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There they stand, her 17 volumes,
The journals that she edited and gave us.
Through their pages for 17 years she entered
Recurrently, irresistibly, our lives.
For always there, behind the authors,
Behind the articles, the comments and reviews,
We felt her presence, personal, insistent,
A pervading ethos unmistakably hers.

Some editors leave their offspring at the printer’s door,
“You’re on your own now, sink or swim.”
She could not so become detached
But accompanied her charges to the printed page and beyond
With worry, or relish, or content;
Perhaps with worry more than anything—
Worry not for the article but for the subject of the article;
For every issue, each debate, took its toll of her.

So there they stand, her 17 volumes.
For 17 years we felt her presence in them.
In them her presence still will claim its home.

Verner W. Clapp, President
Council on Library Resources, Inc.
Washington, D. C.
EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

The Editorial Board of Library Resources & Technical Services agreed at its 1967 Midwinter meeting that the Summer issue should be a Festschrift for Esther J. Piercy, Editor, whose untimely death came on January 10, 1967. Designated as editor of the memorial issue was Paul S. Dunkin, who—more recently—has accepted appointment as Editor of LRTS, succeeding Miss Piercy.

The Board did not reckon accurately, however, with the response of the many friends of Esther Piercy who were invited to contribute articles for the Festschrift. The resulting material could not be contained in the allotted 128 pages; and, indeed, it soon became apparent that no more than half of it could be published in one issue of LRTS.

The editorial staff has decided, in view of the wealth of material submitted, that the memorial number shall consist of two parts, of which the present issue is the first. Part II will be published as Volume 11, Number 4 (Fall, 1967) of Library Resources & Technical Services.

The staff wishes herewith to express its deep gratitude to all whose respect and devotion for Esther Piercy prompted them to compose these distinguished and distinctive expressions, contributed in her honor.
WHEN I CAME TO THE PRATT LIBRARY in 1960, I knew Esther Piercy as one of the ornaments of librarianship, respected and admired by the leaders of the profession. I realized how lucky I was to have such a distinguished chief of technical processing. Never one to sequester herself in the bustling processing areas, Esther shared in important decisions affecting the entire library system. In the six and a half years we worked together, I came to know and esteem several sides of Esther's character.

I was not surprised that she was a passionate partisan of the Baltimore Orioles. But I was not prepared to find her such a canny baseball strategist. While caught up in the excitement and confusion of a game she could still make cool and penetrating judgments on the manager's decisions. I recall a lively conversation she had with Dick Hall, the ace Oriole relief pitcher, whom we entertained at lunch one day after he spoke at the Library. They were in perfect rapport discussing fine points of the game. Esther shared the general exuberant joy of all those on the shores of the Chesapeake Bay when the Orioles beat the Los Angeles Dodgers four straight in the World's Series. I don't think the victory surprised her very much. The strengths of both the Baltimore pitchers and hitters were an open book to her.

If there ever was a stereotype of the cataloger as one concerned only with title pages, authors' dates, and editions, Esther helped destroy the stereotype. On a staff of voracious readers she took second place to none. She was also a discriminating critic and was called upon by the book editor of the Baltimore Sunday Sun when he had novels of high literary quality to be reviewed. Esther was as sensitive to the adept use of words as she was to the skillful cataloging of a book. Her experience as an editor, wrestling with the writing of others, made her critical of her own. She wrote, as she dressed, with style.
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Esther was devoted to all the people around her. She was a social being; a gracious hostess in her pleasant apartment, which had been one of Baltimore's old carriage houses. She liked parties and took pleasure in arranging them and participating in them. Her human warmth was shown in that wherever her career took her—to New Mexico, to Chicago, to New England, to Baltimore—she established close, enduring friendships. As an admirer of Adlai Stevenson, she was in high spirits at meeting him when the famous statesman came to the Library to help celebrate the 70th birthday of Gerald W. Johnson, the historian, one of Baltimore's most honored citizens.

As a co-worker, I came to see Esther under all the circumstances of stress and intellectual ferment common to a working relationship in an institution that is constantly stirred up by ideas from a gifted group of colleagues accustomed to working for constructive change. I was consistently impressed by her imagination, dedication, concern for the welfare of her staff, and the high standard of professionalism she set. Her qualities and accomplishments enhanced the reputation of the Pratt Library. She was alert and receptive to the ideas and suggestions of the staffs of the public departments on cataloging and classification problems. Her goal was the constant improvement of service to library users through the production and maintenance of a catalog that would be a bridge to the seeker of knowledge and information rather than just a technical achievement. Esther was always a challenge to work with because she seldom considered any idea, even her own, unsusceptible of improvement. As it was sometimes disconcerting to have her question what was thought to be established, so it was always stimulating to observe her constant striving for the ideal. She kept the rest of us from lapsing into complacency. Alternately swept by an appealing, almost girlish enthusiasm, and restrained by sober second thoughts, she envisioned the ultimate while keeping her feet on the ground.

Esther's death came to her, as it will to many of us, with much work unfinished. She left behind the recently begun Pratt reclassification-book catalog project, perhaps the most comprehensive of its kind ever undertaken. It took vision and courage just to conceive this tremendous task. Because of her careful planning and her superb organizing ability, the work will go on, and at its completion it will be one among the several monuments to a great librarian.

We who worked with her from day to day are losers with all librarians in her death. But we are also richer for having had her personal friendship, her close professional association, and her invigorating example. As a charming lady who liked to be where the action was she also contributed mightily to the action. To keep that action going toward the ever-increasing fruitfulness of the encounters between people and books will be a most appropriate way to honor Esther Piercy.
THOUGH, IN THE OFFICIAL VIEW, the experiment demonstrated that a permanent, full-scale program of cataloging-in-source is impractical, this was not Esther Piercy’s conclusion or recommendation and the year she spent as director of the experiment’s Consumer Reaction Survey revealed anew the extraordinary qualities of this very gifted woman.

In September 1958, Miss Piercy was given a leave of absence by the Enoch Pratt Free Library in order that she might devote a major portion of her time to the survey. Its purpose was to ascertain the use libraries might make of the catalog entries appearing in the publications they acquired. The survey was begun at the end of October 1958, when Miss Piercy met at the Library of Congress with the author of this article and the American Library Association’s Cataloging Policy and Research Committee. At this meeting it was decided to send interviewers to approximately 200 representative libraries. In preparation for the interviews it was further decided to send a questionnaire indicating the information which should be assembled in anticipation of the visit. Miss Piercy prepared a tentative outline of the questions to be asked.

Following the October meeting, Esther Piercy surveyed the operations of the Processing Department of the Library of Congress and then visited the H. W. Wilson Company in New York and the Bro-Dart industries in Newark to gather background information. With this in hand, she prepared a preliminary draft of the questionnaire—the first of four such drafts. In November 1958 each member of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee tried out the second of these drafts in her own and in one other library. This draft was studied by, and considerably revised as a result of suggestions made by, Maurice F. Tauber and Carlyle J. Frarey.
Meanwhile, a very able team of interviewers had been assembled: Eleanor E. Campion, Virginia Drewry, Richard O. Pautzsch, and Joseph H. Treyz, Jr. This group met with Miss Piercy and myself at the Library of Congress in mid-January 1959, making changes (principally cuts) in the third draft of the questionnaire, making a final selection of the libraries to be visited, and outlining the itineraries for the interviewers.

At the Midwinter conference of the American Library Association in Chicago at the end of January 1959, the Director of the Consumer Reaction Survey met on three occasions with the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee. The Committee approved the last draft of the questionnaire (renamed “Information to be Assembled”) and the plans which had been made. She also met with the Administrators of Technical Services of Large Research Libraries group, discussing the project with them.

In February 1959, Miss Piercy sent letters to 185 libraries asking them to cooperate in the Consumer Reaction Survey and mailed questionnaires to those who accepted the invitation. In April 1959, Esther Piercy and her survey staff began a series of visits to 200 selected libraries (public, college and university, school, and special) which by the end of May had taken them to 38 States and the District of Columbia. Miss Piercy bore the brunt of the task, paying visits to 64 libraries, publishers, and bookstores in 14 States.

This is a formidable number. Probably only one who has, within a similarly brief period of time, made a transcontinental journey of comparable proportions can realize the effort involved. For most of us the distances traveled, close connections, long hours, hit-or-miss meals, uncertain hotel accommodations, and living-out-of-a-suit-case would have added up to a gruelling ordeal. But Esther Piercy enjoyed it, thrived on it, and had many delightful tales to tell of her experiences “on the road.” Her reports were a model of their kind, giving the whole story in illuminating detail.

During the latter part of the summer of 1959, the survey team staff sorted the questionnaires and the 200 letters received, by type of library, and abstracted the information for the final report. With the aid of this data, the survey director prepared her report which was reviewed at a meeting in Washington in October 1959 by the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee. Some revisions and rearrangement of the material were indicated, and Miss Piercy in December 1959 completed the revised and final report on the Consumer Reaction Survey.

Esther Piercy’s handling of the survey was marked, like all her activities, by organizing abilities of the highest order, infectious enthusiasm, great good humor, and the other winning personal qualities which endeared her to everyone who knew her. Her contribution in this, as in so many other fields, will not be forgotten.
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The Library profession has suffered an incalculable loss in the untimely death of Esther J. Piercy. It is a personal loss felt by her countless friends and associates as well as by those who knew her from afar for her many professional achievements. Her contributions to the advancement of librarianship were widely recognized. No greater memorial is needed than the volumes of *Journal of Cataloging and Classification* and *Library Resources & Technical Services* which she so ably and skillfully edited. The list of offices which she held in national and local library associations reflect the depth and scope of her interests as well as her willing acceptance of professional responsibility. Not only did she bring to these positions a wealth of wisdom and understanding, but a personal charm and extraordinary ability that converted problems into effective solutions.

For many years Esther Piercy took an active part in the deliberations and activities of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee as nominee of the American Library Association, and served during part of that period as its recording secretary. We, her fellow members of the Committee extoll her virtues, cherish her memory, and mourn her departure.

Certified a true record of *Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee*, a joint committee of Lake Placid Club Education Foundation and American Library Association.

February 25, 1967 (Signed) Deo B. Colburn, Secretary

Personnel:
Carlyle J. Frarey, Chairman
Marietta Daniels Shepard, Vice Chairman
Edwin B. Colburn
Virginia Drewry
Frances Hinton
John A. Humphry
Mary Louise Mann
Pauline A. Seely
William J. Welsh
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MEMORIAL FUNDS FOR ESTHER J. PIERCY

As announced in the Spring, 1967 issue of Library Resources & Technical Services (v.11, no.2, p.166), the Board of Directors of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association, in its meeting of January 12, 1967, authorized the establishment of a memorial fund for Miss Piercy, whose long and distinguished service to the Division as both officer and editor of its periodical was well known among the membership. Contributions to this fund—or communications regarding it—should be directed to the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

A second fund in honor of Miss Piercy has been established at the Enoch Pratt Free Library of Baltimore, where she was, at the time of her death, Chief of Processing. The text of the announcement regarding this second fund reads as follows:

To honor the memory of Esther J. Piercy and to give lasting recognition to her notable professional contributions, a fund is being established in her name at the Enoch Pratt Free Library. The purpose is to make it possible for young members of the Pratt staff to attend library conferences. Esther Piercy took a particular interest in the professional development of young staff members and encouraged them to participate in ALA and other professional organizations. Her colleagues believe the Fund will be an especially appropriate tribute.

Checks for this latter fund should be made payable to “Esther J. Piercy Fund” and sent, c/o Office of the Director, to Enoch Pratt Free Library, 400 Cathedral Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

• 266 •  Library Resources & Technical Services
Cataloging and CCS: 1957-1966

Paul S. Dunkin, Professor
Graduate School of Library Service
Rutgers—The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

On January 1, 1957 the American Library Association’s 57-year-old Division of Cataloging and Classification (DCC) became the Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS) of the ALA’s newly formed Resources and Technical Services Division (RTSD).

What have the ten years since then meant to cataloging and to CCS? Obviously, many things.

This is not a complete and annotated bibliography nor a detailed and documented history; either would have required a great deal of time and several volumes. I have selected only what seems important or significant or simply typical; and I have briefly told you why I think it so. The result is, of course, incomplete; often it is the product or my ignorance or my prejudice. Probably your selecting and your judgments would have taken other directions.

Cooperative and/or Centralized Cataloging

Ever since Jewett we have dreamed of the day when the same book would not have to be cataloged again and again in individual libraries. In the ten years past we tried desperately to bring the dream to fulfillment.

At the national level the Library of Congress (LC) played a major role.

First was the Cataloging-in-Source experiment, undertaken with funds from the Council on Library Resources (CLR). The basic idea was simple: Print on the reverse of each book’s title page a copy of the LC card for that book, and let individual libraries make their own copies of the card with a “cataloger’s camera” not yet perfected. Cataloging would be done at LC from page proof just before the book went to press. LC cataloged 1,203 titles in this way, and there was a consumer reaction survey carried out by a team headed by Esther Piercy. The report of what happened (Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, 1960) is an amazing document. The libraries surveyed were enthusiastic, although they were not unanimous as to precisely how they would use the cataloging information or, indeed, how much of this information they needed. But the Library of Congress found the experiment only a costly nuisance.
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and stated flatly that there should be no further experimentation with the idea.

Probably we failed because we were perfectionists: At one blow we hoped to get a complete and perfect card on the reverse of every title page. So every book came to LC as an emergency case. The catalog entry was the last thing done before the book went to press but it was done in full detail; catalogers in Washington and publishers in New York had to be on their toes to meet publication deadlines. Even worse, last minute changes in the publishers’ offices now and then produced an error in collation or imprint or even title transcription in the already finished entry.

The “full card” idea, like every perfectionist idea, had lost sight of the real problem and made perfectionism its goal. Author headings, added entries, subject headings, call numbers—these are the costly items in cataloging. And every one of them could be added to a manuscript at any time after it was accepted for publication. Thus the publisher could send them along with the manuscript to the printer.

Such a compromise with reality would have freed Cataloging-in-Source from dependence on the “catalogers’ camera” and also from the errors of which the LC Report complained. (In any event, most of these “errors” involved matters of marginal value such as exact collation.) Individual libraries would have been able to tinker with the cataloging in any way they wanted, but it seems possible that most of this tinkering could have been done by clerks, not by catalogers. At the other end of the line, publishers could have listed their books in the same way they would be listed later in library catalogs. Also the entries in printed bibliographies would be the same as in library catalogs.

CCS asked LC to consider a limited experiment along such less ambitious lines, but the Librarian of Congress replied that LC was “in a position in which it is quite impossible for it to consider undertaking any additional projects” (LRTS 4:284, 1960).

With Cataloging-in-Source well out of the way, LC turned to substitutes. In late 1959 LC began to furnish Publishers’ Weekly with (in addition to information previously given) Dewey numbers and LC subject headings. In 1960 these entries began to go into Bowker’s newly established American Book Publishing Record (BPR).

The LC Report on the Cataloging-in-Source experiment had suggested (p. 48-50) that BPR might help do what had been expected of Cataloging-in-Source. Paula Armstrong reported in LRTS (6:294-95, 1962) that at Colorado State College Library, after using BPR for over a year, a check of 193 random orders showed 68.9 percent listed in BPR one to eight months ahead of their listing in Cumulative Book Index (CBI) 12.5 percent listed simultaneously, and 18.6 percent listed in CBI one to two months sooner than in BPR. CBI entries often lacked information supplied by LC to BPR—e.g., the LC number—and sometimes they had a different author heading from that used by LC.

