the books are sorted into bins for shipping to the proper libraries. One copy of the original order slip is sent to the billing office where invoices are prepared for the individual libraries. Formerly, this was the point where the punched card left the book to be used in billing. The accompanying flow chart (Figure 3) describes the original pattern of the work. The same chart is still generally applicable at present, with the exception that multiple-copy order forms have been substituted for punched cards.

Conclusions

Several specific problems in the areas of space, administrative structure, and work flow in a particular processing center have been pointed out, and these may be of general interest to others who are planning new centers. In addition, there are several general observations that can be made. Although it seems axiomatic that proper planning should precede any attempt to organize a processing center, there may be such a rush to get started that basic concerns are overlooked.

On-the-job training of staff for a centralized processing center is desirable because some of the jobs—such as the photo-reproduction of catalog cards, typing of master stencils for cards, and operation of punched card equipment—require the development of special skills that are not yet common stock of library personnel. Too, the idiosyncrasies of clerical work in library practice, such as the peculiarities of library filing, may impede adjustment to new routines. Although staff trained in the general applications of the above routines may be available, time should be allowed to permit them to become familiar with the special features of a particular system. It would not be effective, when working to meet a deadline, to attempt on-the-job training for a variety of positions at one time, nor would it be realistic to anticipate a high rate of accurate production in the beginning period. Time devoted to staff training prior to actual operation may be costly, but the cost would be offset by increased efficiency, and the Director would be freed to concentrate on major operational problems as they arise.

The lack of job descriptions and clear assignments of responsibility, especially for supervisory positions, may retard progress. In the case discussed here, for example, there was no clear decision made on keeping records, nor was any staff member assigned to record statistics. This lack proved to be a severe handicap when it became necessary to forecast the effects of proposed changes.

The establishment of a centralized processing unit should allow for a period of trial and error. Without trial and error, it is difficult to forecast the impact of such innovations as attempting to integrate school library materials into a work flow geared to public library material. Unfortunately, one aspect of error is backlog in the cataloging and delivery of materials, but if enough information on the critical aspects can be provided as background for starting centers, perhaps the amount of
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backlog and its effect can be minimized. The amount and effect of backlog can probably be minimized, too, by careful organization of work flow, with the placement of differing functions in the proper relationship to each other, before production begins. Then, if different but more effective ways to do the work are later discovered, adjustments can be made without undue disruption in activity.

A worthwhile addition to the literature at this point would be a manual of operations for processing centers, setting forth recommended systems for floor layout, work flow, and machine use to aid new centers in planning. Such a manual is especially important in view of the shortage of staff with experience in this new area of librarianship. It would provide guidelines for establishing new centers and should be as specific about details as possible. Perhaps some division of the American Library Association could sponsor such a manual. The immediacy of the need for some guidelines is particularly clear now because the provisions of many of the state plans for use of Library Services and Construction Act funds will encourage the development of centralized processing units.

Processing Centers for Public Libraries: A Tentative List

SEVERAL PEOPLE AND PROJECTS have recently been working to compile accurate information on processing centers, starting with establishing an authoritative list of such centers.

One of the difficulties is defining the term. It is used for the following list as a “processing center or multi-service center” providing any parts of processing (acquisitions, cataloging, preparations, catalog cards or book catalog) whether as a separate service or as one of other services. Consolidated libraries, such as metropolitan or county libraries with branches, are not included nor are agencies offering purely advisory services, nor are commercial enterprises. (The last are being reviewed in a separate study.)

Lists have been compiled from time to time, e.g. Orcena Mahoney’s appearing in the Winter 1961 LRTS. In 1965 the Missouri State Library distributed a questionnaire; in 1965/66, as part of the South-eastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study. Sarah Vann gathered data; Donald Hendricks of the University of Illinois Library Research Center has been studying the question, and the ALA-RTSD Regional Processing Committee (Peter Hiatt, Chairman) has been working to produce an accurate list, and is now compiling additional data concerning the operation of the centers, all collected via a questionnaire.
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The list which follows is fundamentally Miss Vann's, but the others mentioned have made contributions. It is published here primarily to seek further information. Anyone with knowledge of additions or corrections is requested to send it to Peter Hiatt, Division of Library Science, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405.

**Place**

**ARIZONA**
- Florence

**CALIFORNIA**
- Belmont
- Fresno
- Pleasant Hill
- Sacramento
- Salinas
- Santa Rosa
- Stockton
- Ventura

**COLORADO**
- Greeley

**FLORIDA**
- Orlando

**GEORGIA**
- Atlanta

**HAWAII**
- Honolulu

**ILLINOIS**
- Oak Park

**INDIANA**
- Crawfordsville
- Terre Haute

**IOWA**
- Jefferson

**KENTUCKY**
- Frankfort

**MARYLAND**
- Salisbury

**MICHIGAN**
- Lansing
- Traverse City
- Wayne

**Name of Center**

- Pinal County Free Library
- San Mateo County Library Processing Center
- San Joaquin Valley Library System Processing Center
- Contra Costa County Library and Alameda County Library
- State Library: Processing Center
- Monterey County Library
- North Bay Cooperative Library System
- Stockton & San Joaquin County Public Library
- Black Gold Cooperative Library System Processing Center
- Northern Colorado Processing Center (Weld County Library)
- The Library Book Processing Center
- State Catalog Service, Division of Instructional Materials and Library Services, State Department of Education
- State Library
- Book Processing Center
- Oak Park Public Library
- Crawfordsville Purchasing and Processing Center, Crawfordsville Public Library
- Emeline Fairbanks Memorial Library
- Raccoon Area Processing Center
- State Library
- Eastern Shore Book Processing Center (Wicomico County Library)
- State Library
- Grand Traverse Federation Processing Center (Traverse Public Library)
- Wayne County Library System

---
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Place Name of Center

MINNESOTA
Minneapolis Anoka County Library

MISSOURI
Bolivar Southwest Missouri Library Service, Inc.
     Jefferson City State Library: Library Services Center of Missouri

MONTANA
Great Falls Great Falls Federation of Libraries
     Libby (Great Falls Public Library)
     Miles City Northwest Montana Federation of Libraries
     (Lincoln County Free Library)

NEVADA
Carson City Sagebrush Federation of Libraries
     (Miles City Carnegie Public Library)

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Concord State Library

NEW YORK

(Of the 19 Systems, excluding the three Systems in New York City, the Ramapo-Catskill Library System and the Southern Tier Library System contract for service; the Mid-Hudson Libraries contracts with a commercial firm for a book catalog.)

Albany Upper Hudson Library Federation
Binghamton Four County Library System
Buffalo Buffalo & Erie County Public Library
Hempstead, L. I. Nassau Library System: Processing Center
Ithaca Finger Lakes Library System
Jamestown Chautauqua-Cattaraugus Library System
Nioga Nioga Library System
Patchogue, L. I. Suffolk Cooperative Library System
Plattsburgh Clinton-Essex-Franklin Library System
Rochester Pioneer Library System
     (Rochester Public Library)
Rome Mid-York Library System
Saratoga Southern Adirondack Library System
Schenectady Mohawk Valley Library Association
     (Schenectady County Public Library)
Syracuse Onondaga Library System
Watertown North Country Library System
Yonkers Westchester Library System: Processing Center

NORTH CAROLINA
Raleigh State Library: Processing Center

OHIO
Barnesville Library Service Center of Eastern Ohio
Columbus State Library

OKLAHOMA
Oklahoma City State Library: Multi-County Processing Section

OREGON
Medford Public Library of Medford and Jackson County
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IN THE MAIL: SEARCHING

I cannot resist expressing my objection to the viewpoint on acquisitions searching displayed by Ashby J. Fristoe in "The Bitter End" in your Winter 1966 issue.

I would agree that the comparative probability of locating a title in various bibliographical tools is one basis for selecting the searching sequence, but it is not the only one. In addition to the "productivity" of the various tools, I would add the following considerations:

(1) The information supplied by the bibliographic tool. It is rather naive to assume that locating a title in *PW Announcements* (now called *Forthcoming Books*) is the same as locating it in *NUG* or finding an LC proof-slip. *Forthcoming Books* gives little guidance as to correct entry or correct form of author’s name. It does not give series, which is an important item to know in avoiding duplication. As another example, the fact that a typical LC proof-slip file has only one slip per book and no cross references is important. A book request is not likely to be found in this file unless the entry is already correct or almost correct. It may give a little peace of mind to confirm correctness of entry. But if, in another case, a title is searched in *NUG* or *CBI* and a reference from the entry on the request to the correct entry is found and the title is then found in the “Orders Out” file under this entry, then the searcher has really accomplished something.

(2) The information needed. I particularly dislike the idea that the reason for searching book requests is merely to find them listed somewhere. What good does it do you to find a title listed if you do not find any additional information thereby and if you never did doubt the information given on the request? If a book request has all of the needed information except the price, a different searching sequence may be indicated than if the correct entry is the item to be sought. If a book has been selected on the basis of a review in a source such as *Library Journal* or *Choice*, why search *Forthcoming Books* or *CBI* for verifica-
tion unless you doubt the selector’s copying ability? However, if the description of the book leaves some doubt as to correct entry, you might still search NUC.

(g) Time of year. Considering only “productivity” of tools, I question whether Mr. Fristoe’s results would have been obtained at another time of year. For example, in the fall of the year when there are several quarterly cumulations of NUC he could have covered six months with the same number of searches as he used for two months. Also in the fall of the year, Books in Print, which Mr. Fristoe does not mention, is a rather productive tool.

There is one point on which I strongly agree with Mr. Fristoe. I also believe that it is extremely wasteful to search all requests to the bitter end. However, depth of search should depend on how necessary the missing information is as well as the probability of locating the title by further searching. For example, if a book was urgently needed and I was unable to obtain the book because I did not know the name of the publisher, then I probably would search to the bitter end.

I do not mean to imply that searching of each book request must be handled on an individual basis. If the library has a complete file of current English-language proof-slips, all current English language requests might be routinely checked against this file. Also, book requests can be assembled into groups to be checked in one or another of the bibliographic tools. However, I feel that when decisions on such procedures are made, “productivity” of bibliographic tools is only one of the factors to be considered.—Frances Simonsen, formerly Acquisitions Librarian, St. Paul Campus Library, University of Minnesota.

MR. FRISTOE’S ANSWER

In answer to Miss Simonsen’s comment on my paper, “The Bitter End,” I would like to point out that my paper dealt solely with current (1965) American imprints, and nowhere in it can I find any statement to the effect that the comparative probability of locating a title in various bibliographical tools is the only basis for selecting the searching sequence. I merely offered what I still consider an optimum sequence for current American imprints.

With respect to her specific comments, I agree that “it is naive to assume that locating a title in PW Announcements (now called Forthcoming Books) is the same as locating it in NUC or finding an LC proof-slip.” I maintain, however, that it is worse than naive to search in NUC, CBI, PW or any other similar tool for material which has not even been published. A quick look at Forthcoming Books would save a great deal of “bitter end” searching for books which could not possibly be in the standard tools. Certainly Forthcoming Books does not give much guidance as to correct entry, but one of the duties of a searcher who can not verify an entry is to follow the rules in the “Red Book” and come up with the correct form of entry. As for the lack of series information which might cause duplication, this is easily prevented by enclosing with the order a small instruction slip which includes the statement “SERIES: If title is part of a SERIES, and this information has not been indicated on our order, please report and await confirmation before sending.”

As for her comments about the information needed, all I can say is that in my limited experience you would be naive indeed if you didn’t “doubt the information given on the request.” I do not consider myself cynical when I say that many requestors cannot copy Library Journal or Choice entries correctly. I merely maintain that the effort to verify and, in many instances, correct the entry should be limited, not open-ended as she seems to favor.
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In addition, I do not feel that a book should not be ordered merely because a searcher has been unable to locate it in some bibliographic tool. If the searcher puts the author entry in correct form and the book is ordered and a second order for the same book reaches the searcher's hands and if the searcher follows the same rules for author entry, the likelihood of duplication is very low. Certainly it is better to attempt to get the book than to wait for it to appear in some bibliographic tool. When a professor wants a book, he wants it with as little delay as possible. It should be enough that the requestor indicates an author, title, and publisher; this should enable a dealer to locate the book, in spite of the fact that the searcher could not locate it in his search. If it is ordered under an incorrectly spelled name, the dealer should question the order; if he does not, the library should be able to return it.

With respect to her comments about the results which might have been obtained at another time of the year, I have no facts on which to base an answer; however, it is still true that the titles would have appeared in the proof slip file before they appeared in the NUC cumulation in the fall and probably before they appeared in Books in Print, and for this reason the search should have first taken place in the proof slip file. In addition, if I were unable to order a book because I did not know the name of a publisher, I would not, like Miss Simonsen, "search to the bitter end"; I would make a limited search and then, if not successful, return the request card and ask the requestor to furnish the name of the publisher.