Walter H. Kaiser reported on use of BPR in Wayne County Library.
(Michigan) over an 18 month period (Lj, Jan. 15, 1963). Entries had been available as required 87 percent of the time for current books, and they had been enlarged by xerography and used both for catalog cards and for book pockets. In addition, the subject heading tracings had been pushed up on the card and preceded by a note: "Related books in catalog under...."

Another aspect of the story was told by Ashby J. Fristoe in LRTS (10:91-95, 1966). A group of 100 order cards picked at random from current (1965) American imprints were searched in Cumulative Book Index (CBI), LC proof-slip file (LC PS), National Union Catalog (NUC), American Book Publishing Record (BPR), Publishers' Weekly (PW), and Publishers' Weekly Announcements (PWA)—now called Forthcoming Books.

When all six were used in random sequence, 940 searches located 71 titles. But a detailed examination showed that every title found in NUC, BPR, and PW was also found in LC PS. (There was one exception found in CBI). NUC, BPR, and PW were then eliminated and the remaining tools were searched by varied sequences. The best sequence was (1) LC PS (2) PWA (3) CBI, which with 228 searches found the 71 titles.

Undoubtedly there are many success stories of the use of BPR similar to those of Paula Armstrong and Walter Kaiser. But the nagging question remains: Is BPR truly a substitute for cataloging in source? LC catalogs a book and then separates the book from its LC entry; and in every library someone has to find the entry in BPR or some other list and then connect the entry with the book again. Coverage is not an automatic (and instant) 100 percent as would have been the case with Cataloging-in-Source; instead, we have Mr. Fristoe's 228 searches to locate 71 out of 100 titles. Finally, publishers' listings and printed bibliography listings still differ from catalog listings and thus cause trouble for user as well as cataloger.

In September 1961, LC started the Cards-with-Books program working with such publishers and dealers as could be interested; by 1962 it was accounting for the distribution of well over a billion sets of cards every year.

A major event of 1957 was the three-volume LC National Union Catalog (NUC). It superseded LC's Books: Authors, but it included, not only titles cataloged by LC but also those LC titles assigned to Priority Four and all titles in Roman alphabet for publications issued in 1956 and reported by other libraries. In 1962 came LC's National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, 1959-61, representing collections in some 400 repositories, a welcome by-product of the CLR grant in 1958 to enable LC to establish a national union card catalog of manuscript collections. Finally, in 1964 the RTSD (Committee on Resources) Subcommittee on the National Union Catalog agreed to sponsor publication of the pre-1956 NUC. The catalog would be fully edited by LC with added entries, cross references, etc. In effect it will
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replace all previous LC catalogs to 1955; it is expected to be completed within ten years. The contribution of LC's National Union Catalogs for cataloging and for national bibliography is obvious.

In the fall of 1963 the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) began informal discussion of their cataloging problem: They were spending about 16 percent of their total budgets on cataloging (some sixteen million a year), they had to do about 45 percent original cataloging of books for which LC cards were not available, and backlogs had increased 160 percent in the previous decade. A study by John Dawson, financed by CLR, confirmed, among other things, that centralized copy was particularly needed for current Western European publications.

ARL's Committee on Shared Cataloging (William S. Dix, Chairman) met with the Librarian of Congress and then, aided by James Skipper, Executive Secretary of ARL, Germaine Krettek of the ALA Washington office, and others, succeeded in getting written into the Higher Education Act of 1965 authorization for funds which the Librarian of Congress would use in acquiring and providing cataloging information for (so far as possible) all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship. Funds actually provided to date have been meager.

Meanwhile, however, LC's John Cronin has pushed ahead vigorously with plans in this country and abroad. LC tries to establish close working arrangements with the authorities in each country responsible for that country's national bibliography and, of course, with dealers. On the one hand, this helps in earliest possible selection of titles; on the other hand, LC can prepare its own preliminary cataloging entries from the final printer's copy of entries for new titles in the national bibliography before the bibliography itself has been actually printed. LC offices for this purpose have been set up in London (British National Bibliography), Oslo (Royal University Library), Vienna (Austrian National Library), West Germany (Deutsche Bibliothek—Frankfurt), France (Bibliotheque Nationale), and elsewhere; negotiations are still going ahead all over the world.

At the ALA Conference in New York (1966) John Dawson, William S. Dix, John Cronin, and James Skipper reported on the progress of Shared Cataloging; the papers were printed in LRTS (11:27-49, 1967).

All this, wrote Mr. Skipper, is "based on the expectation that the Library of Congress will become the world center for bibliographic control." If the great dream comes true it will be largely because of the pressure of ARL and the drive and imagination of John Cronin. But the dream can become only the melodramatic statement of what might have been if Congress fails to appropriate the funds and/or LC grows weary.

Also at the national level there is the LC study of Machine-Readable Cataloging Information (MARC). Made possible by a grant from CLR, it is a pilot program to distribute to selected libraries cataloging data in
machine readable form. The immediate aim is, of course, to study the feasibility of centralized preparation and distribution of data from which the participating libraries can automatically produce catalog cards, book catalogs, reading lists, and other library materials at local computer facilities.

Ultimately it could lead to much more. LC might become the center of a national communications network in which machine readable data would be transmitted electrically from library to library (LRTS, 10:392:1966). In SL (57:384.1966) Mr. Clapp remarks that this may result in adding “to the reference librarian’s bibliographic reach”; and “the catalogs that can be thus linked become one catalog and their libraries one library for purposes of bibliographic access.”

But as the ten years ended MARC was also still just a dream dependent on LC’s reaction to it, how libraries used it, and the possibility of getting funds once the CLR money is exhausted.

Finally there is LC’s work with cards for children’s literature. In November 1965, Mrs. Patricia S. Hines became head of a newly established LC Children’s Literature Cataloging Section with responsibility for assuring cataloging coverage of currently-issued children’s literature and adapting existing LC cards to assure coverage of earlier in-print children’s books. Modifications of standard LC practice on these cards include such things as a shortened Dewey number, addition of a brief annotation, and some difference in application of LC subject headings—e.g., use of fewer subdivisions—but very little difference in LC terminology (out of 950 headings used, only 7 are not in the LC list of subject headings). Edmond Applebaum and Patricia Hines described the new service in some detail and with examples of the two versions of LC cards for three titles in LRTS (10:455-60.1966). LC’s venture into this area was not regarded by all as an unmixed blessing; cf. Theodore C. Hines’ article in Lj (91:4183-87.1966) and the comments of John Cronin and others on the Hines article in Lj (91:5129-32.1966).

Apart from the national level, cooperation and centralization of cataloging moved vigorously in at least two directions: the commercial processing firm and the processing center. Barbara Westby listed commercial firms in Lj (89:1508 ff.1964). It was a valuable list, and we should have worked out some way of keeping it regularly up to date; plans for this are moving ahead. Also, if possible, we should have tried to make it evaluative—a sort of buyers’ guide. Meanwhile a partial list (LC, Wilson, Alamar, and Bowker) appeared in Lj (91:5183-35. 1966).

SL (October 1965) had several articles on various kinds of cooperation. LRTS gave considerable space to accounts of the processing center—e.g., Summer 1958, Winter 1961, Winter 1964, and Fall 1966; and there were articles and books published elsewhere. “Guidelines for Centralized Technical Services,” produced by Peter Hiatt’s RTSD Regional Processing Committee, appeared in LRTS (10:233-40.1966). Perhaps the most readable, as well as the most useful and provocative article was that by Sarah Vann summarizing the southeastern Pennsylvania processing center.
feasibility study, which had been initiated by the Free Library of Philadelphia with guidance and financial assistance of the Pennsylvania State Library (LRTS, 10:461-78, 1966).

With both the commercial processing firm and the processing center our only concern here is with the centralized cataloging which each supplies. The “Guidelines” had asked of the participating libraries, “Agreement on cataloging and classification, including the form of the catalog” (p. 237). Miss Vann, however, found that local changes are often made on cards from the center; changes range from the member library which changed classification and cataloging for each entry and added more subject headings, to the member which “grandly notes, ‘make changes that I desire’ ” (p. 479).

Different libraries think they have different cataloging needs. For instance, the profiles of six special libraries in SL (57:179-84, 227-31, 327-31, 1966) show libraries using LC cards for from 75 to 90 percent of their books but with at least some differences from LC in subject headings and classification. Commercial services will allow almost any variation the customer is willing to pay for. Variation shows up also in the centers themselves; cf. Donald Hendricks, writing of the first year of operation of the Oak Park, Illinois, Book Processing Center in LJ (90:4699-4703, 1965). The Center began with a cataloging code approved by a majority of the contracting libraries with “compromises on many levels”; that is, the Center began its life by refusing to conform to any existing service such as that of LC cards. On the other hand, even after this preliminary agreement on a code for the Center, some member libraries made changes on cards from the Center.

And here we get back to the basic problem which has faced every effort at cooperation and/or centralization since Jewett first demanded that in Smithsonian cooperative cataloging “nothing, as far as can be avoided, should be left to the individual taste or judgment of the cataloger” (p. 47). Standardization will save money; but it will save money only to the extent that we accept it. How much standardization can we tolerate? How much standardization will we tolerate? The questions are not quite the same—or are they? If every car were exactly like every other car how much more cheaply we should live. If clothing were the same style all over the world—or even just in this country—how much more cheaply we should live. If every house were exactly like every other house how much more cheaply we should live. A world of interchangeable parts—how much more cheaply we should live.

The itch to tinker is part of man. From tinkering comes the color of life. From tinkering comes all of what we call “progress.” To banish tinkering is, indeed, to live cheaply, but in the long run is it also to live efficiently?

The Machine

Often closely allied with attempts at cooperation and/or centralization is the Machine. The Machine has come far in the past ten years,
and it touches every corner of the library. Here we shall talk only of what seem to be some of the implications for cataloging and classification.

Perhaps chief among the theoretical studies was the University of Chicago Graduate Library School's 'Library Catalogs: Changing Dimensions', edited by Ruth French Strout (1964). The various papers are a dramatic blend of the old, the present, and what may be the future. Here also perhaps should be noted J. C. R. Licklider's 'Libraries of the Future' (1965), 'Automation and the Library of Congress' (1963) touched now and again on cataloging and classification; and later studies such as Lawrence Buckland's 'Recording of Library of Congress Bibliographical Data in Machine Form' (1965) and, of course, the MARC project, already noted, all have great possible significance for the future of cataloging. In the LC projects, as in many other studies relating to the Machine, the Council on Library Resources turns up again and again.

Every year has brought its flurry of articles and notes in periodicals—e.g., the ten papers from the ALA Institute (June 24-27, 1964) printed in LRTS (9:5-52, 1965); the group of papers on Florida Atlantic University Library in CRL (25:181-89, 1964) and individual papers such as that by John Markus on the use of computers in book publishing (including book catalogs) in American Documentation (AD) (17:76-87, 1966), or that on the application of computers to cataloging in the Connecticut-Harvard-Yale complex, by Frederick G. Kilgour in AD (17:124-31, 1966).


This catalog of books and articles could go on for a long time; perhaps what has been noted is typical.

And yet, alongside the preoccupation with the Machine and the New Order and exhortations to catalogers to get with it, there was a healthy (and healthful) voice of scepticism. Melvin Voigt's thoughtful review of the LC automation report, for instance, found it hard to believe that the estimate of cost could be accurate "without at least simulating the processes," and he suggested that proposed results of user-console dialogue might at least sometimes be achieved more cheaply in more conventional ways. Richard Dougherty described one now defunct machine operation which had proved both inefficient and costly (CRL, 25:7-12, 1964). The Dougherty paper is one of those all-too-rare examples in our "literature" of the report of a failure; usually we burst into print only to report successes—or what we expect to be successes. Phyllis Richmond presented the serious problems which human error can create when we deal with the Machine (LRTS, 10:155-60, 1966). Finally Leroy H. Mantell suggested that some evidence seems to indicate that perhaps the "knowledge explosion" which the Machine and other glamorous new things strive desperately and sometimes melodramatically to master may not be of the frightening proportions often suggested (AD, 17:8-16, 1966).

It may be that in the long run much more important than all the
things the Machine can do will be a side-product: The Machine demands that we re-think our whole attitude toward our work. Some things even the Machine cannot do; which of these things do we really need? But the Machine can also do many things we could not do by hand; which of these new things do we really need?

What, in short, is the basic purpose of cataloging and classification?

The Book Catalog

The Machine is notable, among other things, because it made possible the return, after more than fifty years, to the Book Catalog.

One of the most interesting and best written books of the decade was The Printed Book Catalogue in American Libraries: 1723-1900 (1964) by Jim Ranz, a chronicle of the long years of service of this form and how the book catalog eventually yielded to the card catalog because of less cost and easier expansion among other reasons. The Machine solved both problems to some extent.

In the 40's came the printed catalog of LC cards; and in the 50's the supplements each contained some new improvement which made it possible to get more entries onto a page and to make the entries somewhat more easily read. The first LC printed catalog was an author catalog, and inevitably in the 50's came the other half, the LC subject catalog. And finally we had a printed catalog not merely of LC cards but of Union Catalog Entries. Once again we began to see how easy it is to scan a page at a time instead of fingering one card after another, and how helpful it is to have a catalog not restricted as to location or number of copies. So the LC book catalog was followed by many others—notably among the first, the Los Angeles County Public Library where the new device made it easy to supply branches with brand new catalogs every year, and cumulated supplements.

The ALA Bulletin (October, 1964) carried a statement of "Preferred Practices in the Publication of Book Catalogs," one of the products of three years of study by a joint committee of CCS and the Reference Services Division, chaired by David Weber. It was a committee of great activity which turned out or stimulated many interesting papers. We published a number of them in LRTS; these and others appeared in Book Catalogs (1963) a collection edited by Robert Kingery and Maurice Tauber. David Weber's quite successful ad hoc interdivisional committee was succeeded by a permanent RTSD Committee headed by Ian Thom.

The Book Catalog continued to gain in popularity, and the flood of papers rose. The Fall 1964 and the Fall 1966 issues of LRTS dealt with the Book Catalog and there were, of course, studies in other periodicals and books—e.g., articles by David Weber, William Spence Geller, and George Piternick in Ruth Strout's Library Catalogs: Changing Dimensions (1964), noted above.

People began to tell more than "How I run a book catalog good."

There were studies of cost—e.g., George B. Moreland on the Mont-
gomery County (Maryland) Library catalog in LRTS (8:379-90. 1964); and by Robert M. Hayes, Ralph M. Shoffner, and David Weber on a Stanford University study in LRTS (10:57-90. 1966). Such studies must somehow answer Margaret Brown’s practical and thoughtful warning: “In comparing costs, a book catalog versus a card catalog, we tend to forget that we are not comparing like things” (LRTS, 8:356. 1964). How, she asked, can we measure such things as convenience of having a catalog in many locations, or improved cataloging copy? Ira Harris pointed out that very little thought indeed had been given to study of how the book catalog might affect readers’ services (LRTS, 8:391-98. 1964).

Catherine Chadwick noted the help the Book Catalog might give cooperative programs (LRTS, 10:160-63. 1966); and Sarah Vann thoughtfully compared the advantages and drawbacks of the book catalog for such programs (LRTS, 10:475-76. 1966).

Perhaps a book catalog can serve several libraries without formal cooperation between them. Walter Brahm suggested that individual card catalogs giving “special treatment to a paltry 40,000 book titles” could be replaced by some sort of a printed author, title, and subject index of many more titles (Lj, 90:2510-11. 1965). Eric Moon noted that one such printed catalog to a state might be enough and that “Fifty catalogs would certainly be preferable to 50,000” (LRTS, 10:11. 1966). Finally, Mary Gaver’s Elementary School Library Collection (1965), although designed primarily to help in book selection, could, as it suggests, be used as a book catalog in a small library.