Finally, let me say that I am aware that there must not be blind adherence to the searching sequence I have recommended. It would be stupid to order a $1,000 item without verification, and I would give it a very thorough search. Nevertheless, I still maintain that it is a good system designed to take care of the bulk of the current American orders. To alter the system to take care of a few exceptions would be to allow the tail to wag the dog. It is the professional librarian's job to pull out the exception, give it a "bitter end" search if appropriate, and allow the bulk of the orders to be processed routinely and rapidly.

**SEMINAR ON THE CATALOGING AND CLASSIFICATION OF AFRICANA**

The Institute of Librarianship at Ibadan organized a two-day Seminar in April, 1966, on the Cataloging and Classification of Africana which was attended by about sixty librarians and student librarians from various libraries in Nigeria. The proceedings, including papers and discussion, will, it is hoped, be published by the end of the year.

**BOOKDEALER-LIBRARY RELATIONS STUDY**

The ALA and the National League of Cities are jointly sponsoring a study with the working title: "Libraries, Purchasing Agencies and Book Wholesalers: Development of Guidelines for Book Purchasing Procedures and for Determining Qualifications of Library Book Venders Bidding on Contracts." The 6-months project is being funded by a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc.

Libraries with pertinent information, experience, successful forms, etc., are urged to contact the Director, Miss Evelyn Hensel, at her project address: The National League of Cities, 1612 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.
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Solutions in Establishing a New Catalog at the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Library

ELEANOR R. HASTING, Associate Librarian (retired)
U.S.—HEW Department Library, Washington, D. C.

IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND why the Department Library of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare became interested in and decided to turn to a retrospective book catalog and to start a new catalog, one needs to know something about the Department Library.

The U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, created in 1953 as the result of a major government reorganization plan, is made up of the Office of Education, Food and Drug Administration, Public Health Service, Social Security Administration, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Welfare Administration, and St. Elizabeth’s Hospital. These agencies predate the Department itself, having been established years earlier—some within other executive departments and some as separate organizations. In addition, the Department carries out federal responsibilities for three federally-aided institutions: The American Printing House for the Blind, Gallaudet College (the world’s only college for the deaf), and Howard University. (Recently, two additional agencies have been created within the Department—Aging Administration and Water Pollution Control Administration.)

Several of the agencies noted above had established libraries of their own. The Department Library is a composite of these libraries, plus that of the Children’s Bureau (formerly in the Labor Department, now in the Welfare Administration), and a part of the old Public Health Library, all of which were combined into one large library when the Department was formed. The libraries of St. Elizabeth’s Hospital, Gallaudet, and Howard remain in their respective institutions.

Until 1963/64, the Department Library had two distinct card catalogs, each of which was an amalgamation of the several independent catalogs of the agencies noted above. Each catalog had its own system of filing and its own subject heading structure. They were known as Education Catalog and Welfare Catalog. In 1963/64, these two catalogs were combined into one Author/Title Catalog and a Subject Catalog.

These catalogs are now being replaced by the book catalog for a variety of reasons. The two most important are: First, the desire to have a new catalog with consistent entries based on a single subject heading list and, second, to construct a catalog which might eventually become automated. Early in our thinking of a book catalog, we decided that the
most feasible plan for us would be to print our present catalogs "as is," in spite of inconsistencies and inevitable errors, because extensive editing and revising would be too costly, both moneywise and in staff time.

After careful investigation and study, we decided that for the present we would not plan for the publishing of a yearly catalog, and that future catalogs, if any, would supplement the proposed book catalog and would never include the entries represented therein. This decision was concurred in by the publisher and by the public service staff members.

Early in 1964, we began to plan for the new catalog and decided that the end of the year would be the most reasonable cut-off date, so we closed our old catalog at the end of 1964 and began the new one with 1965 cataloging. We began immediately to think of what would be involved in starting a new catalog, e.g. would it be a divided catalog? If so, how would it be divided? What filing rules would be used? What cataloging policies would we follow? What subject headings? How would we treat new serials? What about continuing serials, etc.?

One of our first steps was to set up a series of meetings with the Department Librarian and with the Associate Librarian and Subject Specialists from Readers' Services Section. These meetings dealt with the questions stated above, and any suggestion made by a participant was given consideration. Some of the problems presented at these meetings were easily resolved, and for the most part Technical Services Section was given a free hand in setting policy.

We decided to continue with a divided catalog, dividing on an author/title and subject basis, but with personal and corporate bodies used as subject filing in the Author/Title Catalog. However, personal and corporate entries sub-divided by a form subdivision file in the Subject Catalog. Filing would be done as far as possible in straight alphabetical order, with successive editions of the same title filing in reverse chronological order.

The subject heading policy for the new catalog was a little more difficult to establish. The Department Library had previously used a list prepared by the Social Security Board Library, Selected List of Subject Headings Used in the Social Security Board Library, for materials in the welfare field, and the Library of Congress list for other materials. We finally decided to use the LC list for all materials, with some slight modification, e.g. a direct approach for all headings consisting of a noun and an adjective. We thought such an approach would lend itself more easily to automation, if and when we decide to automate. We also decided that some of the LC subject headings in the social science field would have to be modernized to suit our needs. For example, Public Health, not Hygiene, Public. We also decided that in the beginning we would not make "see also" subject references for the new Subject Catalog. We are not sure at this point whether or not we will ever include them. Instead a copy of the LC subject lists will be available at the public catalog. If we decide later to include "see also" references, they will be done as a special project.

Probably, the most disturbing problem in establishing a new catalog
is how to handle serials. After considering various solutions, all of which entailed very time-consuming routines and complicated details, we settled upon the following solutions, which we think will answer our problems. We should preface these solutions by saying that serials in the Department Library do not include periodicals. Periodical titles have never had catalog records made. We hope at some future date to automate all serial and periodical records and publish these as a supplement to our catalogs.

We decided that in cataloging both serials and monographs, we would follow the new code and catalog under successive entries. Because we will always have to use the printed catalog in conjunction with the card catalog, continuing serial titles, unless analyzed, will be represented in the printed catalog and in the serial checklist, not in the new catalog. Continuing serials with change in entry will be cataloged under the new entry for the new catalog. “Continued by” notes were added to the old cards and the entry closed, as long as that entry had not been filmed for the printed catalog. Changes in entry, too late to have “continued by” notes appear in the printed catalog, will have to have history cards and necessary references made for the new catalog. “Continued by” notes, in all instances, are added to the shelflist and serial checklist. This results in some rather unorthodox situations, but cannot be avoided. Serials which later discontinue publication will be “killed” only in the serial checklist. We will make no attempt to close entries and recatalog for the new catalog. Analyzed serials had to be handled in a different manner. As each serial issue was checked in, the assistant noted whether or not the title was to be analyzed. If analyzed, the assistant withdrew the main entry card for the serial, leaving a charge in the old catalog, and forwarded it with the piece to the cataloger. The serial checklist card was then annotated “1965” to show that the transfer had either been done or was in process. If filming of the tray in which it filed had been done or was about to be done, this was called to the cataloger’s attention before withdrawing the card. If the filming had not been done, the work was then either done “rush” or postponed until after the filming was completed.

In all instances, the cataloger reviewed the series entry, indicated any additional entries or cross references required, and forwarded the main entry card either for reproduction or for filing into the new catalog. Main entry series cards were always filed into the new catalog after the filming of the old catalog was completed, unless changes made this undesirable. In these instances, the charge card remained in the old catalog. The main series entry for numbered series in the new catalog has a note added to it saying, “For numbers not listed here, consult the printed catalog.” We considered making a specific reference to numbers listed in the old catalog, but discarded the idea as being too cumbersome and time consuming. A similar note is used for series listing contents, although these are made sparingly. Note: In all probability, not all such entries have been reviewed. Therefore, this is still current practice. Titles such as Who’s Who, etc., are considered as continuing
serials, and no attempt has been made to recatalog them for the new catalog. Incomplete monographic sets, which appear in the old catalog, will be recataloged for the new catalog as new volumes are added.

After filming of old catalogs, or any part of them, was completed, no effort was or will be made to clear records for titles appearing there, as they are withdrawn or lost from the collection. The official shelf-list withdrawn and annotated for a withdrawn file will comprise the only record. Replacements for lost volumes may be recataloged for the new catalog.

We know that special problems may arise which will not quite fit into the above routines, but these will be resolved on an individual basis. As soon as our complete catalog has been published, we expect to discard our old card catalog. We have thought of no good reason for keeping the card file, but would welcome any comments upon this decision.

We realize, as stated before, that many inconsistencies or even errors will show up in the published catalog since it does reflect the work of many people over a long period of time and change. We do hope that, in spite of this, it will prove to be a valuable reference tool, as it is a unique bibliographic record in the fields of education and welfare.

The retrospective catalogs are being published by G. K. Hall & Co. The filming of the cards was done in the Library by an employee of G. K. Hall, with a minimum disruption of service. Approximately eight months were required to film 909,000 cards. The cards are reproduced by offset on Permalife paper with 21 cards per page. The volumes are being bound in Class A library binding. They are priced in the United States at $1930 for the Author/Title Catalog and $1220 for the Subject Catalog.* As stated before, no decision has been made on what form a future catalog might take, the only firm decision being that no attempt will be made to include the material in the catalogs now being published.

* Further information may be obtained by writing G. K. Hall & Co., 70 Lincoln Street, Boston, Massachusetts, 02111.

REPRINTS

Microcard Editions, Inc., has announced the publication of a new aid to libraries, Guide to Reprints.

The Guide lists all reprints issued by or available from publishers in the United States, serials and lengthy sets as well as monographs. The first issue contains some 9,000 entries, the output of approximately 50 publishers.

Reprints are defined as full-size copies of existing works made by any method of reproduction that does not involve newly-composed type. Paperbacks, with the exception of journals, are excluded.

Listing is alphabetic by author or title, each entry giving the name of the reprinter and the price of the work. Microcard Editions expects to issue the Guide to Reprints once a year. For further information write: Microcard Editions, Inc., 901 26th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20037.
The first Italian cataloging rules in modern times were formulated by Giuseppe Fumagalli, the noted bibliographer as part of his work, *Cataloghi di biblioteche e indici bibliographici*. Then, in 1922 the Ministry of Education published a set of official rules mainly for the use of governmental libraries. These rules derived in part from the rules of Fumagalli, and also from the Anglo-American code.

Next in chronological order came the rules published in 1931 by the Vatican Library for its own use. Subsequently, this code was adopted by other libraries and in many parts of the world.

Before the Second World War, there was a widespread dissatisfaction with the *Regole* published in 1922; librarians found that the wording of many paragraphs often left too wide a margin for subjective interpretation and that solutions to certain cataloging problems were not provided for. In 1940, at a meeting of the Associazione dei Bibliotecari Italiani, the question of a union catalog of Italian libraries was brought up, and as a preparatory measure, a revision of the cataloging rules was proposed to ensure the use of uniform entries for cards sent to the Catalog. During the war years, all those projects came to a standstill, but discussions were resumed in the late nineteen-forties by librarians and official bodies concerned with library matters. In 1951 a law was passed for the creation of a union catalog, the Centro Nazionale per il Catalogo Unico, situated in Rome, with branches at the four other national libraries. The realization of this center immediately brought up again the problem of uniform cataloging rules. At a meeting of the Italian library association in 1951, a group of librarians proposed the adoption of the ALA rules, whereas others preferred to keep the Italian rules with certain modifications. A committee worked on a revision from 1952 on, taking into account the ALA rules, and the usage in various European countries and the Vatican.

The new rules were published in 1956. In this code, about 140 paragraphs give the rules for choice of entry and form of entry, and also the rules for descriptive cataloging for the author-title part of a divided catalog which is preferred in most Italian libraries to the dictionary catalog. Actually, the number of cases presented is greater than the numbered paragraphs would lead one to believe, since often several connected problems are treated together in one section. The text is divided into four main chapters: I. Introduction. II. Rules for choice of entry and form of entry. III. Rules for descriptive cataloging. IV. Author-title part of a divided catalog.
form of entry in that order: Single authors. Corporate bodies. Anonymous works. III. Rules for descriptive cataloging. IV. Orthography, conventional signs, punctuation, etc. At the end of the volume, appendices give rules for cataloging incunabula, maps, and music scores, as well as tables for transliteration and a list of abbreviations of bibliographical terms.

Some aspects of the rules are of interest to American librarians. Contrary to many continental codes, the principle of corporate body as author is recognized, whether it be an institution or a government. However, certain types of government publications which according to American usage are entered under country, such as parliamentary and executive documents, are entered directly under the name of the body, adding the name of the country after it. (Rule 76)

Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of the Census, United States of America.

Special reports . . .