The computerized book catalog has some implications for catalog codes and subject headings. Wesley Simonton suggested several possible results (LRTS, 8:399-407. 1964): (1) We may abandon the notion of “main entry” (really an anachronism as Cutter remarked many years ago) for the “author” and be content with simply “entries” in a finding list catalog. Ralph Parker made the same suggestion (LRTS, 8:348. 1964). (2) We may drop certain qualifications of entry—e.g., the phrase “joint author.” (3) We may abandon the time-honored Second Objective of bringing all the works of an author together in one place. Thus we find in book catalogs such as those produced by Phyllis Richmond one line allotted to a title (LRTS, 8:359-65. 1964). In the one-line entry in the book catalog described by Erik Brombert, G. A. Dubinski, and Donn Remington, the author is represented only by surname and initials (SL, 55:611-14. 1964). Mrs. Richmond uses rather drastic abbreviations; this is possible with the book catalog because a list of abbreviations and their meanings may appear at the front.

As to subject analysis, Mr. Simonton suggested that we may come to use more subject headings than now and that perhaps the “currently fashionable post coordinated descriptors so widely used for index-report literature” will be more used. Mrs. Richmond, whose book catalogs deal with science libraries on a university campus “as supplements to card catalogs,” reports no reader demand for subject approach. Many book
catalogs do give subject approach but it is generally on a divided catalog basis; thus the book catalog carries us away from the dictionary catalog.

The book by Jim Ranz did tell about book catalogs in this country through 1900, but (even more important) it told of the influence of the book catalog on the development of our thinking about the purpose and organization of the catalog. Perhaps this same (as yet uncertain) by-product will in the end be the most important result of our new preoccupation with this old form, the book catalog.

Cooperative and/or Centralized Cataloging, the Machine, the Book Catalog: These three currents—often joined—have swept us headlong through the past ten years. Precisely where they will carry us, whether in the long run they will be good or bad (whatever those two terms mean) we may not know for some time.

Catalog Code Revision

CCS inherited code revision from DCC. Catalog code revision began well before 1957 with the publication of Seymour Lubetzky's landmark study Cataloging Rules and Principles (1958) although the formal appointment of Committees, with Chairman, Wyllis Wright, and Editor, Seymour Lubetzky, was completed only by 1956, and code pension ended some two months after 1966 with the publication of Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (1967). Catalog code revision was the most important single project of CCS during the decade.

Procedure was simple, thorough, and democratic. Mr. Lubetzky submitted rules to the Section Heads of LC's Descriptive Cataloging Division, then to the Code Revision Steering Committee, and then to the full Code Revision Committee. Each rule was thus progressively reviewed and revised. Finally, there were two Institutes: Stanford, 1958 and Montreal 1960, to which all who wished could come and for a week question the Editor and the Committee Chairman. These Institutes proved that Wyllis Wright and Seymour Lubetzky were men of patience, understanding, and endurance. They also resulted in further revisions of the proposed rules. LRTS published numerous articles on code revision and full accounts of the Institutes. There were also many articles in other journals.

Of these articles two may be mentioned: Olivia Faulkner's "No Conflict—No Search" (Cataloging Service Bulletin 54. January, 1960) was a careful, scholarly study of the "No Conflict" principle after it had been in operation at LC for ten years. It showed that the practice had brought great savings at no reduction in usefulness of the entries it produced. Although never stated explicitly as a principle or rule in the developing code, "No Conflict" was an attitude which seems to have influenced much thinking about code revision. In LQ (38:172-91. 1963), Elizabeth Tate examined the relation of catalog entries prepared according to the Lubetzky Code of Cataloging Rules (see below) to the way in which books are cited in bibliographies and elsewhere. Apparently a user equipped with such a bibliographical citation would have a
better chance of finding his book easily under the Lubetzky Code than under the ALA rules of 1949.

Three notable books dealt with code revision:

(1) Ruth French Strout's *Toward a Better Cataloging Code* (1957) consists of papers presented at a Chicago Graduate Library School conference in June 1956. It pictures the history of cataloging, the background of code revision, and prospects of success. The Conference brought the British into the picture both with a paper by Arthur H. Chaplin and with floor discussion of the desirability of Anglo-American agreement.

(2) Seymour Lubetzky's *Code of Cataloging Rules, An Unfinished Draft* (1960) was prepared with an explanatory commentary for use at the Montreal Conference. These rules remain "unfinished" and none of them survived intact in the 1967 code; but their logic, clarity, and brevity remain unsurpassed.

(3) Arthur H. Chaplin's *International Conference on Cataloging Principles Report* (1963) consists of papers presented at the IFLA Conference in Paris, October, 1961. Before the Conference Mr. Chaplin had drawn up a draft statement of cataloging principles derived from Mr. Lubetzky's *Code of Cataloging Rules* and delegates prepared papers on the various problems of codes for author and title entry. At the Conference delegates discussed the various parts of Mr. Chaplin's draft in the light of the papers. Then they adopted a final version of the "Statement of Principles" and agreed to work, each in his own country, for rules in conformity with these principles. The "Statement of Principles" endorsed corporate entry; thus came to an end the conflict of more than half a century between the "Prussian Instructions" school and the "Anglo-American" school.

If work on catalog code revision had resulted in nothing more than these three books it would have been well worth the effort.

The Paris Conference of 1961 and its "Statement of Principles" mark the high point of code revision. The American delegates came home from Paris to face the backlash.

When talk of code revision began we were idealists; we said we would work out the best possible code with no thought of cost; that could come later. Actually, once work began, it never did quite turn out that way. Discussion in Committee and in the Institutes came back to cost again and again, and the rules themselves often departed from what seemed logic to meet what seemed a practical need. The Commentary which accompanied Mr. Lubetzky's *Code of Cataloging Rules* pointed out a number of such rules.

By 1961 the new ideas were in print, both in the *Code of Cataloging Rules* (1960) and in the Paris "Statement." and big libraries looked at them and began to grumble about cost. The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) set up a special committee to study cost of implementation; CCS asked representatives of other parts of ALA to advise the Code Revision Committee; the CCS Cataloging Policy and Research Com-
mittee and many other librarians talked and wrote endlessly about cost of revising old catalogs to meet the new rules.

Finally the ARL and LC agreed on what they wanted the new code not to do, and at the Miami Conference in 1962 the Code Revision Committee agreed to work out a code to suit them which would in other respects follow the Paris "Statement of Principles." The major concession was that the new Code would keep the traditional "Institutions" exception and enter many corporate bodies under place instead of under name. Thus ironically the American Committee on whose draft code the Paris "Statement of Principles" rested was itself unable to carry out a major part of that "Statement." Meanwhile Seymour Lubetzky had joined the faculty of UCLA and had little time for code revision. At the request of CCS, LG granted Sumner Spalding a leave of absence to serve as Editor. Lucile Morsch replaced Mr. Spalding as LC representative on the Steering Committee.

Under Sumner Spalding work went ahead much as it had under Mr. Lubetzky, except that now the Committee was operating within limits set by ARL and LC. The CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee (Chairman, Bernice Field) with Lucile Morsch revised the ALA-LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging (1949) and LC rules for special classes of materials such as manuscripts, maps, music, etc. The book as finally published had, thus, two main parts: rules for entry and heading (Editor, Sumner Spalding) and rules for description (Editor, Lucile Morsch), and Mr. Spalding served also as General Editor of the work. Title: Anglo-American Cataloging Rules . . . North American Text (1967).

The "Anglo-American" phrase may be slightly misleading. It is true that the (British) Library Association's committee and the American committee exchanged drafts of rules, minutes of discussions, and working papers and that, from time to time, Noel Sharp, Philip Escreet, Mary Piggott, and Hugh Chaplin attended meetings of the American Committee just as Wyllis Wright and Sumner Spalding and other Americans now and then went to England. The book does represent agreement on many rules for entry and heading. But on page 371 are listed 11 rules for entry and heading which "differ materially in substance from the corresponding rules in the British text." Included are, of course, the important rules 98 and 99 which maintain the "Institutions" approach (although the word itself is missing). At this point the British preferred to follow the Paris "Statement of Principles" more closely. Finally there is a note that "Differences in rules for description could not be determined at the time of publication of the North American Text."

Anglo-American Cataloging Rules is a compromise and, like all compromises, it is not an inspiring document. For many who had worked with code revision during what seemed to be the Lubetzky Revolution it is disappointing. Moreover, its style is, probably of sheer necessity, straight governmentese.

It is, no doubt, the most expensive code ever written. The hundreds of thousands of hours of work contributed by experts would have cost a
small fortune had they been paid for. LC took care of Mr. Lubetzky's salary while he served as Editor and paid many other expenses besides. The Council on Library Resources also contributed heavily; CLR bore the lion's share after Mr. Spalding became Editor.

It may be the last major code ever written for card catalogs. As it was being written, LC and the large research libraries were pushing ahead with experimentation and plans for automation. It is ironic that they were also pushing for compromise in the code because of the cost it would mean in changing their card catalogs.

This irony involved also an old problem: Standardization. In the last days of 1966, now that the manuscript had been finally put together, LC began the study of the new code which resulted in the 1967 LC decision on "superimposition": LC would apply the new rules only to works new to the library and to headings for persons and corporate bodies being established for the first time; there would, of course, be a few exceptions. Thus, LC had itself played a decisive part in code revision, but LC would not conform to the results and libraries would know when LC had conformed only after they had seen the LC cards for a particular title. We have noted above that member libraries sometimes change the cards from their processing center even though they had agreed on a code for the center; here we have what corresponds to the center itself departing from the code.

One final note on code revision: Just as the machine-and-management tidal wave was sweeping over librarianship, here was a little band of men and women, none of them a paid consultant, who for over a decade met two days at a time several times a year to think through the objectives of their special obligations to their profession. To many bystanders code revision was only an anachronism. To many of those who took part it was a challenging intellectual experience such as they had never before found as librarians. For when you entered a room where code revision was to be discussed you did not carry a pedantic conglomeration of detailed rules. All you needed was intelligence, imagination, and logic.

No doubt this was largely due to the leaders: Seymour Lubetzky is a prophet who broke through the heavy walls of formalism and led us back to the objects and ideals of Cutter. After the Miami Compromise, Sumner Spalding picked up the pieces left of the dream and patiently, carefully patched them together. Wyllis Wright has served his profession in many ways; perhaps code revision is his noblest achievement. He was born to be a Chairman, to listen quietly and carefully till all have had their say, then gently but stubbornly to insist that the talkers do something.

**Classification**

We shall look briefly at some developments in three areas: (1) Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC); (2) Library of Congress Classification (LCC); and (3) Classification Theory.

*Volume II, Number 3, Summer 1967*
Throughout the ten years the Battle of the Slogans has continued to rage: "Integrity of Numbers" versus "Keeping Pace with Knowledge."

DDC 15 had been a major revolution. Everyone seemed to want simplification; it was, indeed, the golden age of simplification for everything connected with cataloging and classification. Much money and work had gone into DDC 15, involving the usual studies, questionnaires, consultations—what not? So DDC brought simplification: shorter and fewer numbers (4621 numbers as compared with 81444 in DDC 14); relocations (1015 of them); and everyday English spelling.

The counter-revolution broke almost at once. In this mood the ten years began for DDC.

DDC 16 appeared in 1958, a compromise of necessity. But it did save what could be saved from DDC 15 (a total of 752 relocations for users of DDC 15 and 985 for users of DDC 14). And it was still in everyday English.

In late 1958 the DDC editorial staff merged with the LC staff which was assigning DDC numbers to books cataloged by LC. The new Decimal Classification Office, directed by Benjamin Custer, was thus able to keep DDC up to date as a routine operation in the same way that LC keeps its own classification up to date—assigning call numbers to honest-to-goodness books. Thus, to the pressure of the classification theorists was added the day-to-day pressure of new books with new ideas and different ideas; how long could DDC cling to "Integrity of Numbers"?

In 1965 we had the answer: DDC 17 pushed gently but relentlessly toward an up-to-date classification scheme (746 relocations, along with other changes). At once it became a controversial book. Foes complained of the long numbers, friends praised the greater specificity long numbers brought. Foes complained of the relocated subjects, friends praised the relocated subjects because they brought DDC up to date. Foes attacked the new tables of area and standard subdivisions, friends praised these same tables because they brought clarity and specificity. Friends and foes sometimes united to damn the index because it did not give exact numbers for all topics. Eta cetera, et cetera, and et cetera.

It may have been in anticipation of such a reaction that Melvil Dewey introduced his own relocations in DDC 2 (1885) by noting that these changes resulted from twelve years' use of the scheme and by promising that these numbers were "settled . . . not likely to be again altered." But 1965 was not 1885; librarians could count on more changes in DDC 18. For instance, Melvil Dewey's DDC had suffered from Anglo-Saxon-Protestant bias. DDC 17 had gone far to remove it. In 1964 Pauline Seely and Sarah Vann made a survey of use of DDC abroad, covering some twenty-two countries (non-Anglo-Saxon). Miss Vann reported on the Survey to the CCS on July 5, 1965 at the Detroit Conference. The Survey was completed too late to affect DDC 17, but it will, no doubt, result in relocations in future editions.

In the winter of its discontent, DDC had to face attack from another
quarter. The CCS Classification Committee "Statement on Types of Classification Available to New Academic Libraries" (LRTS, 9:107, 1965) pointed out that DDC numbers appear on LC cards "for about 35% of titles." Mr. Custer then replied that an analysis of samples of orders for LC cards showed that DDC numbers appeared on some 80% of LC cards that are sold. One of the best papers on cataloging and classification during the past decade was Verner Clapp's "DC Numbers on LC Cards" in LRTS (9:393-409, 1965). The villain in the piece, it seems, is not DDC but LC. In 1934 the annual average of LC titles receiving DDC numbers had been 99%, but beginning in the 1940's this had steadily declined to 26%, in 1964. Mr. Clapp's history is straightforward and fascinating. The LC reply simply returns to Mr. Custer's statistics and suggests that "the burden on users of DC occasionally to supply classification when not provided on the LC card is not great" (LRTS, 9:413, 1965). The basic question is an old one and it is broader than just DDC: Is the Library of Congress truly a national library?

In any event a number of librarians seem to have felt that the "burden" was not so light as LC suggested. A storm of articles asked "Is Dewey Dead?" (cf. Lj, September 15, 1966), and many libraries began to think of joining the "Flight from Dewey" to LCC. DDC has always roused deep emotion; this was (and is) no exception. In such an atmosphere Phyllis Richmond's sensible note in Lj (91:4870, 1966) pointing out that libraries cannot use either LCC or DCC call numbers uncritically just as they appear on the LC card goes largely unheeded.

So DDC ended the decade as it had begun it—in the eye of a storm.

(2) Library of Congress Classification (LCC)

A major response to the increased interest in LCC during the ten years was the CCS Institute on LC Classification in New York July 7-9, 1966. Chief emphasis was on the detail of the system, with members of the LC staff explaining thoroughly and patiently how the scheme works. The final day took up problems and cost of reclassification to LC. The proceedings will be published.

Conversion to LCC was the subject of other meetings—e.g., representatives from 22 New England college and university libraries at the State College at Worcester, Mass., May 12, 1966 (ACRL News, July/August, 1966, p. 84; and 30 Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana librarians at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, October 16-17, 1966 (ACRL News, December, 1966, p. 189).

Howard F. McGaw published a list of academic libraries using LCC in CRL (27:31-36, 1966) and a bibliography of reclassification in LRTS (9:483-88. 1965). The economic argument, of course, hinges on a library's willingness to accept without challenge the LCC call number printed on an LC card. Views of the extremist and the moderate appeared in such exchanges as that of Daniel Gore (Lj, 89:2287-91. 1964; and LRTS, 10:519-24, 1966) and Mathilda Brugh O'Bryant (LRTS, 9:367-70. 1965).
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One hindrance to the use of LCC is the lack of a manual of instructions. To some extent this need is filled by Leo E. Montagne's *American Library Classification with Special Reference to the Library of Congress* (1961). As a history of classification, the book is uneven and at times irritating in style and treatment; but the second half of the book is a helpful outline and introduction to LCC.

Another hindrance has been the lack of a schedule for law. In 1963 the Council on Library Resources made a grant to LC to develop and publish a shelf classification in this area, and the work is going ahead.

(3) Classification Theory

"In my travels around the world, I have evolved a law of librarianship that says that the degree of interest in classification systems is inversely proportional to the state of development of librarianship and bibliography in the area."

Ralph Shaw's gay wisdom thus opens a brief and lucid discussion of "Classification Systems" (*LRTS*, 7:113-18, 1963) which one wishes were typical of discussion of classification theory during the ten years. Instead, we have had the usual long procession of heavy and solemn stuff, not all of it helpful to American librarianship in general or helping to bridge the gap between the practitioners and the theorizers.

Below are noted a few items which may be of some interest to the general reader.

There was the usual flood of new and enlarged editions of Ranganathan's works, topped off by a conglomeration not by Ranganathan: *Library Science Today: Ranganathan Festschrift Volume I*, edited by P. N. Kaula (1965), containing among some other rather strange things, Mr. Kaula's suggestion of a minor modification of Colon for use in small, general libraries: a schedule and index of ready-made numbers (p. 92).

Among other collections, more scholarly, more interesting, and perhaps more useful, one might mention *Classification Research*, edited by Pauline Atherton (1965); *The Sayers Memorial Volume*, edited by D. J. Foskett and B. I. Palmer (1961); and *The Rutgers Series on Systems for the Intellectual Organization of Information*, edited by Susan Artandi (1964-1966). Of individual books we might name J. Mills' *Modern Outline of Library Classification* (1960) and its better written and more intriguing little companion volume, Bernard I. Palmer's *Itself an Education* (1962); and the chaotic harangues of John Metcalfe, such as *Information Indexing and Subject Cataloging: Alphabetical, Classified, Coordinate, Mechanical* (1957); and Eric de Grolier's *Study of General Categories Applicable to Classification and Coding in Documentation* (1962), a rather routine performance.

Of the countless journal articles, some have tried to explain the newer approaches to general readers—for example, Pauline Atherton on Colon in *LRTS* 9(1965)436-472, and Susan Artandi on SYNTOL in *LRTS* 9(1965)473-477. Others have dealt with more general matters—for example, Phyllis Richmond on systems evaluation by comparison testing in *CRL*.
27(1966)23-36, a lucid, common sense statement lighted by occasional flashes of humor. Some have had definitely practical implications—e.g., Ann Painter's report of an investigation which showed that "the rate of consistency in indexing varies between 62 and 72 percent in both manual and machine oriented systems" (LRTS, 7:279-80. 1963).

One new general library classification may be worth nothing: Fremont Rider's International Classification (1961). It has a sensible and thought-provoking preface, and its notation (no more than three capital letters per topic) might be both economical and easy to apply. Even if it were perfect, the chance that many would adopt it seems slight indeed. General libraries are already using (or "saddled with"; it depends on the point of view) DDC or LCC; in either case the printed cards from LC or (if it should develop properly) the MARC information from LC provide a ready-made classification number. Why waste time and money thinking up call numbers from a new schedule? Here again we meet Cooperation and Standardization. There is a further consideration: Even if we could forget Cooperation and Standardization the fact remains that for many years—perhaps since Mr. Dewey's Decimals burst upon the world in 1876—we Americans have thought of classification as simply a device for building call numbers—i.e., a device to locate books.

Is the study of classification by the librarian in a general library something like the study of Latin and Greek in the schools of our fathers—a survival from an earlier day permitted to remain simply because it seems to provide intellectual discipline?

Subject Headings

The ten years saw new editions of the standard "tools": LC 1957 and 1966, and Sears 1959 and 1965. The last LC list was computer produced and will be able to be revised more easily and perhaps more frequently. The last edition of Sears was edited by Barbara Westby and differs from its predecessors in that it does not indicate DDC numbers for its headings, perhaps theoretically defensible on the grounds that a subject heading list has no necessary connection with a specific classification scheme, but none the less something of a hindrance in the everyday work of a catalog department.

Both lists still suffer from our preoccupation with the "convenience of the public" inherited from Cutter against which Marie Louise Prevost warned us long ago (LQ, 16:140-51. 1946). Both lists are still cumulations of headings adopted at different times by different people for different reasons. David Haykin had struggled manfully with this many-headed monster (Subject Headings, 1951), but his work was only an attempt to arrange inherited practice into a logical system. Unfortunately his death prevented him from working out a subject heading code which might have helped establish principles on which subject heading work could rest.

Typical of the chaos in our present subject headings system is Bartol Brinkler's elaborate and scholarly study of "The Geographical Approach
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to Materials in the Library of Congress Subject Headings” in LRTS (6:49-63, 1962) with the brief LC comment (p. 63-64) restating the generalities which we have followed since Cutter and re-admitting that “in the last analysis” choice of a heading “often depends on the cataloger’s subjective judgment.”

“Specificity” is a magic word which we all accept but seldom really define. “Specificity” means all things to all men and little to most, particularly when we are prepared to abandon our definition at any point where the “convenience of the public” can be argued. Thus the Sears headings have always been broader than the LC headings; and we have noted above that the LC subject headings on their cards for children’s books differ somewhat from the headings on LC cards for the same books in catalogs for adults.

Meanwhile changes appeared or were suggested often from experience other than that of work on our conventional card catalogs, notably from work with the machine and with the book catalog. Thus, as a byproduct of designing a catalog computerization project came a study of the use of subject cards in the Yale medical library: In 501 searches, 12.8 percent were subject searches; only half of the 501 were searches by the public, and of these 17.9 percent were subject searches (Benedict Brooks and Frederick G. Kilgour in CRL, 25:483-87, 1964). We have noted above that Mr. Simonton suggested the computerized catalog might lead to more use of “descriptors” and that Mrs. Richmond found no demand for subject approach among users of her book catalogs for science libraries.

Much was written about subject approach other than that of the “direct and specific subject.” For instance, there were articles on “coordinate indexing” such as those by Robert Balay and John Gardner in CRL (27:464-69, 1966), or by Audrey N. Grosch in SL (56:303-11, 1965), and books such as John C. Costello’s Coordinate Indexing (1966). “Keyword in Context” (KWIC)—slightly reminiscent of the 19th century “subject word”—appeared rather often (e.g., Marguerite Fischer’s article in AD, 17:57-70, 1966). The list could go on for a long time.

In the light of these developments we began to look again at our Cutter inheritance. John Metcalfe’s Alphabetical Subject Indication of Information (1965) is incoherent but stimulating; E. J. Coates’ Subject Catalogues; Headings and Structure (1960), somewhat like Miss Prevost, seeks to bring more order into the search for the “specific” subject heading. As the ten years ended, Richard Angell was appointed Chief of the newly created Technical Processes Research Office in LC’s Processing Department. Perhaps LC will do some re-thinking of subject heading theory.

Speaking very broadly, there is much similarity in the development of theory of classification and theory of subject headings. Both once sought to fit new books and other material into prearranged schemes; now sometimes we try to find schemes which arrange themselves about the material as it appears—post-coordination as opposed to pre-coordination.
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Cataloging and Classification in General

Here we may consider some of the developments which apply to several of the compartments listed above.

(1) Books

Perhaps the outstanding book of the decade in this area is Esther Piercy's *Commonsense Cataloging, A Manual for the Organization of Books and Other Materials in School and Small Public Libraries* (1963). It is just that, well written, well organized, practical at every point. Ever since Cutter's *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog* gave way to the Anglo-American code of 1968, we have shifted our attention to the needs of the large research libraries and allowed the smaller libraries to shift for themselves. Miss Piercy's book is the latest and the most successful of several private attempts to close this gap.

L. Jolley's *The Principles of Cataloguing* (1960) is a provocative study in large measure arising from the problems raised in code revision but also concerned with the basic problems of subject cataloging.

*Information Storage and Retrieval: Tools, Elements, Theories* (1963) by Joseph Becker and Robert M. Hayes, is a massive attempt to bring into focus the new thought and the old. It is, of course, broader than just cataloging and classification, but none of us can afford to ignore it.

(2) Cost

Cost produced the Miami Compromise in Code Revision and left us with "Institutions." Cost figures also, as we have noted above, in talk of the Book Catalog. The movement toward centralization and/or cooperation raises the question: Which things can the local library do more cheaply, which things should it leave to the center? Articles such as Catherine MacQuarrie's about Southern California libraries (*LRTS*, 6:387-50. 1966) tried to answer. Also there were studies of individual libraries such as the Bohdan Wynar-Harold R. Malinowsky *Cost Analysis Study, Technical Services Division, University of Denver Library* (1965); and studies of individual sections of the problem such as the ALA Library Technology *Catalog Card Reproduction* (1965). The LC automation study tried to predict cost. "The flight from Dewey" raises the question of cost.

And yet, alongside such developments there has been scepticism. We have noted above Margaret Brown's insistence that the cost of a book catalog and the cost of a card catalog were two different things, and Melvin Voigt's doubts about the cost analysis in the LC automation study. Some fifteen years ago Felix Reichmann showed conclusively that inner-library comparisons of cost are inconclusive because "libraries, like books, are distinctive . . . resemblances are coincidental only"; each catalog department is (like its library) a rugged individualist (*Library Trends*, 2:290-317. 1955). In 1963 Mr. Reichmann found the situation little improved, and he warned against oversimplification in comparing costs.
of different libraries (CRL, 24:200-201, 1963). Also Don Culbertson
deplored the bewildering variety of cost statistics and the lack of stand-
ard in this area (CRL, 24:487-89, 1963). Perhaps the only safe study of
cost is in the use of standard times for clerical operations in cataloging
much as Henry Voos studied clerical areas in other parts of technical

(3) The User

Ever since Cutter’s remark about the convenience of the public
(and, no doubt, before then) we have insisted on this and that practice
or exception because of user’s convenience. Often we have been unable
to document “convenience,” but we have often tried; see Carlyle Frarey’s
perceptive summary of attempts to find the user in Maurice F. Tauber’s

The past decade saw the most ambitious attempt yet: Catalog Use
Study by Sidney Jackson, edited by Vaclav Mostecky (1958). There were
5494 interviews with patrons in 39 libraries ranging from large university
libraries to high school libraries. Findings were extensive, but, on the
whole they did not greatly differ from those reported by Mr. Frarey for
earlier studies.

This study, like the others, raises questions. Is there such a creature
as “the user”; or are these (as with costs) many users each with his
individual habits? Can such a study include many kinds of libraries and
succeed? Even if we find “the user,” can we safely build our practice to
fit him—or shall we have to keep on making studies to find out if “the
user” (just as you and I) changes habits and ways of thinking from
time to time?

Finally, there was the question of financing. To pay for this massive
undertaking there were two $1000 grants from foundations, additional
funds from the Division of Cataloging and Classification, and a great deal
of volunteer labor. Perhaps the most serious defect of the Catalog Use
Study was that it was born before the Council on Library Resources.

(4) Council on Library Resources

The most influential single force at work during the decade may
have been the Council on Library Resources. Cataloging in Source,
MARC, Catalog Code Revision, the Paris Conference and the Paris
Statement, LC’s Law classification, LC’s National Union Catalog of
Manuscript Collections, John Dawson’s study for the ARL Committee
on Shared Cataloging—in these and other areas work went ahead which
might well never have gone beyond the dreaming stage. We are all much
indebted to the imagination and the wisdom of Verner Clapp and his
Council.

Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS)

And now we shall look briefly at CCS. What has the decade brought
to the organization?
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Any discussion of CCS must begin with a fact: We reduced our status in the ALA hierarchy by choice. The Division of Cataloging and Classification (DCC) endorsed the broader horizon both by a poll of its members and by action of its Executive Board. We felt that we were closely involved with much more than just cataloging, and we wanted ALA organization to reflect this involvement. So the Resources and Technical Services Division (RTSD) was created with sections for acquisitions, cataloging and classification, copying methods, and serials.

We lost some things in the deal. Marie Louise Prevost had fought for years before she could bring DDC to share her dream of a Division journal; and Esther Piercy had given the Journal of Cataloging and Classification flesh and blood and sturdy life. Now JCC merged with Serial Slants to form Library Resources & Technical Services (LRTS), a new journal for the new Division. To LRTS we surrendered Miss Prevost as Editor, Miss Piercy as Honorary Editor, and Carlyle Frarey as Managing Editor. We, like each of the other sections of RTSD, had only an Assistant Editor.

Our President became only a Section Chairman, and our Executive Board became only a Section Executive Committee. Our Executive Secretary had come like our journal the hard way. Now we lost her the easy way; she became the Executive Secretary of RTSD. Our twenty-nine regional groups became regional groups of RTSD. Our Policy and Research Board became a CCS Policy and Research Committee. Later, when a book catalog committee was set up, it was an RTSD committee.

Perhaps worst of all, we sandwiched in another layer between us and the top of the bulky, bureaucratic conglomeration we call the American Library Association with its red tape and heavy snow of carbon copies of this and that.

And yet, ten years later, it seems like a wise decision. We now have close organizational contact with people whose everyday work in libraries blends with ours. We have a journal which Esther Piercy built into one of the leading professional journals here and abroad. That journal brings together many things we should have found before, only by looking far and wide. And in that journal catalogers have found as full and free expressions as they ever found in JCC.

If numbers count for anything—and I doubt if they do—CCS has more members than DCC had, and RTSD is the largest type-of-activity division in ALA. CCS has contributed perhaps more than its share of RTSD Presidents and elected members of the Board of Directors. We have had to share our hard-working Executive Secretary with other Sections of RTSD, but each holder of that office has spoken the language of catalogers, and CCS has gained a great deal from them both.

It may be that the voice of CCS has become muted. But in a day of centralized and/or cooperative processing, a day of the machine and the book catalogs, the voice of the cataloger also is muted, or, rather, merges with the voices of other librarians. Indeed, it may be that before long there will be catalogers only in LC and the centers. But not just the role
of the cataloger may decline. For not processing alone but whole libraries move toward centralization; and the machine serves not processing alone but all library work.

We come again to Cutter and Library of Congress printed cards (Rules, 1904, p. 5): “I cannot help thinking that the golden age of cataloging is over, and that the difficulties and discussions which have furnished an innocent pleasure to so many will interest them no more. Another lost art. But it will be all the better for the pockets of the public, or rather it will be better for other parts of the service—the children’s room and the information desk, perhaps.”

Perhaps.

Short End to a Long Discourse

“But, my dear,” said the Hatter with a frown, “Was there progress?”

“Well,” said Alice earnestly, “There was change.”