It can also be observed from the above example, that subordinate bodies are entered under the main body.

Constitutions, laws, decrees, etc., are entered under the name of the country, in Italian, followed, in brackets, by its official name at the time of the publication of the document in question. (Rule 75)

Francia (Empire Français)
Code civil des Français . . .

It should be noted here, that form headings are not used at all. Since geographic entries are used sparingly, and corporate bodies are entered under their name, the notorious problem of societies and institutions does not arise. Periodical publications, collections, criminal and civil trials, are considered for the purposes of cataloging as anonymous works. (Rules 93, 96, 97, 98) Periodical publications which change their title and publications of corporate bodies which change their name are entered under successive titles or names. (Rules 76, 96)

Even if in some points there is a disagreement with ALA usage, in many aspects the 1956 Italian rules actually anticipate the changes projected for the new Anglo-American code, and in fact are among the most recently-revised ones in Europe. On the eve of the Paris Conference on Cataloguing Principles, when codes and their revision were often discussed in library circles, some Italian librarians warned their colleagues not to rush into yet another revision. Thus, Dr. Carlo Revelli, of the Torino Civic Libraries wrote: "Nel caso d'Italia, che possiede un regolamento il quale ha solo cinque anni di vita, non occorre nemmeno discutere: anche se il regolamento internazionale si rivelasse superiore a quello italiano, l'impossibilità pratica di correggere per intero i cataloghi suggerirebbe di mantenere le regole nazionali."5

Many Italian librarians took a lively interest in the discussions pre-
paratory to the Paris Conference. This is evident in the many articles which appeared at that time in Italian library periodicals. Especially to be noted are the contributions of the official Italian delegates to the Conference: Dr. Fernanda Ascarelli, Director of the Biblioteca Alessandrina of Rome University, Dr. Diego Maltese of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale of Florence, and Prof. Francesco Barberi of the Direzione delle Accademie e Biblioteche. The Italian representatives participated actively at the meetings, and Dr. Ascarelli also presented the Working Paper on Compound Surnames and Surnames with Prefixes (No. 12). After the conference, Dr. Ascarelli and Dr. Maltese presented a series of oral and written reports on the resolutions, discussing the implications of the adopted cataloging principles and their possible acceptance by Italian librarians.

Since 1961, those who took part in the Paris Conference have been urging Italian librarians to consider a revision of the 1956 rules, to bring them into line with eventual international usage. The reflections of Dr. Maltese finally took the form of the publication, late in 1965, of his book, *Principi di catalogazione e Regole italiane.* With this publication, Dr. Maltese fulfills the task assigned at the conclusion of the Paris Conference to all official delegates, “to arrange for the widest possible publicity” for the text of the *Statement of Principles,* and “to take the necessary action to ensure that cataloging rules in their countries are established or revised as soon as possible in conformity with the principles laid down by the conference. . . .” To conform to the first recommendation, Dr. Maltese gives *in extenso,* an Italian translation of the *Statement,* and he fulfills the second by drafting a revised version of a certain number of paragraphs and sections of the 1956 code.

The revision, which concerns only the entry rules, forms the principal part of the work, and is preceded by introductory chapters discussing the functions and the structure of the author catalog, the problems and general principles of cataloging, the old Italian rules and the necessity for their revision. Throughout the discussion, the author’s long experience and his wide knowledge of cataloging literature, from Panizzi and Fumagalli to Ranganathan and Lubetzky, are evident. The author voices the feeling of uneasiness of many librarians having to cope with the great quantity of printed matter which enters our libraries, causing a corresponding growth and complexity of library catalogs, which as a result become very difficult tools for the library user to consult. The user of the library catalogs is kept in mind all along, since, as Dr. Maltese puts it with admirable clarity, “Il catalogo deve servire alle necessità di chi lo usa.” He agrees fully with the functions of the catalog as established at the Paris Conference and believes that to be easier to construct and to consult it should be based on certain basic principles, since all minute questions of cataloging practice can be reduced to the problems of choice of entry and form of entry and that in fact the problems are few in number but the special cases are infinite: “Le categorie e i casi sono infiniti, mentre i problemi sono pochi.” In coming to the discussion of the present Italian cataloging rules, Dr. Maltese finds that
they could be modified fairly easily since they are not in basic contradiction with the Statement of Principles.

In the last and most important part of his work, he examines in detail a considerable number of the 1956 rules in the light of the Statement. He respects the order of the paragraphs of the old rules and also the original text. The proposed alterations are indicated in the following way: the sentences or parts of sentences which Dr. Maltese thinks should be deleted, are enclosed in square brackets, his own additions are printed in italics. Copious notes explain the reason for the change in each case; and to further prove his point, the author refers the reader to the pertinent article of the Statement by giving its number.

What of the proposed changes? They vary from a radical change of some basic rules to changes or a clarification of the wording of the rules, and in some cases the author suggests changes in the terminology used. In redefining terms and specifying their usage, Dr. Maltese takes into account the definitions used throughout the Statement and also the Basic Vocabulary accepted at the Paris Conference.

In discussing the kinds of entries (Rule 3) Dr. Maltese proposes the reduction of their number from four to three: main entries, added entries, and references. The 1956 rules prescribed four kinds of entries: main entries, analytics, and two types of references. It is interesting to note that throughout, Dr. Maltese advocates a far greater use of added entries than has been customary in Italian libraries. It seems that the lack of facilities for mechanical card reproduction has made it difficult for them to use unit cards. This means that in many cases where American librarians would make an added entry, Italian practice would prefer to make a reference; for instance in the case of a joint author, a reference would be made from his name to a shortened form of the main card.

Certain of Dr. Maltese's proposals will help to simplify and shorten entries. In accordance with the Statement of Principles, for both names of single authors and corporate bodies, he advocates the elimination of certain additional characteristics such as place, after the name of the corporate body except "when needed to distinguish the author from others of the same name." Dr. Maltese advocates that all government publications be entered under country (Rule 76) regardless of their nature, a proposition that has been considered too radical a change by some of his colleagues.

For corporate authors Dr. Maltese proposes a more extensive use of direct entries under the names of subordinate bodies, particular government agencies; this is contrary to the practice of the 1956 rules, which prescribes entry under the main body at all times. (Rule 76)

The author shares the aversion of many Italian librarians to form headings and has made no attempt to introduce them into his proposed new rules. He prefers instead to use conventional titles, for instance in the case of treaties (Rule 75):

Italia.

Trattati ecc. Trattati e convenzioni fra il Regno d'Italia . . .
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The entry rules for compound surnames and surnames with prefixes are reworded to conform to Article 12 of the Statement. Now usage of the country of the author is preferred; in the old rules, entry for compound surnames, for instance, is under the first name mentioned, followed by the others (Rule 41).

Many language problems are simplified. Dr. Maltese proposes the elimination of the name of the country in the original language, which according to the old rules had to be added to the name in Italian, for entries of official publications such as constitutions, etc. In the case of entries for sovereigns, the name was to be followed by the title in the language of his country, which sometimes must have caused lengthy searches by catalogers (Rule 45).

In view of the proposed changes in the ALA code, it should be noted that Dr. Maltese does not consider entering the works published under a pseudonym under the pseudonym, even if used often by the author (Rule 51), but still prefers to enter the work under the author’s real name.

Dr. Maltese proposes that his revised version be used in conjunction with the 1956 rules in libraries that wish to modernize their cataloging practice. He is, however, fully aware that his can be at best only a temporary measure and that eventually the rules in their entirety should be revised to provide a set of rules considerably reduced in number and easier to apply, a circumstance which will profit the cataloger and in the long run also the library user for whom the catalog is ultimately destined.

One cannot but agree with Dr. Carlo Revelli, who contributed a lengthy review of the book to the Italian library association’s bulletin earlier this year that Dr. Maltese’s thorough study of the 1956 rules constitutes an admirable starting point for any future revision of those rules. However, those who will work on the eventual revision should consider whether a radical regrouping of like problems together (such as works of multiple authorship) is not preferable to an attempt to respect too closely the present set-up of the rules. If it were done, it would be interesting to examine at a future date the comparative success of the new Italian and Anglo-American codes in this respect.
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**List of Current State Documents Checklists**

MARGARET T. LANE, Recorder of Documents
Office of the Secretary of State, Louisiana
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bibliography Series &amp; Frequency</th>
<th>Latest Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>[Checklist] Consignment (Irregular)</td>
<td>no. 152, April, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Checklist of Arkansas State Publications (Semi-annual)</td>
<td>no. 45, July-December, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>California State Publications (Monthly, Annual Cumulation)</td>
<td>v. 20, no. 6, June, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>“State Publications” (In Accessions List) (Quarterly)</td>
<td>v. 15, no. 4, July, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Short-title Checklist of Official Florida Publications (Bi-monthly)</td>
<td>no. 150, May-June, 1966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bibliography Series &amp; Frequency</th>
<th>Latest Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Current Hawaiian (Quarterly)</td>
<td>v. 22, no. 4, March, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Publications of the State of Illinois (Semi-annual)</td>
<td>July-December, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>“Indiana Documents Received at the State Library” (In Library Occurrent)</td>
<td>v. 22, no. 2, May, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa Documents (Quarterly)</td>
<td>no. 41, January-March, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Checklist of Official Publications of the State of Kansas (Irregular)</td>
<td>v. 7, no. 4, January-June, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Checklist of Kentucky State Publications (Annual)</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Official Publications (Irregular)</td>
<td>v. 3, 1954-1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Documents (Semi-annual)</td>
<td>no. 35, July-December, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>“Maryland State Documents” (In Maryland Libraries) (Quarterly)</td>
<td>v. 32, no. 3, Spring 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Commonwealth of Massachusetts Publications (Monthly)</td>
<td>no. 7, July, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Checklist (Irregular)</td>
<td>no. 29, June, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota State Publications (Quarterly)</td>
<td>v. 10, no. 1, February-August, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>“Montana Documents” (In Inside the Library)</td>
<td>Publication suspended with v. 14, no. 11, August, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no. 73, June, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Checklist of New Hampshire State Departments' Publications (Biennial)</td>
<td>v. 2, no. 4, July, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Checklist of Official New Jersey Publications (Bi-monthly)</td>
<td>Ceased publication with no. 14, January-April, 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>New Mexico Official Publications (Quarterly)</td>
<td>v. 18, 1964/65, cumulated; v. 20, no. 1, July, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Bibliography Series &amp; Frequency</td>
<td>Latest Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina Publications; a Checklist of Official State Publications (Bi-monthly)</td>
<td>no. 83, March-April, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio State Publications (Monthly)</td>
<td>no. 82, June, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Checklist of Official Pennsylvania Publications (Monthly)</td>
<td>v. 2, no. 11, June, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directory of State Publications (Annual)</td>
<td>v. 14, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Checklist of Departmental Publications (Annual)</td>
<td>1966 supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>“A Checklist of South Carolina State Publications” South Carolina Bibliographies (Annual)</td>
<td>no. 3N, July, 1963-June, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>A List of Tennessee State Publications (Annual)</td>
<td>no. 11 [1963]; no. 12 never printed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Checklist of Official State Publications (Bi-monthly)</td>
<td>no. 211, May-June, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Checklist of Utah State Publications (Semi-annual)</td>
<td>[1st], Spring, 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Checklist of Virginia State Publications (Annual)</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia State Publications in Print</td>
<td>[1st], July 1, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Short Title Checklist of West Virginia State Publications (Annual)</td>
<td>1964/65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“State Publications” (In West Virginia Collection Accessions List)</td>
<td>v. 6, no. 7, July, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Wisconsin Public Documents (Bi-monthly)</td>
<td>v. 49, no. 6, November, 1965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Structure of Indexing Authority Lists

C. D. Gull
Professor of Library Science
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

The consideration of the structure of indexing authority lists appears to be conspicuously absent from the literature of subject cataloging or indexing, yet such a structure is required to guide the builder of a list in the choice of classes, and to guide the user of an index, catalog, or list to the classes most closely corresponding to his needs.

The attached chart* is an attempt to develop a logical or mathematical model of the relationships and characteristics which are common to typical lists of subject headings in libraries, and of thesauri, descriptors, uniterms, keywords, etc., in scientific and technical information centers. The specific examples originally considered were from two lists, *Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress* and the *"Thesaurus of ASTIA Descriptors"* which was under preparation in 1961, but the chart has been generalized to represent any authority list or any classification system.

For any authority list we can say that $M$ is the set of all symbols employed in the construction of the list and of all permutations and combinations of those symbols (Box 1). We next assume that there are classes within $M$ (Box 2), even though they may not all be named. These classes are most commonly expressed as words derived from the dictionary, but they may be single numbers from the list of Arabic numerals, single letters from the English alphabet, or individual symbols commonly employed in writing and printing the English language and mathematics. Class designations are called "Terms" here (Box 3).