WILSON INDEX EXPANDS COVERAGE

Following a complete study by the ALA Committee on Wilson Indexes, the subscribers to Applied Science & Technology Index voted to expand the index’s coverage effective with the January 1967 issue. The periodicals indexed increased from 195 to 225 with 52 new titles. Periodicals in the fields of physics; aeronautics and space science; automation, information retrieval and computers, and general engineering have more than doubled. Periodicals in the fields of industrial and nuclear engineering have also increased. Five periodicals in the field of mathematics are indexed as opposed to only one previously. Also showing an increase are periodicals in the fields of construction, electricity and electrical communication, and general science.

Applied Science & Technology Index is published monthly except August, with bound annual cumulations, and is sold by annual subscription on the H. W. Wilson service basis.

UNION LIST OF SERIALS FOR SAN FRANCISCO AREA

The San Francisco Bay Region Chapter of Special Libraries Association has published a Union List of Periodicals: Science-Technology-Economics.

This publication contains more than 4,000 titles listing the holdings of 73 special libraries of the San Francisco Bay Region in the fields of science, technology, and economics, including business.

Rather than indicating holdings under the latest title with cross-references from previous titles, holdings are listed under the title at the time of publication with references to former and subsequent titles.

The Union List sells for $20 a copy, which includes tax and mailing charges. Checks should be made payable to the San Francisco Bay Region Chapter, Special Libraries Association. The cost to contributing libraries is $10 for the first copy. All orders must be accompanied by payment and should be sent to: Joseph R. Kramer, San Francisco Bay Region Chapter, Special Libraries Association, P.O. Box 1184, San Carlos, California 94070.
Ten Years of Progress in Acquisitions: 1956-66

Richard M. Dougherty
Associate Director of Libraries
and
Abigail McKinney
Head, Acquisitions Department
University of Colorado Libraries
Boulder, Colorado

Ten years have wrought great changes on the world of acquisitions. Federal aid to libraries, mass purchasing techniques, inter-institutional cooperative acquisition programs, and mechanization of ordering and related procedures are all developments of the last decade. They were uncommon in 1956.

Two landmark events which have had an immeasurable impact on librarianship occurred during the last decade. The Library Services Act, signed into law in 1956, heralded the federal government’s commitment toward library development. The 1956 LSA was to be but the first in a succession of legislation salubrious to the library profession.

October, 1957 is certain to be remembered as a decisive year in the profession’s history. Russia launched Sputnik I and convincingly demonstrated to the world its scientific capabilities. Once official embarrassment had subsided, the immediate effect was an increased emphasis on education. Education at all levels from elementary to graduate, particularly science education, acquired a new mantle of importance. Many advances of the sixties can be traced to October 1957.

The Federal Government’s Role

In less than ten years the federal government has achieved an eminent role in promoting library development. Funds to purchase materials, train new librarians, and construct facilities to house and service burgeoning collections have been made possible through numerous legislative acts.

The granddaddy, the 1956 LSA already cited, was followed by the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) in 1963. With the passage of the LSCA, funds were authorized for the first time for construction of library facilities. Title III of the latest LSCA will provide funds to investigate means for developing library networks. Five million dollars is authorized for 1966-67, to be increased steadily to fifteen million by 1971. At this writing, the funds have yet to be appropriated; however, Congress is expected to vote on the Title in the near future. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) already has
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stimulated library development in elementary and secondary schools.\textsuperscript{5} Title II-A of the 1965 Higher Education Act authorized basic grants of five thousand dollars, and special purpose grants to support cooperative ventures that meet national and regional needs. Some librarians have overlooked the possibilities of Title VI of the Higher Education Act. This Title provides funds to purchase audio-visual equipment and to develop audio-visual programs, but under certain circumstances these funds can be used to purchase library materials.

Title IIC of the same Act authorized establishment of the National Program for Acquisition and Cataloging (NPAC). Acquisition librarians have been quick to recognize the program's potential. The program will enable librarians to make accessible to researchers and scholars the world's significant literature.

The Shared Cataloging Program was launched on July 1, 1966 in London; in September arrangements were completed in Oslo, Wiesbaden, and Vienna; by mid-November, 1966, the Paris office was opened. Plans are now under way to negotiate agreements as quickly as possible with the Central European countries of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. Although these countries appear to be interested in cooperating, they must first solve several problems unique to their own situations.\textsuperscript{6}

Public Law 480, passed in 1961, provided a mechanism for selected U.S. research libraries to acquire current publications from countries in the newly emerging areas of the world, such as Pakistan, India, Arabia, Indonesia, and more recently Israel.\textsuperscript{7,8} PL 480 is legally based on a 1958 amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 which permits the U.S. to sell its agricultural products in foreign currency and exchange the foreign currency for goods of that country, including books, periodicals, and other research materials. Although difficulties were encountered in implementing the PL 480 program, it has demonstrated the feasibility of the centralized approach. In a real sense the PL 480 program has served as a pilot project to NPAC. As the scope of PL 480 expands and becomes more closely coordinated with NPAC, it will become even more valuable to researchers.

Space does not permit a listing of all the laws that bear directly on acquisitions work. For a complete summary of library legislation, the reader is referred to the current issues of the \textit{ALA Bulletin}. A particularly informative discussion on legislation appeared in the February 1966 issue.\textsuperscript{9}

“Grantsmanship” is a new art to most librarians. Paxton Price recently commented that for librarians to take “advantage of all the assistance available to a given library requires a full knowledge of legislative provisions and an alertness to all state and local opportunities for participation.”\textsuperscript{10} An \textit{Lj} report correctly observed that unfortunately grants are too often awarded to those who can best apply for them rather than to those who need them most.\textsuperscript{11} Few would quarrel, we believe, that acquisition librarians as well as administrators need to be intimately
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familiar with the everchanging aid menu if their library is to gain the full measure from governmental programs.

The Nature and Scope of Acquisitions Work

Educational developments during the fifties and sixties have both stimulated and shaped library development. Growth, expansion, and upgrading have been the keynotes. New institutions, expanded research programs, independent learning, inter-disciplinary research, and new teaching techniques are but a few of the advances that have influenced library growth.

The unprecedented demand for retrospective materials produced marked changes in the antiquarian book trade. Xerographic reprints, microform editions, and reprint manufacturing are now “household” items. Reprint manufacturing flourished; in fact, reprinting has been a chief beneficiary of the boom. University Microfilms, Inc., employing the micro-photographic and xerographic technologies, produces Xerox reprint editions. UM’s catalog now lists several thousand titles. Presses such as the Lost Cause Press offer blanket microform editions of titles listed in standard bibliographies.

Educational philosophies and teaching techniques which place greater emphasis on independent study and less on textbook oriented learning sent students scrambling to the stacks. All types of libraries have felt the crush of student users. Audio-visual materials became a more important source of information. Librarians, consequently, broadened traditional orientation from books, periodicals, and pamphlets to include a variety of non-book materials. Microforms, slides, films, pictures, phono-records, tapes, film strips, and even computer printouts are now often accepted as a regular part of an acquisitions program. This trend suggests that librarians now are focusing more on the information rather than the carrier.

The move to independent study also brought respectability to the paperback book. They are no longer “black sheep” to be scorned. Ten years ago paperbacks symbolized cheap “sex” fiction void of literary merit. Today, of course, even editions of scholarly works often precede the hardback edition. Also juveniles are now offered in paperback. The American Association of School Librarians is currently investigating the impact of paperbacks on library operations in schools and school libraries. The initial findings of the study are to be presented at the San Francisco Conference. A second study, co-sponsored by ALA and the American Book Publishers Council (ABPC) on the use of paperbacks in public libraries will soon be completed and published.

Acquisition librarians now cope with the problems of acquiring materials from geographic areas and in languages that were not judged essential to research a few short years ago. This task has not always been an easy one. The book trades of many countries were either nonexistent or in an incipient stage. Governmental restrictions on book purchases, the paucity of selection tools, and the need for large volumes of materials
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all acted as catalysts to the development of mass purchase plans. PL 480 and the Farmington Plan are two examples of "purchase by category" acquisition plans.

Stechert-Hafner, in cooperation with the University of Texas and the New York Public Library, developed the Latin American Cooperative Acquisitions Project (LACAP) in direct response to the needs expressed during the Seminars on the Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials.14,15 Stechert-Hafner agreed to send a representative to the Latin American countries in return for blanket orders from libraries. Each library could set its own limitations, specifying subject areas, geographic areas, or imprint data. LACAP has been a marriage of research libraries and private industry, a union that seems to have been profitable for both.

The "Greenway Plan" denotes another variation of the "get 'em all" acquisition technique. This plan has been operational in public libraries for several years. The libraries receive all the publications of selected publishers, without the privilege of free return. Under such agreements, the libraries enjoy the benefit of receiving titles faster at significantly higher discount rates. This plan has found its greatest acceptance in large library systems.

Jobber "approval plans" have also achieved a measure of popularity. Under these plans the participants receive the publications of selected publishers. Upon receipt of volumes, book selectors select the titles to be retained, returning the unwanted books at no cost. One advantage of this plan lies in the opportunity to exercise judgment in selection. Of course, the psychology of this technique, and possibly one of its drawbacks, is that once the book is in the library the tendency is to include it in the collection. Richard Able, Stacey's, and B. H. Blackwell, Ltd. are three firms that offer the approval approach.

The trend toward mass buying techniques has infringed on the venerable function of book selection. Some librarians have objected to mass buying on these grounds; they warn that collections could become bulked with valueless titles if acquisitions are not carefully screened. There is merit to the objections, but it remains to be seen what the long range impact of mass buying will have on library collections.

Pressures to build strong, broad research collections have led some libraries to participate in cooperative acquisition programs. The Farmington Plan and PL 480, already cited, illustrate one approach whereby several libraries agree to acquire materials in depth in a subject, language, or from a geographical area.

The Midwest Inter-Libraries Center, now the Center for Research Libraries, the New Hampshire Interlibrary Center, and the New England Center, which were originally created as cooperative storage warehouses to store little used materials, are now also carrying on cooperative acquisition programs. For example, the Center for Research Libraries, under the sponsorship of ARL, provides for a program to acquire, microfilm, and house foreign newspapers.
Processing centers serving public and/or school libraries have developed a variety of centralized purchasing plans. But, oddly enough, centralized purchasing did not arouse much interest among academic librarians until very recently. Everett Moore reported in his study of public junior colleges in Southern California that the majority of institutions studied used the same selection tools and that there was a "significant correlation" between the books purchased in these same schools. The findings tend to suggest that a processing center for these libraries might prove beneficial.

At present there are two major studies underway. One, financed by the Council on Library Resources, involves several New England institutions. The second study, funded by the National Science Foundation, includes eight state supported institutions of Colorado. Both studies are attempts to determine whether or not a centralized operation will produce cost advantages and speed up the flow of materials and bibliographic data to the participants. If centralized purchasing proves advantageous to academic institutions, it could drastically alter traditional book distribution methods. Is it possible for an academic processing center to assume the role of a non-profit jobber, thus supplanting the commercial jobber? The desirability of regional processing centers for academic libraries has by no means been resolved.

Librarianship and the Book Trade

The greater purchasing power of libraries has influenced book distribution patterns. Some publishers have, after a hiatus of many years, reestablished Library Services Divisions in an all-out drive to persuade librarians to establish blanket orders with their respective firms. Some publishers have joined together to form centralized organizations such as the Collier-Macmillan complex to take full advantage of mass production principles.

Publishers selling directly to libraries have created stiffer competition for library jobbers. This is an intriguing situation since the publishers are also the jobbers' source of supply. While libraries could not operate without the services of a reliable and energetic jobber, the competition provided by publishers may prove salutary to libraries in the long run.

The phenomenal growth of libraries and the book trade have caused a variety of problems. Some publishers at times have been either ignorant or oblivious to the needs of libraries; for example, a few years ago trade bindings of juvenile books were often not sturdy enough to sustain heavy use. As a result, the profession urged and cajoled publishers to develop sturdier bindings. Gradually most publishers responded, and it was not long before special library bindings were made available (of course at a substantially higher price).

Ten years have produced notable changes in the attitudes of publishers and jobbers towards libraries. Libraries now command a larger share of the total book trade market than ten years ago when public, college, university and special libraries spent $65,316,500 for the purchase of
materials.\textsuperscript{18} By 1963, this figure had skyrocketed to approximately $119,658,000. Although statistics are not yet available for 1966, there is every reason to expect the figure to be well in excess of three hundred million dollars.

Events of the last ten years have drawn booksellers and librarians closer together. Although there are problems yet to be solved, there are many mutual concerns and, as a matter of fact, both groups have worked hard to develop accommodating solutions. To expedite progress, a joint American Library Association/American Book Publishers Council Committee (ALA/ABPC) was created. A recent accomplishment of note has been the publication of prepared guidelines by a joint committee of the SLA/ABPC. This document contains recommendations intended to improve and standardize publishers’ book advertising practices. The recommendations suggest that each book publisher include the name of the author, editor, or compiler, and the full title and copyright date in all advertisements as well as in the book itself; and when space permits, that the edition and any prior publication record, series identification, institutional affiliation of the authors, list price, pagination, size, number of illustrations, tables and charts should also be included in all publishers’ announcements. Translated works should include the original author, title, and the date; the proceedings of symposia should include the place, date, and sponsors of a conference.\textsuperscript{19}

If these recommendations are adopted by the book trade, bibliographic control will be vastly improved, thereby eliminating some of the problems now plaguing book selectors. The recommendations have been approved in principle by the Executive Board of the Acquisitions Section. The Board, however, believes that series information and the prior publication record should always be included regardless of space constraints.

One function of the Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee is to act as a bridge between librarians and booksellers. It is this committee which handles complaints from librarians. In the last few years most reports have originated from librarians. Their complaints have focused on such matters as the quality of bindings, services, discount rates, etc.

A problem which continues to harrass the Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee is the itinerant microfilm periodical jobber who fails to live up to agreements. Librarians should be wary of jobbers who offer to exchange microfilm for hard copy. A number of libraries reported that they never heard from the jobber again once they had turned over their bound volumes. Others found later that while some film was received, it was less in quantity and quality than had been promised. The committee strongly advises librarians to be sure to obtain films first as promised before relinquishing bound volumes, and to collate carefully the films provided to insure that they are of acceptable quality.\textsuperscript{20}

Librarians are not the only ones, however, registering complaints to the Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee. Jobbers and publishers also have cause to grumble. They charge that some libraries’ demands
have become totally unrealistic and that they are being strangled with paperwork; for example unreasonable invoicing practices. Jobbers report that librarians often do not or are unable to distinguish between the services that jobbers can best perform from those a publisher should render; as a result, jobbers are forced to handle ludicrous requests. Several jobbers and publishers have expressed alarm over the interminably long lags between the receipt of books and the receipt of payment. If the percentage of outstanding accounts reaches a certain point, a bookseller may be forced to borrow money to defray immediate expenses, an expensive proposition under any circumstances. No one knows how widespread this problem is, but some firms have cautioned that if the situation does not improve, an increase in book prices may become necessary.

The causes of the present difficulties are not completely clear, but it is not difficult to speculate. The massive infusion of governmental funds for the purchase of books has overwhelmed acquisition personnel; as a result, untrained or inadequately trained staff have been pressed into service. Antiquated procedures have been taxed to their breaking point or have collapsed altogether. These pressures, coupled with other service demands, have necessitated *ad hoc* decisions that may be expedient but not efficient. There also seems to be a direct relationship between paperwork and federal grants.