The next important consideration arises from the circumstances that out of all the possible classes which could be derived from permuting or combining the symbols in $M$, some classes are selected for use in a given authority list and other classes are excluded from use (Boxes 4 and 5). Use is here defined as comprising only the terms which are used for the construction of the list, for indexing purposes, for storing index records, and for the construction of questions for the search and retrieval processes. Examples of both of these major groups of selected and excluded terms are found in all types of authority lists.

*Improved from an earlier form dated December 1, 1961.
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STRUCTURE OF INDEXING

AUTHORITY LISTS

1. ANY LIST: \( M = \text{set of all Symbols and Permutations} \)
   Order = Undefined.

2. There are CLASSES within \( M \);
   they are Subsets of \( M \).

3. TERMS (broadly defined) are
   used to describe CLASSES

4. TERMS EXCLUDED FROM USE

5. TERMS SELECTED FOR USE

6. CONNECTIVES FOR \( \cap \) AND \( a \cap b < \text{LESSER THAN} \ a \prec b \)
   (Grammar)
   \( \cup \) OR \( a \cap b < \text{NOT} \ a \prec b \)
   Equals or includes \( a = b \)

7. (Not) \( e < f \)
   \( h \cup i \)
   \( j < k \)
   \( l < m \)
   \( q < p \)

8. (but) \( c \cup d \)
   \( g \cup h \)
   \( k < j \)
   \( n \cup n \)
   \( p < q \)

9. INTER-CLASS CONNECTIVES
   Equals or includes

10. (Not) \( u \)

11. \( c \prec d \)
    \( e \cup d \)
    \( f \cup e \)
    \( s \cup t \)
    \( u \cup s \)
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Connectives

It is further necessary to consider the various kinds of connectives which are employed in the structure of the indexing authority lists. The connectives can be divided into two groups: intra-class connectives for terms (Box 6), with examples in Boxes 7 and 8; and inter-class (inter-term) connectives for classes (Box 9), with examples in Box 11. The examples of these connectives have been placed under the two groups, terms excluded from use (Box 4) and terms selected for use (Box 5).

**Intra-Class Connectives for Terms**

Since letters, numbers, and symbols are strung together to create one or more classes or words, it is desirable to identify the connectives which are employed to indicate a class as it is arbitrarily understood by a user. These connectives have some of the aspects of grammar (Box 6). The common symbols for these connectives are and, or, less than, not, and equal or identical to. AND is commonly used as the connective between letters, and as the connective, actually the space, between two words in a phrase. AND may in some instances be expressed between two words as a comma and a space following the first word, or is most commonly written out as or between words. LESSER THAN indicates the order of words in a phrase, such as Air Conditioning. Here, Air has a lower value than Conditioning if one uses a numerical scale increasing to the right. This connective also has the implication of AND, that is to say “Air AND Conditioning” in the order specified by the symbol. NOT may rarely be found expressed as the word not, but is more commonly found as a prefix attached directly to a word such as in, or un. EQUALITY or IDENTITY is an arbitrary distinction applied by users. Thus the juxtaposition of “gasoline” and “petrol” to indicate a single class requires that they be written together in some fashion which shows the synonymous character of the relationship.

Some of these intra-class connectives also occur with terms excluded from use (Box 7); they are all aspects of the identity relationship; the terms in Box 7 are excluded from use; the terms in Box 8 to the right of the arrows are the terms selected for use.

**Inter-Class Connectives**

**Selected Terms.** If we limit ourselves to considering classes which are selected for use (Box 11), we have two types of relationships which appear to be expressed by the logical or as a concept and physically in mechanical, electrical, and electronic devices. In the non-hierarchical situation in which there are two or more identifiable classes which are closely related and appear to belong on parallel conceptual levels, it is desirable to connect the classes in pairs in both directions. This situation is represented by the double headed arrow as a symbol on the chart, and commonly in the verb See also for one of the directions and xx for the reverse tracing, meaning “See also reference from.”

The hierarchical relationships of class inclusion need to be shown
with inter-class connectives, and or is applicable here too. Thus, r is
equal to or includes s, equals or includes t, can be written as follows:
\( r \subseteq s \subseteq t \); this is the typical See also reference from the general to the
specific in a subject heading list. The tracing in the reverse direction is
shown by xx, and the logic is or. (Box 11).

In the "Thesaurus of ASTIA Descriptors," 2d ed., December 1962, the
cross references from the general to the specific are more clearly shown
by the phrase, "Generic to"; and the reverse direction from the specific
to the general by the phrase, "Specific to."

**Excluded Terms.** Inter-class connectives are required to connect terms
which are excluded from use for several reasons with terms which are
selected for use. Between Boxes 7 and 8 the symbol is shown as a single
headed arrow; In conventional subject heading lists the verb is See, and
the tracing under the selected term is “x,” meaning “See reference from.”
It is interesting to note that while this connective expresses identity of
terms, the effect is to provide a direction which reads "not f but g." The
possibility of confusion is removed when it is realized that not is applied
to a term and its position within an ordered sequence of terms, and that
not is not applied to the class, since the class is used by calling it g.

In a hierarchical chain viewed as proceeding from the specific to the
general (Boxes 10 to 11), it is possible to decide that the most specific
class, or any intermediate class in the chain, shall not be used. In the
December 1962 ASTIA Thesaurus the verb is “Use,” and the tracing un-
der the next more general class is “Includes.” Here again the direction
reads “not u but t,” but the intention is to show the class inclusion re-
lationship here rather than identity. In some conventional subject head-
ing lists the verb used is “See under,” and no tracing seems to have been
employed.

**Recommended Cross Referencing Symbols**

Seven cross referencing symbols are required to care for the relation-
ships displayed in the chart. The following symbols are recommended
for consideration, in place of the variety of words and symbols used for
cross references and tracings in existing lists. These symbols are simple
and similar in appearance, and show the graphic directions of relation-
ship in a manner already commonly accepted. The symbols are:

\[ \rightarrow ; \leftarrow ; \leftarrow \rightarrow ; \downarrow ; \uparrow ; \leftrightarrow ; \uparrow \uparrow \]

Between Boxes 7 and 8 the single arrow aimed to the right \( \rightarrow \) stands
for “see” or “use” between identical terms, and the single arrow aimed
left \( \leftarrow \) stands for the tracing meaning “x” or “See reference from.”

In Box 11 the double headed horizontal arrow stands for “see also”
\( \leftrightarrow \) in both directions; since it is used with both terms, no tracing
(such as “xx,” “see also reference from”) is required with this symbol.
In Box 10 the right angled arrow aimed downward shows class inclusion \( \downarrow \) toward more specific classes, and the right angled arrow aimed upward shows \( \uparrow \) class inclusion toward more general classes. If one of these vertical arrows shows the relationship between two classes as it is intended to guide the user, then the other arrow represents the tracing between the classes as intended to guide the builder of the list.

In Box 10 a specific term is excluded from use and a vertical arrow bent double \( \leftarrow \) shows that the next more general class is to be used. In Box 11 the arrow bent double is horizontal \( \longrightarrow \) to show that the most specific term on the right is included in the term on the left. Since the most specific term is not to be used, the bent arrow directs the user to turn back to use the next more general term.

**Cautionary Note**

It should be observed that the use of AND, OR, NOT, and IDENTITY in the construction of search questions to connect classes selected at random from an authority list is a different use of the logical operations from that under consideration to illuminate the problems of structuring the authority list. Thus, it is possible to connect two terms, Blind and Venetian, from a list to create the following four classes, Blind, Venetian, Venetian blind, and blind Venetian, to express four different concepts. It is the responsibility of the framer of the question to recognize the possibility that the coordination of Blind and Venetian in a question with logical AND may possibly group documents on Venetian blinds and blind Venetians together in one list rather than in two lists, if syntax is ignored.

(The original text was developed while the author was Consulting Analyst, Information Systems Operation, General Electric Company, Washington, D. C.)

**IN THE MAIL: COMMONSENSE CATALOGING**

One can understand and appreciate the dilemma faced by the editor of a journal who publishes a book which is obviously significant in the field covered by the journal. While the editor cannot solicit a review, the readers of the journal are, I feel, entitled to some expression of opinion about such a work. For that reason I trust that Miss Piercy will allow me, as a fairly consistent reviewer for her, to comment on her book *Commonsense Cataloging: a Manual for the Organization of Books and Other Materials in School and Small Public Libraries* (New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1965; $5.00) "In the Mail," if not in the regular review columns. I trust that my comments will not be construed as flattery for one who has allowed me to say many critical things about other books in her review columns, for I have attempted to read and to comment upon it as critically as I have those other works. I hope, to use Machiavelli's words, "that the truth of the matter and the weightiness of the theme shall make it acceptable."

Miss Piercy's book is a detailed presentation of suggested techniques and methods for organizing a collection of materials, both book and non-book, for a small library. I find it, incidentally, too detailed at times as with the beautifully simple description on page 121 of how to tie together catalog cards. The book is meant to serve both as a general guide and as a manual for small libraries in which purposes it should serve extremely well. Those of us in larger libraries are
likely to look upon the work as being too mundane, and that would be a serious mistake. It serves admirably as a refresher course for the tired administrator and makes excellent reading even for those of us not in any way directly concerned with the problems it is dealing with. The wonder of it is best described by the adjective that Miss Piercy has chosen to modify that nasty word "cataloging." She claims to have selected it to "dispel some of the fears, mystery, superstitions, and mystique which sometimes surround the word 'cataloging.' After all, all the librarian has to do is decide, first what purposes the collection is intended to serve, and then how best to organize the materials to perform the service." (p. 6)

For all of us, no matter how large or small our collection, those are sound words of advice.

The word commonsense can, however, be taken in another meaning, for Miss Piercy's organization and content are models of commonsense. Here you will find no lengthy explanations of the theoretical advantages and disadvantages of one principle of cataloging as opposed to another. Miss Piercy believes in setting forth in simple, direct, straightforward precepts how she would go about this task. Where needed, some explanation is given simply and quickly. ("The beginning cataloger tends to make too many subject entries. He should not try to analyze every thought in the book but should deal only with its major contributions. Subjects go out of date quickly, in both terminology and concepts, and the cataloger who is overgenerous in assigning them finds recataloging more difficult." p. 61)

One does not always agree with Miss Piercy's advice (as for instance when she stresses the necessity for placing price information on the shelf-list card) on many matters; and may even quarrel with her reasoning (as for instance when she justifies the value of the shelf-list for its usefulness in book selection and order work) on some matters. When all is said and done, though, it is quite clear that if a person organizing a small library were to follow her general guidelines, and especially if he were to use the appendix for a staff manual in the way it is designed, the end result could only be a well-organized collection that could be taken over and directed by another person with little or no continuity of tenure. What more could one ask for?—Norman D. Stevens, Acting Librarian, Rutgers University Library, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

A Proposal for a Bibliographic Bank for the Province of Ontario*

H. C. Campbell, Chief Librarian
Toronto Public Library, Toronto, Ontario

In early August of this year a memorandum was prepared by staff of the Toronto Public Library putting forward very tentatively the possibility of establishing through cooperation of the major libraries of the Province a computerized catalogue or bank of biblio-

* This paper was prepared as a memorandum to the libraries concerned, dated November 16, 1965.
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graphic data which would be available to any library on-line to the computer. Such a machine catalogue would supply, instantaneously, information, including location, about any book or other material previously recorded in the computer. In its maximum form of expansion such a system, operating upon a large store of information, could be a searching tool of very great power, encompassing the holdings of many kinds of libraries and special collections.

The subsequent circulation of that memorandum to libraries and other institutions and their administrative personnel brought a variety of responses almost unanimous in expression of interest in the suggestion. Replies and enquiries were received from the following institutions, together with a few enquiries from other countries asking that they be kept informed of developments in the proposal: Osgoode Hall Law School; Carleton University; Scarborough & Erindale Colleges; York University; University of Guelph; Victoria University, Toronto; University of Western Ontario; Innis College; Ontario Department of University Affairs; Queen's University; Trent University; and the University of Toronto.

A number of the responses were from an administrative viewpoint, and, although it was not the intention of that memorandum, nor is it of this second one, to discuss administrative approaches to the proposal, it is nevertheless appreciated that behind the interest in the administrative economy necessary to the successful operation of a computerized exchange of bibliographic data among a network of Ontario Libraries there lay the technical questions of cost and organization and their implications for the cooperating libraries.

As a result of these responses and queries, a suggestion arose that a somewhat more specific discussion of the proposal would now be in order with regard to costs and their relation to the several possible elaborations of such a bibliographic system, to be used as a basis for further investigation and consultation among interested institutions.

It is intended here, therefore, to sketch an outline of possible systems, to indicate some of the factors that will govern final costs, to list those costs which are immediately ascertainable, and finally to suggest the nature of a pilot project employing the assistance of systems analysts and engineers and of library cataloguers to study the problems involved in a union catalogue and the precise application of data-processing methods.

Extending the Capabilities

The earlier memorandum spoke only of the possible contributions of "book" data that could be used for the first stage of storage in the computer. It made no mention of a variety of other materials that eventually would be available to the central exchange, since it was interested first in what was in existence now in computer input form for the immediate establishment of the exchange and also what would be of immediate interest to the largest number of libraries.

The Toronto Public Library, for example, has on punched cards data for some 30,000 book items and can begin immediately to convert as little or as much of its Metropolitan Bibliographic Centre Union Catalogue as
seems to be necessary for the first stage of development. The University of Toronto has on magnetic tape the data for some 35,000 book items catalogued for the libraries of the New Universities of Ontario.

Documentation

Other kinds of material, however, can be placed in the computer catalogue. The National Research Council Library began, in 1962, the mechanical listing of more than 10,000 serial titles on IBM punch cards. This material could become the basis for a documentation phase of the catalogue of particular interest to research libraries.

Very soon (if not already) it should be possible to purchase for about $1000 each, copies of the magnetic tapes used for storing a complete year’s cumulation of *Index Medicus* produced under the MEDLARS project of the U.S. National Library of Medicine. Other computer input will become available under the U.S. programme for establishment of some dozen specialized science information centres throughout the United States. Recently the U.S. Federal Urban Renewal agency granted a third of a million dollars to the City University of New York for testing a system of storing and retrieving bibliographic references to published materials used by urban renewal and planning specialists. A group of Toronto librarians is maintaining liaison with this URBANDOC reference service in the expectation that it will eventually be able to make computer tapes available to community information centres and their governments throughout the Province.

Therefore, a fuller definition of the Bibliographic Bank for Ontario would take into consideration the documentation possibilities of the computerized catalogue. The technical probabilities of incorporating such an aspect into the computer store remain to be explored, and the costs of converting a variety of materials to a pre-determined and acceptable form of input would become a legitimate and necessary part of a pilot project for the entire proposal.

An Immediate Necessity

It is belabouring the obvious to point out the chain-reaction proportions of the expansion of both knowledge and the information needs of students and researchers inside and outside the academic institutions. The designing of such an information centre would render an incalculable service to all who engage in research through university and special libraries, and would in no way clash with any existing institution.

The Metropolitan Bibliographic Centre in the Toronto Public Library, but one example, is receiving upwards of 20,000 requests for information per year (1965) and this is increasing annually at a currently-estimated rate of 25%. These are requests for book information only; and the Library is being forced to consider what it must do to cope with this volume. It would welcome the capability of tapping a store of information varied in nature and intermediate between itself and the National Library. In any case, this Library will soon begin to extend its
activity of placing in punched cards (or paper tape from its automatic typewriter) all newly-acquired book data, convinced that an information centre of the kind proposed on one level or another, on one scale or another, already a necessity, is the only possible solution to the needs of the researcher in science, medicine, the social sciences, and various other special areas of study.

A Cataloguing Project

In discussing the book-information store of the central machine catalogue, as the experience of individual libraries has already revealed, the application of data processing methods to bibliographic control cannot be approached with the intention of cutting corners in cataloguing. It is accepted among computer experts that the quality of the output is determined by the quality of the input, a dictum which in other language has long been familiar to and easily accepted by library cataloguers.

The successful operation of a computerized catalogue must rest mainly upon the imposition of cataloguing rules on all contributions of bibliographic data received at the central catalogue. It would be expected that a large number of libraries engaging in the exchange would present the central catalogue with a considerable variety of cataloguing practice. At least three libraries in Ontario already have much experience with this matter of rendering uniform the catalogue cards sent in from outlying libraries. One of these three is the National Library in Ottawa; the other two are the University of Toronto Library and the Toronto Public Library. (Information as to which of these three is compelled to do the most editing to a predetermined form is not immediately available nor at the moment absolutely necessary. Some so-called “educated” guesses suggest that the National Library meets the widest variety of cataloguing practice, the University of Toronto Library the least amount since its contributing libraries are all within the academic complex.)

It is obvious that one of the first factors governing the costs of a bibliographic exchange, then, will be the scope of the cataloguing activities necessary to the preparation of the input for the computer’s memory. Any pilot project aimed, therefore, at determining the final system and its costs would very likely have to begin with a study of the union catalogues already in operation, with the following objectives:

1. to find the minimum and the maximum usable entry offered across the whole range of libraries now contributing to union catalogues,
2. to ascertain the optimum entry for each of several elaborations of systems possible for the machine catalogue,
3. to determine the man hours per 1000 entries necessary to the preparation of bibliographic data before it is sent to the processors for input,
4. to estimate the necessary configurations of personnel for cataloguing under each of several possible elaborations of system, and
5. to determine by analysis of present use of union catalogues the complexity of use and demand which may be expected to be satisfied by the
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bibliographic bank, and upon the resulting criteria to determine the final scope of the system design.

It is admitted, of course, that many libraries have engaged in cataloguing for adaptation to computers. To date the only one in Canada that has covered the whole range of subjects of study is the University of Toronto Ontario New Universities Libraries Project. The whole of this cataloguing project now enjoys the fullest approval of the Library of Congress project planners, and must for its very high standards serve as model and leader to other libraries expecting to computerize their catalogues. This project was carried out under the most rigid controls and within carefully-circumscribed limits and was not, to our knowledge, dealing with the problems of union cataloguing; nevertheless, a computerized union catalogue would have to give it the closest attention with regard to usefulness of format and economy of bibliographic control.

Other Cataloguing Considerations

The relevance of studying the complexity of use and demand to be experienced by a central machine catalogue serving a variety of libraries will gain emphasis from a fuller consideration of the assumption that lies behind the fifth-named objective of a pilot project, i.e. that the usefulness of the catalogue will be directly related to the complexity of response that the catalogue is capable of making to any one request, and also from the realization that the amount of cataloguing necessary for any book will affect the amount of programming necessary and the size of staff required to prepare, under direction of processors and programmers, the acceptable form of input.

If the system finally proposed is expected to yield, in response to a given title, only author, location, and a classification number, or, in response to a known author, just the titles, locations, and classification numbers of the titles printed out, then the amount of cataloguing and the amount of data processing will be relatively small.

If the only subject indexing placed in the computer is a classification number, then concrete difficulties will arise, when the size of the store is very large, in making it possible for anyone to retrieve from the catalogue the titles held there under any one classification number. The great length of such a list under some class numbers would make it a prohibitive operation, and the use of such a lengthy printout would be questionable.

Consideration, then, will have to be given to how useful the inclusion of a class number in the stored data would be. To the large libraries, which are under pressure of many researchers, the value of the class number would be little enough. The small public or special library wanting to use the catalogue might very well disagree with the class number given in the response, and for quite good local reasons. In practice, then, the number of enquirers seeking a class number might very well turn out to be few.
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This is but one example of the kind of question which will have to be answered, probably, as in this case on a value-for-expense basis, from a consultation between cataloguers and systems engineers.

With regard to the cataloguing procedures involved, one or two suggestions have been received that may simplify the picture. For example, many libraries follow the practice of having their cataloguers make out worksheets for each book catalogued. The forwarding of a carbon copy of this worksheet to the central catalogue would require little extra effort at small expense to the contributing library. Since this worksheet is the format of information most easily followed by card-punch-machine operators, this suggestion would seem quite reasonable. The second suggestion is more intimately related to costs in an as yet incalculable degree: once the worksheets were received at the central catalogue, inquiry could be made there into the computer whether that information were already in storage; but even more simply, inquiry could be made by the local library through its enquiry console, and in the event of a negative response, the work sheet could then be forwarded to the central catalogue.

No matter how minimal the amount of input, however, the necessity for maintaining some cataloguing staff at the central machine catalogue will never disappear. Granting that the console enquiry unit at the local library may be used on a scheduled basis for a controlled amount of updating of information in the store, still its correction or verification will be necessary, and this activity will have to be scheduled among the central staff.

**Scale of Complexity in the System’s Design**

It is not the intention of this memorandum to attempt the design of the system. Certain possibilities or degrees of elaborateness appear, however, all affecting the scope of the cataloguing part of the exchange and the data processing activities. At one end of the scale of both size of staff and expense is the least-elaborate concept of a machine catalogue that will yield author, title, and location. And it may well turn out that the cooperating institutions would consider this quite adequate for their purposes. The Yale-Harvard-Columbia cooperative effort in the field of medical information reports that fewer than 20% of the enquiries made of their separate card catalogues used a subject approach to the information. This did not prevent them, however, from incorporating subject indexing in their computer catalogue to an average of three subject headings per title with the expectancy of increasing the average as the system developed. This full-scale cataloguing is at the extreme other end on the scale of size and expense, and, as a rough rule-of-thumb measurement, may be fully expected to triple these two characteristics over what would be necessary under the least elaborate concept. The various possibilities seem to resolve themselves into the following.
Possible Systems

(1) Simple input of author-title-location.

(2) Author-title-location together with a limited amount of other bibliographic data such as publisher and publication date or latest copyright date, as input; output would be similar, and would be of more use to smaller libraries for verification of data in their own catalogues than to the largest libraries which probably already possess this information.

(3) Author-title-location with full catalogue entry conformable to Library of Congress entry or British National Bibliography form, fully retrievable by enquiry under title.

(4) Full-scale cataloguing to the standards now being used by the completely organized large-library catalogue departments, incorporating indexing to an average of three or more subject headings per title.

(5) Any one of the foregoing, plus documentation inputs.

Hardware

Probably the most stable element in the entire scheme as far as costs are concerned is that of the data-processing equipment. It is realized that there are variations in prices from one company or manufacturer to another. Still, it is not likely that these differences are anywhere nearly so great as are possible in other aspects of the proposal. It is assumed that only the most powerful data-processing equipment available from any of the major manufacturers is applicable to the design of the central computer store: that is, a central processing unit of the random access type, which will make possible the enquiry-response process, and which is almost unlimited in its capacity to store and randomly select the information sought by the user.

A General Picture of Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment (IBM)</th>
<th>Central processing unit</th>
<th>Data Cell</th>
<th>Disk Storage</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Reader</th>
<th>2nd Inquiry Terminal</th>
<th>Total rental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,920.00 per month</td>
<td>3,235.00</td>
<td>665.00</td>
<td>1,010.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td>$9,295.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each additional remote terminal to cost $165.00 per month.

Cable costs to be determined. Certain other local arrangements show cable costs for 15-20 miles at about $40.00 per month, but based on a sliding scale downward proportionate to the increase in distance. With addition of remote terminals the size of the central processing unit would double at a per-month cost of $1,040.00.

Total equipment rental per month, exclusive of line charges: $10,335.00
**Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary per month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Processor, Programmer</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key-punch operators (3)</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloguers (3)</td>
<td>$1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Assistants (5)</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total professional and clerical staff: $5,750.00 per month

Total equipment and staff per month: $16,085.00

This general estimate of costs is based on the assumption of the least elaborately devised system, includes no maintenance costs, and makes no attempt to describe the increase of costs as the central catalogue increases in size and complexity, with the inclusion of those materials which would be considered part of the documentation store.

**Pilot Project**

Given terms of reference based upon the objectives as listed, it is estimated that one systems engineer working together with two head cataloguers and one reference librarian could in a period of one month meet the objectives given. They would presumably be concerned mainly with the operations of one union catalogue, possibly two, would attempt to determine what pressure of demand would be placed on the bibliographic exchange and the number of libraries that would make up the network in its initial stages, and recommend the scope of the design to be undertaken by systems designers. Total salaries and expenses for this group would amount to $7,500-$8,000.

---

**Further Observations on the Use of LC Classification**

**Daniel Gore, Assistant Librarian**

*Asheville-Biltmore College*

*Asheville, N. C.*

**In a paper** entitled "Some Random Thoughts on the Cost of Classification," *(LRTS, Summer 1965)* Mathilda O'Bryant questions certain arguments which I advanced in favor of the LC classification system in a paper entitled "A Neglected Topic: The Cost of Classification," appearing in the *Library Journal* of June 1, 1964. My principal argument was that, from an economic standpoint, LC should be the system of choice for most American libraries, since to classify by

*Volume 10, Number 4, Fall 1966*
LC a book that has previously been cataloged and classified by LC would cost only a penny, whereas the cost of classifying the same book by Dewey would be about thirty-five cents. Projecting this differential of thirty-four cents a book for a library of a million books, I noted that the savings with LC would be in the range of $340,000.