The Acquisitions Section is cognizant of the need to review present provisions for training acquisition librarians. To this end an *ad hoc* committee was appointed. Initial findings of the committee suggest that acquisitions training should not be segregated from other phases of technical services work. The members of the committee felt quite strongly that there should be an overall program within a library school curriculum that stresses interrelationships with other technical services activities. Such instruction would trace the book from its publication source to acquisitions and cataloging until it reaches the reader. Regardless of the programs finally adopted, it seems clear that acquisitions work has become more complex and demanding than ever before, and that the price of operating with inadequately trained personnel is more than most libraries can bear.

As stated earlier, the reprinting industry has prospered. This has been due largely to the demand of libraries for out-of-print monographs and serials. In 1954, the Reprint Expediting Service (RES) was formed. One purpose in establishing the RES was to create a more effective channel through which libraries could make their needs known to reprinters, and reprinters could better gauge a publication's sale potential. The *Reprint Expediting Service Bulletin* became the committee's chief instrument for improving communications. The *Bulletin* was published under the RES's direction until 1965 when responsibility was turned over to Oceania Publications. A history of the RES and its activities has been prepared by Sam P. Williams.

Libraries have not been satisfied completely in their dealings with
reprinters. Inferior grades of paper, low quality bindings, excessive prices, and incomplete or misleading bibliographic citations are complaints often voiced. The continuing practice of reprinters of announcing phantom publication dates is particularly aggravating. One course for librarians is to learn to recognize pre-publication feelers and to be wary of "in preparation" statements listed in reprinters' catalogs, since both are devices for measuring market potential.

The Acquisitions Section Reprinting Committee has been working toward improving relations with the reprinting industry. The committee has recently prepared a set of guidelines to aid librarians when reprinters ask for the loan of materials for reprinting purposes. It is also hoped that a guide similar to the one developed by SLA/ABPC will be forthcoming.

Price indexes have been developed for several categories of materials. This information is extremely useful to administrators in preparing budget justifications. For example, the hard cover book index, base year of 1957/59, graphically illustrates the steady rise in the price of hardbacks. Other published indexes include paperback prices, periodical prices by category, serial services, and college textbooks for selected years. Although the way was bumpy and circuitous, the indexes are now published each year in the Bowker Library Annual. The profession owes a great deal to the Library Materials Price Index Committee and the R. R. Bowker Company.

There has been one disquieting repercussion in the use of book price index data. Recently the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Harold Howe, testifying before a Congressional committee, charged that book prices had increased excessively. The Secretary cited as his source the library materials indexes developed by the profession. Representatives from the book trade were quick to reply, and not without justification, that the figures were somewhat misleading and were not comprehensive. They argued that no single index exists which measures the price fluctuations of all books now purchased by libraries. The joint ABPC/RTSD Committee is now attempting to find a mutually acceptable solution. At the 1967 Midwinter meeting, it was decided to change the name of the indexes to reflect their selectivity and to recommend that index development be turned over to the appropriate federal agency.23

There are several projects in progress of interest to acquisition librarians. After several years of effort, a proposal to study relations between book jobbers and libraries was funded jointly by the National League of Cities and the Council on Library Resources. Hopefully, the study will provide guidance to librarians in their dealings with jobbers. Although the intention is not to single out unreliable jobbers, the results should facilitate the development of guidelines that will assist librarians in selecting a jobber.24 The study should prove equally beneficial to jobbers. One objective is to define and clarify the services a jobber can and cannot be expected to perform. Furthermore, the data may reveal
inefficient library procedures and policies, and suggest ways to eliminate paper work and improve services.

The project team has already visited many public, school, and governmental libraries in the Washington, D. C. area. From these visits, the team has been able to gain an understanding of the problems librarians encounter in their dealings with jobbers. A questionnaire has been developed and distributed to over fifteen hundred libraries. The returns are currently being collected and analyzed. The project team plans to present the preliminary findings at the meeting of the Acquisitions Section at the ALA San Francisco Conference.

The British book publishers launched a 9-digit uniform book numbering system in January 1967. American publishers are likely to follow suit, especially in view of its implications to automated systems. However, the numbering plan will be just another set of random numbers (and we are already suffering from "numberitis") unless it is used in conjunction with advertising promotional material and listed in current bibliographic tools such as *PW*, *Library Journal*, *Books in Print*, and *Cumulative Book Index*. Libraries could order by book number, thus saving both the book industry and libraries considerable clerical time. Librarians are geared to an author/title type existence and it is likely that a period of adjustment will be required before any new system is wholeheartedly embraced.

**Notable Publications**

Publications of the last ten years can be conveniently divided into three broad groups: selection tools, textbook or instructional materials, and bibliographies.

The list of trade and national bibliographies which has appeared in the last ten years is too long for the scope of this paper, but a few that warrant citation are the *National Union Catalog, 1958-62*, and the *British Museum General Catalog*. The British firm of Mansell, Ltd. has been awarded the contract to publish the retrospective *National Union Catalog* to include materials published prior to 1952. Notable private catalogs include those of individual collections at Berkeley and UCLA, plus specialized catalogs of the New York Public Library's Music and Slavonic collections.

There have not been a great number of new book selection tools, but there have been several significant developments. *Choice*, aimed primarily at the college library book selector, made its appearance in 1964. The publication has quickly become a basic tool in most college libraries and in many public and school libraries. The Council on Library Resources recently announced that a grant had been awarded to underwrite *Choice* until 1970. It is believed by that time the publication will be completely self-supporting.

R. R. Bowker Company began publication of its *American Book Publishing Record* (BPR) in 1960. The BPR is a monthly classified index to the *Publishers' Weekly* issues. It is not possible to say how
many libraries use BPR for selection purposes, but the tool is extremely useful to acquisitions personnel in verifying entries, prices, etc. By adoption of official LC entries and descriptive material on subject headings in current bibliographic tools, the R. R. Bowker Company has been of inestimable value to libraries.

There has not been a great deal published that has been intended specifically for the training of new acquisitions librarians. One exception, however, was a book published by Gertrude Wulfekoetter entitled Acquisition Work (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1961). The book, though useful in explaining procedures and policies to students, is oriented to traditional library work and has excluded or slighted some of the newer methods. Another publication, the Carter and Bonk book, Building Library Collections (New York: Scarecrow Press, 1964), contains a great deal of information useful to acquisitions librarians. Periam Danton authored a book dealing with collection building in foreign libraries, Book Selection and Collections: a Comparison of American and German Libraries (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963).

Other works which have proved their worth to acquisition librarians include:


Mechanization and Automation

Ten years ago librarians were concerned with adoption and use of order multiforms and elimination of the cumbersome purchase order form. Interest in the multiform and its potential applications has continued to be reflected in the literature over the years. The National Library of Medicine adopted photographic techniques as a means of completely eliminating use of multiforms, thereby eliminating typing and proofing. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill adopted a Xerox method to eliminate multiforms for the same purpose. For a short period a few libraries investigated the possibility of using marginal punch cards. There was some interest in this type of form because of the possibility of multiple coding to provide librarians quick access to data on prices, publishers, etc. This did not prove to be a viable approach, and interest in the technique was not sustained.

Without question, electronic data processing techniques and equipment have captured the interest and imagination of acquisitions librarians. Several libraries have reported the development of ADP
or EDP bookkeeping and ordering systems. The use of ADP equipment and punch cards, however, is not a development of the last ten years. Their use was reported in the literature by the Universities of Missouri and Mississippi in the late 1930's.

Most of the systems developed so far can be characterized as off-line and not part of a totally integrated system. A great deal of effort is being spent to develop on-line systems. The project now underway at the University of Chicago Libraries, funded by NSF, is an operational and well publicized example.\(^{51}\) The performance data of automated systems are not generally known. Some are well guarded secrets and might as well be classified "top secret."

Automation is still in its infancy and it is therefore not surprising that not all of the projects undertaken have proved completely successful. Automation has made a vast contribution to acquisition work despite the claims and counter-claims by the proponents and opponents of automation. The computer has compelled librarians to reexamine their procedures and to evaluate these procedures in light of objectives and goals. These self-examinations have usually been long overdue.

Where To From Here

Esther Piercy suggested that we conclude this ten-year review with a peek into the future. It was with trepidation that we agreed to take the flyer. Four C's; computers, communication, cooperation, and cash will dominate thinking in acquisitions work. Computer-oriented, on-line acquisition systems will be commonplace. The feasibility of on-line systems will be demonstrated soon, but implementation will be stymied temporarily because operational costs will prove prohibitive for most institutions. Time will be required to develop joint ventures that will spread the cost base.

Data processing will draw publishers and libraries closer together. Machine readable data will be freely interchanged. The data will be used in ordering and billing procedures. Publishers already have developed systems to maintain inventorial and financial controls. Libraries are working toward the same goals. Hopefully, the results will be less paperwork, faster service, and fewer errors.

Improvements in communication techniques such as telefacsimile and microwave transmission are imminent. Whatever the form and shape of the "black boxes," these devices will spur the growth of information networks and regional acquisition and lending centers similar to the British National Lending for Scientific Materials, if, and this is crucial, the time lag between transmission and receipt can be sufficiently reduced to eclipse the time of traditional interlibrary loan procedures.

The high cost of supporting broad research programs will compel cooperation—if that is not a fundamental contradiction. Cooperative acquisitions agreements will emerge for specialized research areas; furthermore, the programs will be consistent with other activity-sharing
programs, i.e., faculty, equipment, etc. Rapid communications will make the agreements more palatable, if not welcomed, locally.

The last C, cash, will be the decisive ingredient. Will the money be forthcoming to bring the first three C's into reality? Until appropriating bodies consent to underwrite these expensive programs, implementation will lag behind the breakthroughs.

A postscript: in 1976 library supply jobbers will announce an increase in the number of accession books sold—so there we are... .
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A Summary of Some Serial Activities, 1942-1966

WILLIAM H. HUFF, Serials Librarian
University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois

The background of the Resources and Technical Services Division is comprised of many facets of concern of which the Serials Section is a part. When examined in terms of the extensive and detailed work done by those associated with the old Serials Round Table activities and programs prior to SRT, the evolution of the present Serials Section in RTSD presents an interesting odyssey ("... a long wandering usually marked by many changes of fortune").

Serials work, as an activity, will always cut across major areas of library operations. Because of this, there are reasons why this type of work is subject to being fragmented, and the various elements placed into acquisition, cataloging, reference or other points on any given library organization chart. However, long before the days of the Serials Round Table, serial personnel "banded" together because of the feeling of a need to have serials work considered as a distinct entity in any over-all plan. The multitude of bibliographical snarls to which serials are inherent, be it from an acquisition, cataloging or reference point of view, has been the impetus which has drawn personnel working with this erratic material together.
Today, most administrators would agree that serials as a type of publication, because of the relatively high cost of purchasing and processing, do demand special attention and handling by persons motivated to do this kind of work. This has been in evidence particularly during the past ten years through the number of central serials records evolving along with the organization of "self-contained" serials units. In addition to this, we have seen the manufacturing of special kinds of file units to house serials records and extensive examinations and speculations on how to utilize more efficiently this development of central serials records through computerized control over acquisition, accounting, recording, claiming, binding and other related serials operations. None of these considerations of problems is particularly startling except in terms of new electronic equipment now becoming a part of the picture. With this one exception centering around "automation" all of the above matters were quite familiar to Serials Round Table members several decades ago.

The Serials Round Table held its first meeting June 23, 1942, and the Report of the Serials Round Table Secretary, Helen Grant Cushing, covering the period 1942-46 pointed out that the war years had curtailed serials activity. She viewed the Serials Round Table organization as the focal point for serials projects, and expressed the general feeling prevalent among "serialists" that its membership of 50 persons did not give a true picture of the importance of serial activities or of serials themselves in any library's budget. Without question the place of serials in reference work and research programs, or, for that matter, in terms of their relative importance to the library profession was not yet fully recognized. The need to strengthen SRT's membership was professionally apparent, and there was little question of the need to improve this organization's structure as a sounding board for the development of new ideas as well as a means of exchanging ways of doing things. In this first regard, the situation was all but desperate.

However, no solution presented itself immediately and reorganizational problems continued to plague the Serials Round Table throughout the last half of the 1940's. The very fact that its interests and activities crossed so many lines tended to make it fair game for reorganization hunters. SRT was also the focal point of another consideration, the dilemma which Rudolph Gjelsness delineated quite concisely: "The real question seems to be whether to remain a relatively small informal group, perhaps restricting our activities to periodicals or some general aspect of serials work, or if a planned effort should be made to cover the entire field of serials."

The Serials Round Table had not sponsored any expansive new projects during the early 1940's other than the distribution of American Standard Reference Data and Arrangement of Periodicals published by the American Standards Association in June 1943 and the continuation of the activities of the Committee on Indexing and Abstracting Services.
Round Table officers urged its small membership to send in suggestions, emphasizing post-war programs, and anticipating that their activity would be heightened with the resumption of annual conferences which the war had curtailed. The officers wisely advocated and urged that a large and active membership be developed, and that it be drawn from all phases of library work. Marjorie E. Vivian, Chairman of SRT in 1945/46, stated in her Annual Report: "A variety of expressions and opinions is needed to help solve serial problems in a realistic manner and to promote more worthwhile projects in the future." The annual meeting in Buffalo that year saw the dismissal of the Committee on Indexing and Abstracting Services with the presentation of the Committee's "Final Report" and an expression of appreciation for their fine work. However, it was subsequently reestablished the following year as the Committee on Indexing and Abstracting in the Major Fields of Research.

This Committee on Indexing and Abstracting brought to the attention of SRT membership, and others, the weaknesses inherent in the librarians' failure to take the initiative regarding a strong centralized basis for a standing committee. The major problem, however, related to the future of SRT activities was whether or not they should merge with the Serials Committee since the problems of the two groups had much in common. Moreover, some felt a subcommittee could be appointed to arrange conference meetings, the apparent major function of a Round Table. The subsequent holding of SRT regional meetings in 1948-49 heightened interest in serials activities, producing attendance for serial programs beyond what might have been expected at an annual summer meeting.

It was during the 1950 Midwinter meeting at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Chicago that SRT received a revitalizing prescription. John H. Moriarty of Purdue University Libraries, offered his facilities, including Jane Ganfield's services, in the publication of a new journal. The membership immediately voted to accept Mr. Moriarty's offer, and a pronounced increase in the Serials Round Table membership resulted shortly after the appearance of the first issue of Serial Slants. Esther Piercy in the first issue of LRTS highlighted this historical event:

*Serial Slants was born at a Midwinter meeting of the Serials Round Table in 1950 when John Moriarty, suggesting that there was need for closer exchange of information, offered the services of the Purdue University Library to help get started a serial for Serials. For two years it was prepared at Purdue and edited by Jane Ganfield of that institution; in 1952 the operation was moved to Chicago with the John Crerar Library supplying much of the cost as well as the editor,*
parties." The advent of this quarterly continued to stimulate serial activity during the next few years. An examination of the Annual Reports of the Serials Round Table from 1950 up to the death of Serial Slants in 1956 reveals that it occupied a major portion of each year's attention.

It had indeed become a unifying factor for serial workers as well as an easily accessible platform on which they could express their "findings" which ran the gamut all the way from the type of signal flags used on checking cards to the administrative level of whether or not a separate serials department should be established. It was also an exciting quarterly morale booster to flagging serial spirits. It revealed that others in this field were burdened with the same problems, or even worse.

In order to glean as wide a variety of experience as possible, and at the same time increase the membership potential, an Editorial Board was established. Originally, the membership of the board was based on a regional scheme, but later on, according to the 1954/55 SRT Annual Report, it was handled on a "job area coverage rather than a geographical area coverage."