I assumed (perhaps wrongly) that it would be understood that this figure was applicable only to a million-book library in which every one of those books had been cataloged and classified by LC; if none of them had been, the savings might be nil. The illustration was of an ideal, not a real situation, since I have no way of knowing what the real situation will be in any particular library. The maximum savings under ideal circumstances in a library of a million titles is $340,000; the minimum in a real situation, as Mrs. O'Bryant observes, may be as low as $150,000.

Had I stated the case more cautiously, as I should have done, I would have omitted the illustration altogether and declared, instead, that the savings one might expect from the use of LC classification could be computed by multiplying the total number of books acquired by thirty-four cents, and further multiplying this sum by the percentage of suitable LC cataloging available for the books acquired. To anyone who was misled by my illustration, I send along my mea culpa; I also thank Mrs. O'Bryant for calling attention to the idealistic character of the illustration.

In view of the recent acceleration in LC's cataloging activity, the percentage of LC cataloging available will increase sharply in all libraries, and in many, if not most, college and public libraries will approach the ideal of a hundred percent; and the day may not be too distant when the percentage in a general collection of a million books will not fall far short of the ideal. Administrators of the many new libraries which are springing up around the country would therefore be well advised to adopt LC rather than Dewey for their collections, since by so doing they can immediately reap impressive economic benefits for their libraries. The choice for them is a simple and clear-cut one, but it is less so for the directors of the older libraries with large collections; for if they wish to adopt LC, they must decide whether to reclassify completely, or in part, or to leave the existing collection unchanged and begin using LC for all new acquisitions. Whatever they choose to do, they can take comfort in the certain knowledge that they will eventually recover the cost of any reclassification they undertake by virtue of the substantially lower cost of using LC.

Mrs. O'Bryant raises various objections to my claim that LC call numbers can generally be accepted for use in the local library exactly as they appear on a printed card. First, she states that departmental libraries on a university campus may decide to reject whole sections of the LC classification: the chemistry library may spur all numbers in class T, and the engineering library may forbid numbers in class Q. To do this would admittedly raise the cost of classifying these libraries; but before it is done, the director of these libraries should require solid economic justification for the proposed departures from LC. At that point
the changes would probably be abandoned. This is not to say that special organizational situations can never justify departures from LC, for they may. But before any proposals for wholesale departures are adopted, the administration should first scrutinize them under the cold light of cost-effectiveness to ensure that the desired results will be worth the additional expense required to obtain them.

What is the classifier to do when graduate students and faculty come to him with preferences for the classification of individual books that are at variance with the decision reached at LC? Mrs. O'Bryant implies that the classifier should accommodate their wishes by accepting their advice and departing from LC, a position that calls to mind the story of the old man, his son, the donkey, and the conflicting advice of the passersby along the road. But the classifier is happily better situated than the old man to defend himself against good advice, for he can promptly advise his adviser to take the matter up with somebody else, namely the director of the library, who will be at least on an equal footing with the adviser, and can explain to him politely but emphatically that classification is an authoritarian, not a democratic process; that what might please his adviser would be certain to bother other advisers; and that any attempt to please everyone would only lead to perpetual confusion, exceedingly high costs, and, in the end, intense and widespread dissatisfaction. When the problem has arisen in our library, we have found that reasoning and resoluteness soon settled it. When an outright blunder in classification is detected and brought to our attention (this has happened once in the last two years), we make the necessary correction, but otherwise we have made no changes and will make none, and no one has been offended by our position. Once you have made up your mind to ride the donkey yourself, and let it be known, the passersby will keep their advice to themselves and grant you unobstructed passage.

As to the problems of series classification that Mrs. O'Bryant raises, we have found them to be of no consequence whatever. We scatter nearly all our series, and LC often scatters them too. But even when LC classes together, and we choose to scatter, LC may give in addition to the series call number a monograph call number as well, and the result has been that on account of the series situation, we have had to devise call numbers locally for something like three books in a thousand.

To reclassify novels that LC has placed in class PZ would indeed, as Mrs. O'Bryant suggests, cost money, and some libraries do reclassify because of their dissatisfaction with the PZ class, which from certain points of view is unsatisfactory, although it is far from being wholly without merit. But PZ does not have to be reclassified, and we do not do it, because we do not believe that any benefits we might gain would justify the costs involved.

I stated in my paper on classification that temporary shelflist entries were unnecessary when LC was used, because each call number taken from an LC card was unique and duplication was therefore impossible. But of course some numbers will be assigned locally in any library, and, as Mrs. O'Bryant points out, there is always the possibility that the num-
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ber you assigned locally today may be duplicated by an LC number to-
morrow, unless you have made your temporary entries. Not only would
you have to make temporary entries, you would also have to check every
printed LC number against the shelflist before assigning it to a book, to
ensure that it did not duplicate a number that had been locally devised.
This elaborate process would undoubtedly raise the avowed one-cent cost
of classification appreciably, but it is a process that we do not employ at
Asheville-Biltmore College. Our solution to the problem is this: whenever
you assign a call number locally, add to it some element that an LC
number never contains, and voilà! you have a number that LC will never
duplicate. The element we add is a lower-case “x” at the end of the call
number, thus: PR3481.P7x. Since LC cannot duplicate a number such as
this, we have no need of temporary shelflist entries and therefore never
make them. Nor do we routinely check the shelflist as part of the classifi-
cation process, since, again, duplication of numbers is impossible.

While we are discussing the form of LC call numbers, I would like
to digress from the issues that Mrs. O’Bryant has raised to consider
certain practical problems of call-number form which will be en-
countered by any library that adopts the LC system. Here is a typical
LC number as it might appear at the bottom of a printed card:
PS3505.A87Z58. Because the number is too long to be written out in
one line either on the spine of a book or in the upper-left hand margin
of a catalog card, it must be broken up into smaller units. At the Li-
brary of Congress, the number would appear thus on catalog cards:

PS3505
.A87Z58

and I imagine that many other libraries that use LC have adopted this
form also.* But we have found it expedient to break the number down
into even smaller elements, since the number of digits on one line
is still too large for us to type call-number labels with a bulletin type-
writer, as we prefer to do. We would therefore arrange the number
like this:

PS
3505
A8.7
Z5.8

We also have the impression that the number in this form is somewhat
easier to read, but this is merely an impression.

There is the further problem of the location of the decimal point
which nearly always appears in an LC call number. (A student of mine
unwittingly spoke the truth on a quiz when he stated that our library
employs the “Library of Congress Decimal System.”) The point that is
placed in the first example (above) before the letter A is intended to
signify that both the numbers which follow (87 and 58) are to be regarded
as decimals for purposes of shelf arrangement. Thus PS3505.A87Z58
would shelve before PS3505.A9, since .87 is decimaly smaller than .9. Now

* LC would arrange the same number thus on the spine of a book:

PS
3505
.A87Z58
the decimal point in the form that LC uses it is, as you see, a little peculiar, coming as it does before a letter rather than a number; but it no doubt works well enough in a closed-stack collection where the pages can be taught exactly what its meaning is. In an open-stack collection, however, the decimal in this unusual position would probably be meaningless to most readers, and could lead to some real difficulties in the finding of books. So we considered placing the decimal between the letter and the number, thus: PS
3505
A.87
Z.58
But this position also seemed potentially misleading, since the point might as well be construed to be a period after the letter A as a decimal before the number 87. Our next solution to the problem, which for a time we actually adopted, though we later gave it up, was to omit the decimal altogether and simply tell our students that any numbers they found on the third and fourth lines of a call number were to be regarded as decimals even though no decimal point was to be seen. The folly of this solution was brought home to us when we learned from quizzes given in our bibliography course that some students had become thoroughly confused and thought that it was the first line of numbers (3505 in the example above) that was to be regarded as a decimal (which it is not) and that the others were whole numbers (which they are not). We finally hit on the proper way out of this predicament, which is to place the decimal point after the first digit on the third line (and the first digit on the fourth line if there is one) of the call number, where its meaning is unmistakable. If the number on the third or fourth line has only one digit, then the decimal point is omitted and the number stands as a whole number. Here is a sample array of call numbers illustrating the principles of sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>PQ</th>
<th>PQ</th>
<th>PQ</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2603</td>
<td>2603</td>
<td>2603</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>B4.8</td>
<td>E5.875</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>M5.5</td>
<td>M5.5x</td>
<td>M6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>B6.3</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To return now to Mrs. O'Bryant's reservations about our penny classification process, we have brought the cost down still lower since my paper on the subject was published by turning over all the routine classification procedures (and about 98% of them are routine) to clerks, who, incidentally, handle all our routine cataloging and order work too. Professional involvement in the classification process now occurs only when books are received which do not have a satisfactory call number, but such books are rare in our library, as I suspect they would be in most other college libraries too.

Since Mrs. O'Bryant's strictures are likely to give administrators the dismay ing impression that the practical use of LC classification must inevitably lead to complications as troublesome as those associated with Dewey, let me emphasize that the process of using LC can be so simple
that clerks can be taught to do the job when LC cataloging is available. But with very little ingenuity one could, in the local situation, introduce so many modifications to LC practice that the cost of using LC would equal the cost of using Dewey, and might even exceed it. The point is that the administration can drastically reduce the cost of classification if it adopts LC and then insists that economically-sensible use be made of it. But if the administration is not prepared to stop its ears to the siren song of “Let’s improve LC,” then it might as well forget about trying to save any money by using it. For a good thing misused is no better than a bad one well used.

Mrs. O’Bryant touches the very heart of the matter when she states that “there will be many times when a classifier will have to make a decision on the wisdom of following the LC number.” This implies that a classifier should carefully consider every call-number assignment that LC makes, and then decide whether some modification is required. To do this would of course send the cost of classification sky-high. The director of a library using LC must therefore decide on the wisdom of paying a classifier to exercise his wisdom in appraising the wisdom of the classifiers who assign the numbers at the Library of Congress. Knowing the gross imperfections inherent in any system of book classification, whenever devised or however applied, I am unwilling to pay the price of adding a local classifier’s wisdom to the wisdom of the classifier at the Library of Congress in the pursuit of an unattainable perfection. Even setting aside the question of cost, systematic modification of LC decisions may be undesirable, for unless the local classifier has the comprehensive mind of a Bacon, and the foresight of a Cassandra, the changes he makes may prove in the long run to be defects rather than improvements. For these reasons, whenever an LC number is available for the book in hand (and in our library it nearly always is), our clerk accepts it without reflection or criticism, writes the number on the fly-leaf of the book, and the classification process is completed at a cost of something less than a penny.

Mrs. O’Bryant states that there are other reasons than cost that should also attract libraries to the LC system, and we are in complete agreement on this point. But those reasons cannot be stated with the same persuasiveness as the cost argument, which in my opinion is decisive. “To the mind, as to the eye,” Dr. Johnson says somewhere, “it is difficult to compare objects vast in their extent and various in their parts.” To compare the LC and Dewey systems in all their ramifications of structure and use would require a book of tedious length and intricacy, and anyone who had the patience to read it might come away wearier but no wiser. Each system has its merits and its defects, and I believe that LC has far more merits and far fewer defects than Dewey; but to prove this might be as difficult as to prove that Bach was a more profound composer than Handel. Hence my willingness to let the case for LC rest on the cost argument alone.
As outgoing chairman of the Council of Regional Groups, I take this opportunity to thank all of the officers of the various regional groups for the fine spirit of cooperation which they have shown in reporting their news and business to the RTSD Executive Secretary and to me. I have found the discussion meetings at the summer conferences particularly stimulating, and my only regret over them is that too few groups are able to be represented. The meeting at the New York Conference was a typical one: there were only ten of us there, but the lively discussion of ideas for programs more than made up for the small size of the group.

It gives me great pleasure, as one of my final official acts, to welcome a newly-organized regional group. The Tennessee Technical Services Librarians were affiliated with the Resources and Technical Services Division at the latter's membership meeting during the New York Conference. Elizabeth S. Greer (Joint University Libraries, Nashville) is the first chairman of this group.

The Council of Regional Groups luncheon, a traditional event at ALA conferences, was attended by about forty members and guests in New York. As usual, it was a very informal affair with no program.

Regional group meetings held recently include:

The Northern California Technical Processes Group met at the Davis campus of the University of California during the Clinic on Library Applications of Systems Analysis and Data Processing, among whose speakers were Robert Hayes, Ralph Shoffner, Gerald Newton, and Kelley Cartwright, all of the University of California, and Theodore Philips of the IBM Corporation. The two-day meeting covered history and principles as well as such specific topics as flow charting, work measurement, and costs of computer applications to library operations.

The Southern California Technical Processes Group, at their Los Angeles meeting heard Seymour Lubetzky (University of California at Los Angeles) comment on the cataloging code revision.

The Resources and Technical Services Section of the Connecticut Library Association met in Hartford. F. Bernice Field (Yale University Library) spoke to the group on the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules and its implications for librarians.

The Technical Services Roundtable of the Florida Library Association held their meeting in Clearwater. Benjamin A. Custer (Library of
Congress) discussed the history of the Dewey Decimal Classification, with emphasis on the current 17th edition.

Mr. Custer also spoke, at a recent meeting of the Kansas Library Association, to a joint session of the Resources and Technical Services Section, the College and Reference Section, and the Special Libraries Section. After his prepared paper Mr. Custer answered many questions on the use of the Dewey Decimal Classification and on the relative merits of it and the Library of Congress Classification.

The New England Technical Services Librarians met at the Worcester, Mass., Public Library. Following tours of this recently-completed building, the group heard five members of the Boston University Library staff (Gustave A. Harrer, Charles McIsaacs, Barbara A. Gates, Dorothy Ladd, and David O. Lane) discuss aspects of planning a new library building, with the plans for Boston University's new building as examples.

The Technical Services Section of the New Jersey Library Association held its biennial meeting in Winston-Salem. The program, jointly sponsored with the Public Libraries Section, consisted of a paper by C. Dake Gull (Indiana University Library School) on “Recent Trends Toward Automation in Library Technical Services.” Mr. Gull described automated activities in several libraries and cautioned that librarians in technical services must prepare themselves to accept and use automation in the near future.

The Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians, meeting in Lorain, heard a panel discussion on “Organization of Technical Services.” The panel members were Sidney L. Jackson (Kent State University), moderator; Raymond B. Collins (Cuyahoga County Public Library), J. McRee Elrod (Ohio Wesleyan University), and Phyllis A. Richmond (Western Reserve University School of Library Science).


The newly-affiliated group, the Tennessee Technical Services Librarians, met in Chattanooga. Elizabeth Rodell (American Library Association) spoke on “Technical Services as Seen from ALA,” emphasizing the changing environment of present-day technical services and the need for intelligence and insight as well as active participation on the national and local level.
REVIEWS

(Editor's note: Reviews published in this magazine have a deliberately-chosen viewpoint. That is, reviewers are asked to consider publications primarily on the basis of their meaning and contribution to the areas of our interest: the building of library collections and the absorption, care, and control of the materials comprising the collections.)


The Rutgers series was designed with the object of getting authoritative and thorough descriptions of different indexing systems, each articulated to a common pattern to facilitate comparison. John Metcalfe has stuck to his brief reasonably well; but the 72-page chapter, "Historical background," seems disproportionate, even though in fact it contains a good deal of scattered discussion of current developments.

Alphabetical indexing ("indication") is treated in its various applications—the traditional A/Z subject catalog, the A/Z index which complements a classified index, and A/Z indexes which incorporate a certain degree of "classified" control in their heading and reference structure—from Kaiser and Chemical Abstracts to the British Technology Index.

The A/Z subject catalog (or index—Mr. Metcalfe sensibly treats the terms as virtually synonymous) is one of two major forms of pre-coordinate ("conventional") index. It has far more in common with the other major form—the classified catalog—than either has with a post-coordinate index, despite Mr. Metcalfe's astonishing remark to the contrary (p. 14).

How should a comprehensive survey analyze and appraise? Because this reviewer finds Mr. Metcalfe's presentation somewhat jumbled, he will try to appraise Mr. Metcalfe's analysis in as systematic a framework as possible.

To begin at the root—a question being posed—a good index should allow a subject (a search prescription) to be readily located. Mr. Metcalfe describes the A/Z catalog nicely as "known names in a known order" and points out accurately (p. 131) that "the starting point in any information retrieval is a common usage subject name." This reflects a basic two-fold problem—the order of elements in a heading (the name) and the order of headings in a file (the order). In Cutter's day, life was probably no simpler than now, but the subjects of documents were, by and large. Subjects like French painting and the Birds of Sussex did represent "known names" to a fair degree and could be located with fair ease; yet already the "known name" was raising problems as to which part of it came first in the heading. But a document on "Prevention of concrete abrasion by coating with magnesium" begins to make the principle less clear. A "known name," to be any good in an index, must be known in its right order—it is no good looking under Concrete if the chosen form of heading begins with Magnesium, or Coatings, or Abrasion. The problem of "citation order" (of the elements in a heading) is upon us.

Mr. Metcalfe displays a strong inclination to dismiss this very important problem. He refers (p. 102) to "an order fairly easily applied intuitively, but not easily defined" and suggests that "unnecessary difficulty seems to be introduced." He lets the Library of Congress off very lightly for the inconsistencies in its headings and thinks that even his hero, Kaiser, "went too
far” in his distinguishing of concretes and processes. But to say (p. 17) that “short and distinctive names for new subjects emerge . . .” misses half the point, which is that most subjects contain more than names of things. And what about such emerging monstrosities as the “nominal compounds” of technical writing, like “Nozzle gas ejection ship attitude control system”? And this is only an “object,” as Metcalfe would say, and may have “aspects” to follow.

The “known order” is, like the “known names,” somewhat deceptive. We all know what value to place on the layman’s judgment of “easy as ABC”; when we are searching an “alphabetical” file as large and as incrusted with “groups” as the Library of Congress catalog, the notion of a “known order” seems to get lost. Mr. Metcalfe justly criticizes this last—but still seems to waver between a preference for grouped orders and the undoubtedly more alphabetical straight sequence, as in the British Technology Index.

Locating a subject is one thing. Locating with precision is another. Two major parameters determine the performance of an index as to its recall and precision—exhaustivity and specificity. The former is not the concern of the index language (which is what this book deals with), but the latter is; precision depends on specificity in index descriptions.

According to Mr. Metcalfe, specificity applies only to the “objects” in a document’s subject, not to the subject of the document as a whole. So a document on “Bleaching of cotton by hydrogen peroxide” would be indexed specifically by two separate entries, one under Cotton (or Cotton—Bleaching) and one under Hydrogen peroxide. So long as the objects appear in their direct and specific form (not using, for example, Textiles instead of Cotton) we have “specific entry.”

Defending this view, Mr. Metcalfe devotes much time arguing just what Cutter meant by “specific entry” (but did not say). But the central point is that a pre-coordinate catalog can only achieve precision if it provides precise headings; and to most indexers this is what a specific heading is—one which precisely describes the dominant theme of the document as a whole. The breaking up of the exact subject description of a document into several broader ones, which is standard American practice, may have a number of advantages, but its implications for precision in searching are virtually ignored by Mr. Metcalfe.

Once a class is located in an index, the results may not satisfy us, and our class must be adjusted—expanded if we find too little (recall is low), or contracted if we find too much (precision is low). This process of adjustment is aided by juxtaposition (moving, say, from Concrete—Abrasion to Concrete—Aggregates) and by syndesis (cross references). Mr. Metcalfe has little to say of either and notably refrains from discussing the difficult theoretical problem of related terms other than those reflecting pure generic relations (the “RTs” of our new subject heading lists, the Thesauri). There is nothing here to match the analysis of the Library of Congress syndetic structure found in Coates, say.

The major drawback of any pre-coordinate index is the relative clumsiness (compared with a post-coordinate system) with which it handles the problem of multiple access—of getting enquirers to the relevant headings no matter from what aspect they approach the subject. Mr. Metcalfe discusses the various tactics used at some length. He considers the three main methods: (1) single entry, under a heading coextensive with the subject of the document as a whole, supplemented by references from each of the “distributed relatives” (the terms not appearing first); few A/Z catalogs demonstrate this, the British Technology Index being a prominent exception; (2) multiple
entry with coextensive heading, permuted to give different citation orders —this is typical of the classified section of a UDC file, but not of its A/Z section; (g) multiple entry, with non-specific headings. The last is the form favored by most American A/Z catalogs—and by Mr. Metcalfe.

The convenience of the latter is stressed by Mr. Metcalfe—but he nowhere acknowledges that it is inferior to the second in its power for precision and seems singularly indifferent to the fact. It was left to Mr. Cleverdon, in the panel discussion, to make the useful point that questions are rarely coextensive with particular documents, only with parts of them, and that the partial headings are to this extent justifiable.

There are many points on which Mr. Metcalfe's comments display, to this reviewer's mind, a regrettable looseness of thinking or inaccuracy of observation. To take a few examples only: his description of Coates' comprehensive analysis of subject catalog structure as "mainly an exposition of chain procedure," and his assertion that the British Standards Institution's Guide to the Universal Decimal Classification "converts it to single entry and chain procedure" are absurdly inaccurate.

In his treatment of chain indexing, Mr. Metcalfe does not give enough weight to the closeness of the complementary relation between the alphabetical references and the classified sequence in which the latter strongly affects the former, and must do so. This shows, for example (p. 74) in his strange inability to see that alphabetical juxtaposition indicates connections between topics not indicated by the systematic juxtaposition, or his inability to see the quite different qualities implied by saying that chain procedure is both economical and mechanical.

His reference (p. 33) to subheadings as being "only" to break up numerous entries under a heading makes one wonder what he thinks indexing is about if it isn't about breaking up information into smaller and more easily scanned classes than "Universe of Knowledge." His description (p. 16) of classified arrangement as reflecting a "universal code of notation" when it is in the first place an arrangement by concepts (as against the verbal forms of an A/Z index) is careless.

Perhaps it was his annoyance (justifiable to some extent) at the more foolish claims of enthusiasts that classification "brings all related concepts together" that led him to say (p. 105) that "all information can be together in alphabetic indication, it is scattered in classified indication"—but it is quite untrue.

Many of Mr. Metcalfe's observations on practical points and on the relations with machine potentialities are sensible. But one wishes the style in which all this—the good and the bad—is presented were less tortuous. For example, it is not easy to dig out the sense of a passage like this on p. 36 (where Mr. Metcalfe, after all his song and dance about the use of the term "specific," admits his doubts about headings which are not coextensive with the document or item): "Item specification such as Cotton—Bleaching—Hydrogen peroxide as a rule, and entry under it and entry or indexing or cross-reference under permutations, may be considered to be better and may supersede specific entry, but it is not specific entry."—Jack Mills, Department of Librarianship, North-Western Polytechnic, London.


Faceted classifications may never become operationally popular with American libraries, but the principles
underlying them (this word "them" must be emphasized, since there is no single Faceted Classification) should certainly become better known by American librarians. The faceted classifications offer valuable standards of comparison—for those who have eyes to see—but for this sight to be developed, the principles of the original analytico-synthetic (=proto-faceted) classification, Ranganathan’s Colon Classification, will have to have been assimilated. The multifold errors of the Dewey Classification or of the Library of Congress Classification, accepted either with chagrin or with bland unconsciousness by the vast majority of American librarians, can begin to be revolted against in a mature way only when there is awareness, in larger numbers of these librarians, of principles capable of redressing these grievances.

Few of our library schools educate in classification; they, at the very best, train. So that our graduate librarians have, for the great part, no grasp of any general principles in classification, such as Ranganathan’s works can give; and without the guidance of professors acquainted with this school of thought and terminology, these works will make little impression. Introductory works are, accordingly, desperately called for. It would seem that the volumes of the Rutgers Series would be appropriate vehicles for such introduction, though we cannot of course be sure a priori that they will not be amalgams of theorization and corrosive criticism. The volume in hand is, somehow, neither: it is not a theoretical treatment in language more easily understood by American librarians—though to be sure Vickery and the other C R G members have developed a less difficult vocabulary than Ranganathan’s own—nor is it an introductory lecture plus discussions,* nor is it a thoroughgoing practical treatise.

And yet Faceted Classification Schemes is an introduction of a sort; it does show the generalized features of typical faceted classifications, and does so in a way that the uninitiate can follow, but without attempting to be philosophically presuppositionless. The style, in other words, and the ideas, are all such that American librarians could hope to find some means here of mature criticism of their current tools of the strategization of their task of storage and retrieval of information via surrogates; but while this is true, it must be admitted that in comparison with his own work, Faceted Classification; a Guide (London, Aslib, 1960), to the relevant sections of Jack Mills’ Modern Outline of Library Classification (London, Chapman & Hall, 1960), or, ultimately, to Ranganathan’s Prolegomena to Library Classification (London, Library Association, 1957), Vickery’s present work is a very thin one indeed.—Jean M. Perreault, Lecturer, School of Library and Information Services, University of Maryland, College Park.

* The event itself was such, of course, but the printed book scarcely reflects the fact; cf. my longer review in American Documentation.
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SCHOLARSHIPS AVAILABLE AT GLS

The University of Chicago Graduate Library School will offer approximately thirty scholarships and fellowships for 1967-68, in amounts up to $6,700. Included are six pre-doctoral and two post-doctoral training stipends ($2,400 and $6,500, respectively, tuition-free) for medical librarianship. Application deadline for scholarships and fellowships is January 15, 1967. A number of research assistantships will also be offered; these are on a half time (20 hours per week) basis and are compensated at an hourly rate depending on the qualifications of the student. Applications for the latter will be considered at all times during the year. Address inquiries to: Dean, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, 1116 East 59th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637.
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NEW  • Our 27 page list of “RECOMMENDED PAPERBACKS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS”

• Bowker’s PAPERBOUND BOOK GUIDE FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

• Bowker’s PAPERBOUND BOOK GUIDE FOR COLLEGES

• Our circular: “One Source for Paperbacks” (lists publishers whose books we stock, time to allow for delivery, quantities needed for discount, etc.)