In accordance with the ALA policy of discouraging program meetings at Midwinter, the Executive Board of SRT in 1952 approved discontinuing any such meetings at the ALA Midwinter Conference. In effect, if the purpose of a "round table" group was to develop programs for conferences, SRT now had only the annual meeting to consider. However, developing problems relative to the management of a growing serial organization were not quite that concise or easy to reconcile.

From October, 1952 to June, 1954, it was reported that a phenomenal growth had taken place in the SRT membership largely as a result of Serial Slants, increasing from 215 to 366, an increase of 70 percent.
Moreover, charging a higher subscription rate for non-members of SRT had still produced an 84 percent increase in circulation in this group during these two years.

Serial articles were increasing along with the membership and the SRT Executive Board felt a need to have a clearing house for information on serials. Jane L. Pope, Chairman of SRT, 1954/55, reported that Harry Dewey, University of Wisconsin Library School and Editorial Board member, had been appointed as a committee of one to gather such information. Thus began a useful series, “Serials Clearing House,” which brought bibliographical news of work on and about serials to readers of Serial Slants.

The scope of Serial Slants had broadened to the point where it found responsive persons in many areas peripheral to straight serials work such as binding and documents. The number of members in SRT increased from 366 in June, 1954 to 534 as of June, 1955.

The Serials Round Table membership was advised in the last issue of Serial Slants (October, 1956) through the Serials Round Table Management Survey Committee Report that Serial Slants and the Journal of Cataloging and Classification would be merged with the 1957 issue to form a new journal covering all of the interests of the Resources and Technical Services Division. This “Survey Committee” was comprised of Bella E. Shachtman, chairman, and Jane Ganfield, Ferris Randall, Jane Pope, F. Bernice Field, all highly active SRT members, and all having served on the SRT Executive Committee in one capacity or another during its long history.

Serial Slants died quietly in much the same manner as it had existed. However, the new energy which Serial Slants had instilled in serial workers was a positive force. The strength of the established Journal of Cataloging and Classification was combined with the vitality of Serial Slants, and through the alchemy of “serial mergence,” there was developed a new journal, Library Resources & Technical Services.

Under the able editorship of Esther Piercy, who had edited Journal of Cataloging and Classification, LRTS was launched. She introduced it in the following manner:

This is the first issue of a new magazine called Library Resources and Technical Services. To many readers there will be something familiar about it—and with reason. For it is an old friend in new dress—or a new friend in old dress, depending on the viewpoint. As part of the new ALA organization (outlined elsewhere herein) Serial Slants and the Journal of Cataloging and Classification were discontinued with their October issues, and their substance becomes the basis for the new publication. Things have happened so rapidly (with this issue being put together from materials caught in mid-air, so to speak) there has been no time for getting all interests of the new Resources and Technical Services Division represented. This should shortly be corrected, and, as articles or news relating to acquisitions, book selection, etc., become available, they will be included.

That this matter of representation of all technical service interests
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was soon under control is pointed out quite clearly by Theodore S. Huang in his article “JCC/LRTS 1948-1964: One Man’s View” (LRTS, Winter, 1967, p. 18). He cites in “Table III, Subjects Covered” that LRTS volumes 1-4, 1957-60, covered 11 articles on serials and in volumes 5-8, 1961-64, 14 articles for a total of 28 during the period examined. Adding government documents (16) and binding (7), both long associated with serials work, the figure becomes quite impressive. In addition to this, serials received special emphasis in the Summer 1966 issue of LRTS, which contained 9 articles on serials and 2 on documents. Comparatively speaking, in terms of straight acquisition, cataloging, and serials items, there were more articles on acquisitions and the number of articles on cataloging led the field. However, in view of the relative newness with which one must regard serial activities as they are viewed today, I feel the editor of LRTS certainly performed a remarkable balancing act among these three large categories.

Esther Piercy brought to this publication a diversified background in all phases of technical services. As a result of her quiet, dedicated, calm, and efficient direction LRTS developed into a distinguished voice for all units of the Resources and Technical Services Division. The first issue appeared in the Winter of 1957, in its now familiar seasonal brown cover.

In the Spring 1958 issue of LRTS, Miss Piercy introduced the “Year’s Work” programs for areas of technical services:

In the following group of papers the Assistant Editors for specific subject areas review some of the highlights of accomplishment during the past year. This survey was hurriedly done and makes no pretense of being comprehensive; however, it represents a beginning for a practice we hope to make annual. We also hope it serves to call attention to some noteworthy events of 1957.

As mentioned by the writers, the reorganization of ALA with its grouping together in one Division of the various fields concerned with materials control (acquisitions, resources, cataloging, classification, binding, serials, government documents, inter-library cooperation) was an important event tending to recognize formally their interdependence and relationship. That this is not a radical concept was shown by John M. Dawson in his paper, “Departmental Interrelationship” which he presented at the Division’s first program meeting in Kansas City and which was published in the Fall, 1957, issue of this magazine. And, although a blue pencil has been wielded to cut out much of the repetition between the papers, enough remains to illustrate the over-lapping of interests.

These “Year’s Work” programs have now become an anticipated annual review in this publication.

The “happenings” cited in various issues of LRTS’ “Year’s Work in Serials,” which assistant editors for serials, Stephen Ford and David Kaser, cultivated, nurtured and brought to full flower for the Section, reflected the coming of age of the Serials Section as well as the recognition of the important role played by serials in strengthening the entire RTSD operation.

The following chronicle is a brief description of some of the way-
stations in the development of serial activities year by year. It is hoped that a glimpse of the interesting metamorphic process occurring in the world of serials will be brought out.

**1942-1946**

First meeting of Serials Round Table, June 23, 1942.
The war years brought about a curtailment of library meeting activities and conference programs.


In the October 15, 1945 *A.L.A. Bulletin*, the ALA Joint Committee on Indexing and Abstracting in the Major Fields of Research reported in full regarding the establishment of a central indexing bureau. The forerunner of this committee was the Committee on Indexing and Abstracting Services which had originated in the SRT.

At the 1946 meeting of the Serials Round Table the following papers were presented: “A Plea for a Realistic Approach to Serials Problems” by Beatrice V. Simon; “American Journals for Foreign Libraries; the Program of the Committee on Aid to Libraries in War Areas” by Dorothy J. Comins.

**1947**

At the 1947 meeting of the Serials Round Table the following paper was given: “Periodical Trivia” by Lesley Muriel Heathcote. Mrs. Barbara Cowles, chairman of the Committee on Indexing and Abstracting Services of the Serials Round Table, presented a full report of the committee’s activities which included the appointment of a committee of the Periodicals Section whose function was to examine the difficulties inherent in acquiring and using the many existing periodical indexing and abstracting services and to make recommendations regarding their solution. Speakers at this meeting were George A. Schwegmann, Jr., who reported on the “Present Status of the ‘List of Certain Periodicals at the Library of Congress,’” and Homer Halvorson who spoke on “Problems of Reproduction of War Issues in the Light of New Methods.”

**1948**

The following papers were presented at the 1948 meeting of SRT: “Administration of Serials Records” by Ralph H. Parker; “Japanese Publications” by John R. Shively. Wyllis E. Wright discussed with the audience the question, “Union List of Serials, Third Edition or Third Supplement?” Thomas P. Fleming spoke on “What War Issues Shall We Reproduce?”

**1949**

At the Midwinter meeting of the SRT in January Mr. Edwin B. Colburn of Northwestern University presented a paper “Mutual Problems of Serial Agents and Librarians.”

On January 1 the U. S. Book Exchange went into full scale operation supported by a three-year grant from the Rockefeller Foundation with Miss Alice Dulany Ball as Executive Director.

Serials people were much interested in Charles H. Brown’s ARL Committee on the Reproduction of Wartime Serials, which reported that the J. W. Edwards
Company was prepared to complete within the next two years the reproduction of war issues of 100 serials.

The International Conference on Science Abstracting held at UNESCO House in Paris on June 20-25, 1949 stimulated a great deal of interest among members of the Serials Round Table. This activity signified that the problem was no longer merely the concern of the library profession alone. Scholars as well as publishers would have to help solve this bibliographical conundrum which involved gaps and overlaps in the world's serial services.

In October Mr. Albert H. Davis, proprietor of the F. W. Faxon Company, presented at the regional Middle Atlantic Conference, Atlantic City Serials Round Table meeting a paper, "The Subscription Agency and the Library—Responsibilities and Problems from the Dealer's Viewpoint."

1950

The Serials Round Table agenda at the Annual Meeting in July in Cleveland included a paper by Alton H. Keller on "The Union List of Serials on Punched Cards" describing a procedure which would permit continuous revision of the "list" as well as allow for the production of subject and regional listings. Louis Shores told about "The Place of Serials in the Library School Curriculum" giving a brief résumé of the history of the Serials Round Table and subjects covered at previous SRT meetings; in addition, he presented a summary of answers to the questionnaires sent out regarding the teaching of serial work in 19 library schools. Arnold H. Trotier presented the final paper, "Persistent Problems of Serials in Technical Processes."

Publication of Serial Titles Newly Received began.

1951

At the Midwinter meeting of the Serials Round Table in February at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Chicago the following papers were presented: "Serials Acquisition Through the U. S. Book Exchange" by Alice D. Ball; "A Clearing House for Serials Acquisition" by Jerrold Orne; and "Short Cuts in Serials Cataloging" by Emily C. Schilpp.

At the Summer Conference of the SRT in July topics of the papers presented were: "The Serials Conference at UCLA" by Neal R. Harlow; "Centralizing Serial Records at Ohio State University" by James E. Skipper; and "International Differences in Cataloging and Listing Serials" by Marga Franck.

A paper on a subject of continuing interest, "Serial Costs in Relation to Other Library Expenditures and to Inflation" by Charles Harvey Brown, appeared in the July issue of Serial Slants. It was based on a report of the Serials Committee of the Association of Research Libraries presented July 7, 1951.

1952

"U. S. Government Periodicals," by John L. Andricot; "Serials Problems of Public Libraries—Serials in the Brooklyn Public Library" by Lela de Otte Surrey; and "Serials in the Los Angeles Public Library" by Roberta Bowler were presented at the Midwinter meeting of the SRT.

Wyllis Wright, chairman of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, announced that the second supplement to the Union List of Serials would be published in June, 1953.
At the annual meeting of SRT in New York in June, Bella Shachtman spoke on "Simplification in Serial Records Work." A symposium on micro-reproduction of periodicals was held in which Eugene B. Power, University Microfilms Corporation, spoke in favor of microfilm. Albert Boni, Fremont Rider and Murray Gristle presented the advantages of microfilm, microprint and Kard-a-Film respectively. Mr. Rider pointed out that the important thing was not which microform was the best but how to correlate the various types so that they might be interfiled and read on one machine.

1953

*Serial Titles Newly Received* was renamed *New Serial Titles* and expanded to include holdings reported by cooperating libraries beginning January 1, 1953.

At the SRT annual meeting in Los Angeles in June, Andrew Osborn described the plans for *New Serial Titles* to become the continuing supplement of the *Union List of Serials*. The formal program included the following addresses: "Acquisition of Serials from Latin America" by Nettie Lee Benson and "Acquisition of Serials from Eastern Europe" by Philip T. McLean. A panel consisting of Beatrice M. Quartz, Marian Harman, and Esther J. Piercy discussed "Policies for Analyzing Monograph Series."

It was voted by officers and members of the Executive Board of SRT that program meetings at Midwinter conferences would be discontinued beginning this year.

1954

The Editorial Board of *Serial Slants* revised its method of obtaining material for *Serial Slants* from geographical area coverage to one of job area coverage, i.e. Gifts and Exchanges, Library Education, Cataloging, Readers’ Services and Acquisition.

The Executive Board of the Serials Round Table was approached by the Chairman of the Division of Cataloging and Classification regarding the possibility of a merger. The Executive Board examined the proposal by mail and obtained the opinions of the SRT membership through *Serial Slants*. There was a high degree of interest in having a Preparation or Technical Processes Division. However the feeling was stronger that the Round Table should keep its status as a section and *Serial Slants* should be continued.

The Annual meeting of the Round Table in June covered the following subjects: "Some Simplified Procedures for Serials Handling in Small Libraries" by Robert A. Elftmann, "The Lubetzky Proposals for Revision of the ALA Code as they Relate to Serial Entries" by Elizabeth C. Borden, and Henry Fuller explained the work of "The International Index Under Study by ALA Committees."

1955

Andrew D. Osborn’s *Serial Publications: Their Place and Treatment in Libraries* was published by the American Library Association, the first full-length book on serials published by the ALA. This work is devoted to the detailed study of serial technical processing, philosophy of acquisition and handling, and problems of servicing this type of publication.

Consideration of different types of serial records equipment received attention
at the annual SRT meeting in July. Andrew D. Osborn wrote on “Evaluation of Serial Equipment for Library Purposes” and Johanna Tallman discussed “The Use of Signals in Serial Record Work.” Harry Dewey presented a report on the status of a clearinghouse for all serial and allied plans, research and projects.

1956

The ACRL published Charles Harvey Brown’s Scientific Serials: Characteristics and Lists of Most Cited Publications in Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Physiology, Botany, Zoology, and Entomology (ACRL Monograph no. 16).

A poll in March showed SRT members favored a sectional status in a division devoted to technical services; a subsequent poll of ALA members in acquisitions, cataloging and serials indicated the majority favored one division combining all these fields rather than separate divisions for acquisitions and cataloging with serials becoming part of one or the other. In September a committee made plans for the new division recommending the name Resources and Technical Services Division, and the sections were Acquisitions, Cataloging and Classification, Copying Methods, and Serials. The committee insisted upon strong sections to prevent domination by an established group and to stimulate new sections to make their own programs. The Journal of Cataloging and Classification was merged with Serial Slants and the name changed to Library Resources and Technical Services.

1957

Serial people in general felt some anxiety regarding the abolishment of SRT at Midwinter and the beginning of a new phase of the Serials Section. Four committees were to serve as the foundation of each section: Constitution and By-Laws; Nominating; Program; and Policy and Research. The informality of SRT was giving way to the definite formalization of an organizational outline.

The first issue of Library Resources and Technical Services was published in Winter 1957.

Andrew D. Osborn attended the German Library Association Conference at Lübeck where discussions regarding the international problems involved with corporate entries transpired as well as other matters relating to cataloging problems.

The library publication world, particularly, for serials, was highlighted by Frank Luther Mott’s fourth volume of A History of American Magazines covering 1885-1905.

The Superintendent of Documents Office advised that there was available a list of 115 U.S. Government periodical publications for which multi-year subscriptions could be placed. The advantages of multi-year subscriptions were also being brought to the attention of periodical publishers, agents and some libraries by the Committee on Long-Term Periodical Subscriptions.

RTSD's Bookbinding Committee gave approval to the Library Binding Institute for the presentation to the Division of Commodity Standards of the Department of Commerce of LBI's “Commercial Standards for Library Binding.” This committee also finalized its “Minimum Standards for Binding Lesser Used Materials” (LUMSPECS).
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Library Resources & Technical Services
A grant of $6,000 to the Library of Congress provided the funds needed by the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials to initiate a new program for the Union List. The study was carried out by Wyllis Wright, the results published by the Library of Congress for the Joint Committee under the title, *A Permanent Program for the Union List of Serials*. Through this program a union list of serials would be developed at the Library of Congress with numerous possibilities, including the reprinting of the main volume of the second edition of the *Union List of Serials* and using *New Serial Titles* as the ongoing element.

1958

The Executive Committee of the Serials Section received approval from the Division to handle the appointment of the ALA representative to the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials. The Section was fortunate in persuading Bernice Field to continue as a member of this important committee.