Now you can obtain in one order inexpensive copies of classics, as well as best-sellers, mysteries, westerns and other popular categories.

PAPERBOUND BOOK DISTRIBUTORS

(A division of Book Mail Service)
82-27 164th Street • Jamaica, New York 11432 • Phone OL 7-4799

Now in our 17th year
THE NILE BASIN
By Sir Richard Francis Burton
With a new Introduction by
Dr. Robert O. Collins
University of California, Santa Barbara

This remarkable document from the annals of African exploration provides an authentic glimpse of the passions and rivalries that raged among travelers seeking the fabled source of the Nile during the nineteenth century. Sir Richard Burton and John Hanning Speke had journeyed throughout Africa together, but had come to different conclusions concerning the river’s source. Speke announced his findings first, infuriating Burton, and then organized an expedition to verify his idea by traveling the length of the Nile. But he failed to follow the river for its entire course, and Burton savagely attacked his findings, proposing instead his own theory. Unable to debate Speke because of the latter’s premature death, he published his attack, together with reviews by James MacQueen intensely critical of Speke, as The Nile Basin.

Professor Robert O. Collins has provided a new introduction setting forth the facts deduced by subsequent exploration and clarifying the true situation behind this strange, twisted book.

195 pages    A reprint of the 1864 edition
Publication: January 1967    $7.50

MUSICAL LETTERS FROM ABROAD
By Lowell Mason
With a new Introduction by
Elwyn A. Wienandt
Baylor University

Lowell Mason was one of the great figures in nineteenth century American music. In Musical Letters from Abroad, he sought to compare European musical practices with those at home. His fresh and delightful letters, describing music festivals and religious services, concerts and singing conventions, place each event in a complete context of local custom, emphasizing street decorations and food prices as well as musical accompaniment. They thus provide an informative picture of mid-nineteenth century European society as well as a comparison of European and American musical practices.

312 pages    Edition of 1854
Publication: January 1967    $7.95
WHAT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT FEATURE OF A MICROFICHE READER?

Image Quality? A dim, fuzzy image makes viewing a strain. Microcard’s Mark IV has a 6-element lens for a clear, sharp image and a rheostatic control balances screen brightness with room light.

Simplicity of Operation? Supervisory duties are time-consuming, but completely unnecessary with the Mark IV. Its precision fiche holder opens and closes automatically, while a single scanning knob controls focusing. Your library patrons can easily operate it without your supervision.

Freedom from Maintenance? Breakdown of vital equipment can be a potential nightmare. The Mark IV needs absolutely no maintenance beyond an occasional light bulb replacement.

Construction and Styling? A microfiche reader need not be bulky and cumbersome. The attractive and durably built Mark IV weighs just 23 lbs. and measures 20” high, 9” wide and 13” deep.

These features are all important . . . and all are present in the MICROCARD® MARK IV

For more information or to arrange a free demonstration, write to:

MICROCARD CORPORATION
DEPT. L10, WEST SALEM, WISCONSIN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Publishing Period</th>
<th>Volume Information</th>
<th>Binding Options</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN MUSICAL MAGAZINE.</td>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td>1786-1787</td>
<td>Vol. 1, nos. 1-12 (all publ.)</td>
<td>Paperbound in contemp. style</td>
<td>$ 9.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHIVES DES MAITRES DE L'ORGUE DES XVIe, XVIIe, XVIIIe SIECLES.</td>
<td>Paris.</td>
<td>1898-1909</td>
<td>Vols. 1-10 (all publ.)</td>
<td>Clothbound</td>
<td>$325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHIE MUSICAL.</td>
<td>Paris.</td>
<td>1872-1874</td>
<td>Nos. 1-14 (all publ.)</td>
<td>Clothbound</td>
<td>$ 56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHIE MUSICALE FRANCAISE.</td>
<td>Paris.</td>
<td>1875-1914</td>
<td>Nos. 1-174 (all publ.)</td>
<td>Clothbound</td>
<td>$710.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHIE MUSICAL.</td>
<td>Paris.</td>
<td>1875-1914</td>
<td>Nos. 1-174 (all publ.)</td>
<td>Clothbound</td>
<td>$710.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONATSHEFTE FUER MUSIKGESCHICHTE.</td>
<td>Leipzig.</td>
<td>1869-1905</td>
<td>Vols. 1-37 and Gen. Ind. I-IV (all publ.)</td>
<td>Clothbound</td>
<td>$790.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVUE MUSIQUE ANCIENNE ET MODERNE.</td>
<td>Rennes.</td>
<td>1856-1926</td>
<td>Nos. 1-12 (all publ.) and supplement “Bulletin de la Revue . . .”; nos. 1-12 (all publ.) Rennes, 1856; (8 vo);</td>
<td>Clothbound in 3 vols.</td>
<td>$ 93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVUE DES MAITRES POUR AIDER A LA RESTAURATION DE LA MUSIQUE SACREE d'apres les principes du Motu Proprio du 22 Novembre 1903.</td>
<td>Nantes.</td>
<td>1902-1923</td>
<td>Nos. 1-77 (Text and Music) all publ.; Nantes, 1920-Jl. 1926; (4to);</td>
<td>Clothbound in 5 vols.</td>
<td>$205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVUE MUSIQUE DE LYON.</td>
<td>Lyons.</td>
<td>1903-Feb. 1912</td>
<td>Vols. 1-9 (all publ.). Lyons, 1903-Feb. 1912; (8vo);</td>
<td>Clothbound in 18 vols.</td>
<td>$465.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.I.M. Revue musicale mensuelle.</td>
<td>Paris.</td>
<td>1905-1914</td>
<td>Vols. 1-10 (all publ.). Paris, 1905-1914; (4to);</td>
<td>Clothbound in 40 vols.</td>
<td>$1240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEITSCHRIFT FUER VERGLEICHENDE MUSIKWISSENSCHAFT.</td>
<td>Berlin.</td>
<td>1933-1935</td>
<td>Vols. 1-3 (all publ.). Berlin, 1933-1935; (4to);</td>
<td>Clothbound</td>
<td>$ 48.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERIODICAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

We guarantee that all standing orders placed with us are renewed with the publishers at least eight weeks prior to expiration.

New subscription orders are processed promptly and accurately.

All claims for missing numbers receive careful attention.

Stechert-Hafner, Inc.
31 EAST 10TH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003

Your Newest, Most Comprehensive Source of Information for Conference Proceedings

The Directory of Published Proceedings is issued monthly by the InterDok Corp. It is by far the most complete and comprehensive source of current information for published proceedings, covering all phases of science, engineering, medicine and technology.

The regular publication year extends from September through the following June. A cumulative annual issue is made available at the beginning of the subsequent publication year.

Volume Two of The Directory Of Published Proceedings is now being published at the subscription rate of $38.00 in the U.S.A., $48.00 elsewhere. The first annual cumulative issue is available separately to subscribers only, at $19.50.

A complimentary review copy of The Directory Of Published Proceedings will be forwarded upon request.

The Directory of Published Proceedings
INTERDOK CORP. • 6 KENNETH ROAD • WHITE PLAINS, N. Y. 10605
WE SPECIALIZE IN YOUR LIBRARY’S NEEDS

NATIONAL RECORD PLAN

- ABSOLUTELY LOWEST PRICES ON RECORDS IN THE U.S.A.

40% OFF ON ALL RECORDS FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC IN THE SCHWANN CATALOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List Price</th>
<th>N.R.P. Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.79-3.98</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.79-4.98</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.79-5.98</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.79-6.98</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
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</table>

SEND FOR FREE
1966 SCHWANN ARTIST ISSUE

- MOST COMPLETE FILL—UNIQUE BACK ORDER SYSTEM (SEARCHING & O.P. SERVICES INCLUDED)

ADDITIONAL FEATURES:

✓ NO MINIMUM PURCHASE REQUIREMENTS
✓ POSTAGE FREE DELIVERY
✓ PROMPT AND EFFICIENT SERVICE
✓ LIBRARIES ON OPEN ACCOUNT FROM VERY FIRST ORDER
✓ STAFF ENJOYS SAME PRIVILEGES—ORDERS, HOWEVER, MUST BE PREPAID

SPECIAL FEATURE
ALL TAPES IN THE HARRISON TAPE CATALOG AT LOWEST PRICES IN USA

For Additional Information & Free Catalogs Write

MR. LEEDS, LIBRARY CO-ORDINATOR
NATIONAL RECORD PLAN, 28 West 25 St., New York, N. Y. 10010
LITERARY AND HISTORICAL DICTIONARIES

A NEW SERIES SELECTED AND REPUBLISHED BY GALE RESEARCH COMPANY

The Literary and Historical Dictionary Series will bring together a group of highly-specialized and important dictionaries published during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries which encompass fictional characters; literary, artistic, political, and religious movements, nicknames and pseudonyms of authors and other personalities; fanciful names of objects, places, and geographical features; battles; etc.

The LHDS titles are being selected to provide today's librarian, researcher, scholar, and student with the primary tools that quickly unlock obscure or forgotten meanings, history, designations, or terminology that relate to the tens of thousands of persons, places, and things encountered in literary and historical writings published through the early 1900's.

Most titles in the series are included in one or more of the standard bibliographies of reference books in each subject area, such as Winchell, Walford, Zischka, and Sonnenschein; others are in lists of basic books for college and public libraries; all are essential to a solid working reference collection in literature, history, political science, sociology, history, and geography.

THE FOLLOWING TITLES ARE EITHER AVAILABLE NOW OR ARE IN PRESS


The Historic Note-Book, with an Appendix of Battles. E. Cobham Brewer. 1895. 997 pages. 13,000 entries. (Winchell, Zischka, Minto, others). $27.50


Sobriquets and Nicknames. Albert R. Frey. 1887. 482 pages. 5,000 entries. (Kennedy, Winchell, others). $14.00

Dictionary of Battles. Thomas Benfield Harbottle. 1905. 354 pages. 1,800 entries. (Kroeger, Zischka, Sonnenschein, others). $8.00


Curiosities of Popular Customs and of Rites, Ceremonies, Observances, and Miscellaneous Antiquities. William S. Walsh. 1898. 1,018 pages. 750 entries. (Winchell, Sonnenschein, others). $27.50

Handy-Book of Literary Curiosities. William S. Walsh. 1892. 1,104 pages. 1,800 main entries; 1,200 other references. (Walford, Winchell, Sonnenschein, others). $28.50

Dictionary of the Noted Names of Fiction, including also Familiar Pseudonyms, Surnames Bestowed on Eminent Men, and Analogous Popular Appellations. William A. Wheeler. 1917. 440 pages. 5,000 entries. (Winchell, Zischka, Sonnenschein, others). $12.00


A Dictionary of Miracles. E. Cobham Brewer. 1884. 618 pages. (Kroeger, Mudge, Walford, others). $31.00

Literary and Historical Dictionary Series Master Index. Being compiled by the Gale Research Company for publication in 1967. Places in one alphabet references to entries in all the volumes listed above and other volumes to be announced later which will be part of the LHDS group. Approximately 100,000 entries.

WRITE FOR DESCRIPTIVE BROCHURE OR ORDER ALL TITLES ON THIRTY-DAY APPROVAL

GALE RESEARCH COMPANY

1400 BOOK TOWER, DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226
YOU CAN HAVE A WELL ROUNDED PRINTING, STORAGE and FILING PROGRAM when you use PERMALIFE, a Thorographic paper by Standard of Richmond. PERMALIFE is acid-free and absolutely dependable. A life of several hundred to a thousand and more years is assured.* Use PERMALIFE with confidence for

- Library Catalog Card Stock
- Envelopes for storage of documents and manuscripts
- File folders for storage of maps and large documents
- Letterheads
- Reprints

PERMALIFE is beautiful in look and feel, and will give true copies by photo offset. PERMALIFE TEXT and PERMALIFE BOND are watermarked for your protection. For permanency use PERMALIFE and be sure.

*According to tests made of PERMALIFE by the W. J. Barrow Research Laboratory. Details upon request.
For Libraries That Want Quality Bookbinding

Glick Bookbinding Corp.

Specialists in the Binding and Rebinding of Books and Periodicals

Serving Institutional, Public And Research Libraries Since 1905

32-15 37th Avenue
Long Island City, New York 11101
784-5300

In Nassau and Suffolk Area Code 516 483-9534

In New Jersey Area Code 201 642-5374