William H. Kurth reported the dissolution of the Joint Committee on Long-Term Periodical Subscription (Acquisitions and Serials Sections) with the publication in December 1958 of *Periodicals Available on Long-Term Subscription* listing 800 U.S. periodicals available at cheaper rates when ordered for two or three-year periods.

The government documents depository law underwent final hearings toward establishment of additional depository libraries.

The Library Binding Institute published pamphlets on standards for library binding and pre-library bound new books. These LBI standards, intended to replace "Minimum Specifications for Class A Library Binding" and "Standards for Reinforced (Pre-Library Bound) new Volumes" did not receive ALA approval.

A study on the use of lamination for the preservation of manuscripts by the Paper Section of the National Bureau of Standards under the joint sponsorship of the National Archives, Army Map Service, LC and the Virginia State Library was completed and articles were being prepared for publication by the Bureau.

The Serials Section Executive Committee discussed at length the place of the Serials Section within RTSD. The general feeling was that many serial problems overlapped other sections, particularly in the area of acquisition and cataloging. If the major form of activity for the Serials Section proved to be planning programs for conferences, then some type of organization other than a section would suffice. However, the Serials Executive Committee felt that no change in organizational structure should be considered at that point.

The Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials incorporated and began looking for means to fund its operations. The difficulty the Committee faced in finding the money needed ($3,300,000) to carry out its original ideas prompted it to consider alternatives to the original plan of establishing a union list of serials at LC which would serve to complement the *National Union Catalog* as well as permit the production of various types of serial lists. Since the demand for a reprinting of the second edition of the Union List was heavy both from librarians and dealers, it was expected plans would include such a reproduction.

The Serials Policy and Research Committee was established in the fall of 1958 "to recommend long-range policies and plans for research in areas that need to..."
be studies; to keep informed as to research in progress in the area of its responsibilities.” (Revised 1960)

1959

The functions of the Serials Policy and Research Committee were defined further at the Executive Committee Meeting of the Serials Section. This Committee, as the “idea factory” for serial activities, was under way. One of its first recommendations was that an international list of subscription agencies and their specialties be prepared. This was implemented through the formation of the Joint Committee to Compile an International List of Subscription Agents made up of members of the Serials and Acquisitions Sections and under the chairmanship of Elizabeth Norton (SS).

Establishment of a committee to investigate methods of acquiring the publications of roving foreign and domestic congresses and conferences having no fixed headquarters was being considered by the Serials Policy and Research Committee.

William H. Kurth, Chairman of the Committee on Cost of Library Materials Index reported that Helen Welch (Acquisitions Section) had completed the price index for U. S. periodicals in the fields of political science and agriculture. George Hartje cooperated with Miss Welch in analyzing the titles comprising the price index, with the results to appear in the Summer issue of LRTS.

The Southeastern Supplement to the Union List of Serials was published.

In January the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials announced a plan to publish in 1962 a third edition of the Union List of Serials incorporating material from the second edition and supplemented with material from other sources. The Council on Library Resources granted in excess of $244,000 for the project. Edna Brown Titus was appointed editor with an office in the Library of Congress. This announcement alleviated much of the general feeling that control of serials publication was fast disappearing.

The rapid development and the increasing importance of serial publications particularly in the science added heavily to the work of serials staffs. The translations of Russian serials were also increasing at a great rate and required special attention.

The Gesamtverzeichnis ausländischer Zeitschriften und Serien, 1939-1958 to contain the holdings of foreign periodicals in 120 West German libraries began its appearance and is to be completed in three volumes.

The number of serials available on microfilm and microcards increased significantly between 1950-1959, providing compact storage but producing headaches regarding reader service as well as in certain areas of technical processing. The growth of the reprint industry at the end of the decade found serial librarians ready to invest in back files of titles for which retrospective volumes had not been available except in microform. Hundreds of reprinted serial titles appeared on the market introducing a whole new era in serial acquisitions.
Serial activities were shaping up in the form of articles appearing in *LRTS* as well as an increasing number of Serials Section members being appointed to important committees. The status and function of the Serials Section no longer received extensive formal discussion since the Section's existence and its importance in RTSD was in evidence by the numerous matters of serial concern brought to the Section and by the various active Serials Section committees. Although the recommendation of the retiring Executive Secretary of RTSD, Mrs. Orcena D. Mahoney, to consider a committee status for the Section was slated for the Executive Committee's discussion at the Cleveland Conference, no broad changes transpired.

At the Midwinter conference in January 1960, Jane Pope was named Chairman of the International Organizations' Publications Committee, another joint committee comprised of members from the Serials and Acquisitions Sections.

The Editorial Committee, which had continued from the *Serial Slants* days, was dissolved as no longer performing a useful function.

The proliferation of vast numbers of regional and special subject-oriented union lists and indexes grew, foreshadowing what was to be a trend for this decade. The Kraus Reprint Corporation announced that it would begin reprinting the *International Bibliographie der Zeitschriftenliteratur*. The *Index to Foreign Legal Periodicals* made its appearance through aid from the Ford Foundation. *A Guide to U. S. Indexing and Abstracting Services in Science and Technology* was published by the National Federation of Science Abstracting and Indexing Services.

The Duplicates Exchange Union was transferred from the administration of the Association of College and Research Libraries to the Serials Section.

The Joint Committee to Compile a List of International Subscription Agents (with Acquisitions) working on an international directory of subscription agents compiled a master list of agents used by their libraries and sent a questionnaire to 150 libraries to determine scope and quality of service offered by these agents.

The final two sections of the *Union List of Serials* checking edition were distributed.

The Executive Committee of the Serials Section noted that its membership roster stood at about 800 and passed a resolution to retain its section status. Arguments had been advanced that ALA serial activities could best be served by a committee of RTSD.

The RTSD Book Binding Committee chaired by Arnold Trotier reported completion of Phase I of the binding project which centered around the development of library binding standards based upon performance rather than materials or methods. This work was carried on by a grant from the Council on Library Resources working through the Library Technology Project.

The Serials Use Study proposed by the Serials Policy and Research Committee received approval in principle by the Serials Section Executive Committee.
and was forwarded to the ALA Executive Board. The Board, at the Miami Beach Conference, rejected it as "not sufficiently worked out or justified," and the matter was shelved.

The Serials Policy and Research Committee's proposal last year for an annotated list of annuals as a companion volume to Ulrich's Periodicals Directory was accepted by the R. R. Bowker Company and an editor appointed.

The Joint Committee to Compile a List of International Subscription Agents, under the chairmanship of Elizabeth F. Norton, brought together the information they had gleaned from hundreds of questionnaires. The ALA Publications Division expressed definite interest in publishing this useful compilation.

The Committee on U. S. Congresses and Conferences Without Fixed Headquarters (joint with the Acquisitions Section) under the chairmanship of Mary Kahler began investigating improved means of acquiring the publications of such organizations.

After years of frustrating rejection, a new documents depository library law was signed into effect August 9, 1962, establishing more depository libraries.

In his Annual Report for 1961/62, Ian Thom, Chairman of the Serials Section, stated that F. Bernice Field, ALA representative to the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, had reported that the third edition of the ULS was on schedule and that the H. W. Wilson Company would handle distribution. Inasmuch as the Council on Library Resources was underwriting the editorial expenses, only the cost of physical materials would be reflected in the purchase price.

The two-volume ten-year (1950-60) cumulation of New Serial Titles appeared and injected an awesome aspect concerning the tremendous rate of growth of serial operations as reflected by this cooperative publication.

Lists of serials were becoming more common in all fields and now one of the growing concerns was in keeping up with just what serial lists geographically and subject-wise had been published.

Commercial organizations such as G. K. Hall were bringing out bibliographical tools comprised of reproducing catalog cards by photo-offset which, although having useful elements, left much to be desired from the point of fine printing.

The automation picture for serials data processing was highlighted by the announcement from the University of California at San Diego that they had transferred records of over 700 titles to magnetic tape and were posting current receipts by means of key-punched cards subsequently transferred to a computer storage. The limited number of titles involved still left larger libraries skeptical about changing their records. Other libraries, special libraries in particular, either began, or if they had already started, were encouraged to go further. Serial librarians in large research libraries were slower to react to this exciting new magnetic stimulus and in view of their ponderous collections of esoteric serial publications were hazarding guesses as to what the Library of Congress might do in this area.

1963

The compilation of the third and final edition of the Union List of Serials was completed. After much work by many persons in libraries all over the country the mammoth was crated up and shipped to London for final prepublication
processing. Along with it went its persevering editor, Edna Titus Brown, to proofread and edit the work as it was photographed. Certainly few, if any other, single events in the library world had received so much discussion from the time it was outlined by Wyllis Wright in 1957. Everyone was relieved and now looked forward to its publication and distribution.

Major indexing and abstracting services were emphasized through the growth and bibliographical attrition of Chemical Abstracts changing from a decennial index to a quinquennial. A Guide to the World's Abstracting and Indexing Service in Science and Technology, containing 1,855 titles, further emphasized the spread of bibliographical control through secondary publications. The "Periodical and Serial Service Cost Indexes" which had been illustrating the steady strain serials put on the library budgets since the early 1960's continued to point out this fact. Guides, lists, and bibliographies of serials and new indexes such as the British Technology Index echoed the continually ascending importance of serials work.

Workers with U. S. document serials had made available to them Andriot's Guide to U. S. Government Serials and Periodicals and The Science Citation Index continued its expansion. Ulrich's International Periodical Directory took on a continental flavor and indicated serials growth by now requiring two volumes arranged by subject.

Regional union lists continue to pepper the bibliographic scene, some of them being rather sizeable and widely advertised, some receiving limited distribution and some compiled but never published beyond the typescript.

The ALA Publication Division had expressed interest in issuing the List of International Subscription Agents prepared by the Joint Committee to Compile a List of International Subscription Agents. The list of dealers was published in 1963 and gives addresses, types of services, areas of concentration, and performance ratings.

Reprinting activities by large companies such as Johnson and Kraus increased the availability of serials sets long out of print. Large catalogs were now being issued by these companies, some in card form and others on various size sheets. A new matter of bibliographic control in this new form of publication became necessary. The number of serial titles made available in microphoto form (film or card) had been coped with in the latter part of the fifties and some control was possible although only by using a number of tools. Reprints listed in random fashion had become very much a part of the serial librarian's day-to-day concern in terms of the tempting new titles available countered, however, by the very real factor of cost per volume.

Technological developments expanded with new experiments in data processing. The W. J. Barrow Laboratories in Richmond, Virginia announced in 1963 tests they were undertaking under the financial backing of the Council on Library Resources. In The Permanence/Durability of the Book, Mr. Barrow covered aspects of the de-acidification of a book and the strength of new polyvinyl acetate adhesives.
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At the recommendation of the Serials Policy and Research Committee two new ad hoc committees were established: Bibliography of Bibliographies of Serials Committee; and the Serial Holdings Information Survey Committee. The latter committee circulated 74 ARL libraries and the survey results of 63 reporting libraries published in the 1966 Summer issue of LRTS revealed the extremely diverse and complex manner in which serials are handled by libraries, a point of information which has always been suspected but never previously demonstrated so concretely.

The first volume (A-E) of the 4th edition of the World List of Scientific Periodicals appeared. Upon the completion of this edition future editions and corrections are to appear as an annual supplement to the British Union Catalogue of Periodicals (BUCOP).

Western Reserve University Center for Documentation and Communications Research under a National Science Foundation Grant continued research on “Automatic Processing of Metallurgical Abstracts” to reduce the time lag between the appearance of an article and its indexing.

H. W. Wilson’s Agricultural Index, published since 1916, in October became the Biological and Agricultural Index.

The Union Lists of Serials; a Bibliography compiled by Ruth S. Freitag was updated. Some idea of the serials explosion may be gained by comparing the edition published in 1943 which contained 387 entries with the 1964 edition which carries 1,218 citations and makes no claim for completeness.

Numerous serial oriented publications in the form of union lists, directories, and indexes appeared this year and were cited in the “Year’s Work in Serials.”

The 3d edition of the Union List of Serials was reported as proceeding on schedule with publication planned for the fall of 1965.

The Final Report, Serials Computer Project, May 1964, University Library and Computer Center from the Library of the University of California at San Diego, La Jolla presented the feasibility of a system of computer control of serial records for libraries handling from 2,000-10,000 serials.

1965

The third edition of the Union List of Serials was published by the H. W. Wilson Company in February. This work, published in 5 large volumes, totals 4,649 pages; contains 156,499 serial titles held by 956 libraries in the U. S. and Canada, and will sell for $120.

In March representatives from major U. S. information services met to analyze indexing services, with emphasis on biology and chemistry. A plan was presented for the creation of four clearinghouses for distribution of abstracts in agricultural sciences, engineering, physical sciences and chemistry, and biomedical sciences. Plans were made also for reorganizing the National Federation of Science Abstracting and Indexing Services.

The United States for the first time was host to the International Federation of Documentation October 10-15 in Washington, D. C. Two papers which pre-
sented the problem of overlap in abstracting services were of particular interest to serial librarians.

The Council on Library Resources, Inc., granted the Library of Congress $35,000 for the establishment of a National Register of Microform Masters (NRMM), which will publish at regular intervals bibliographical reports citing the existence and location of master negatives (not for reader use) of micro-copied serials, newspapers and books.

The American Documentation Institute assisted by a $60,500 grant from the National Science Foundation is establishing an Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, which will contain comprehensive and critical analyses of progress in documentation and related areas.

Volume I of Ulrich's *International Periodicals Directory* containing more than 12,000 scientific, technical, and medical periodicals under 116 subject headings came off the press this year.

A new service appeared, *The Directory of Published Proceedings*, a monthly compilation by InterDok citing the current availability of published proceedings of national and international scientific and technical meetings, symposia, and congresses.

As of June, 1965, H. W. Wilson Company's *International Index* was succeeded by the new *Social Sciences & Humanities Index*.

The National Library of Medicine announced plans to publish the 1965 edition of *Cumulated Index Medicus* early in 1966. NLM's computer-based Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System (MEDLARS) produced *Index Medicus* and *Cumulated Index Medicus*. The 1965 edition of the latter is comprised of approximately 7,000 pages in four volumes.

*Government-Wide Index to Federal Research and Development Reports* began in April.

The Clearinghouse of the U. S. Department of Commerce issued *The COSATI Subject Category List*.

The *British Union Catalogue of Periodicals (BUCOP)* revised its format and method of recording periodicals and serials. The annual volume of *BUCOP* will serve, in effect, as the updating element for *The World List of Scientific Periodicals*.

A large number of regional union lists were published during the year including the *Union List of Serials in Libraries of Montreal and Vicinity*, and *The Texas List of Scientific and Technical Serial Publications*.

1966

The *National Library of Medicine Current Catalog*, first published in January 1966, is the first computer-produced catalog published by a national library for the use of other libraries. This will be put out in 26 biweekly issues.

The Library Association (London) published the results of a survey made of the world's indexing and abstracting services in the documentation and library fields. The information was compiled by H. Allan Whatley, editor of *Library Science Abstracts*. The survey, financed by the Council on Library Re-
sources, Inc., reveals the growth of indexing and abstracting services in these areas during the past twenty years. Whatley concludes that librarians should take it upon themselves to see that their own service publications are exemplary and lead the field nationally and internationally. He recommends that each country should develop a select service to the most important references to library and documentation literature. He recommends as one alternative, in addition to the preparation of abstracts in translation a study be made of the organization and operation of the Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris and VINITI in Moscow. This survey is available from the Library Association, London for 28 shillings.

The U. S. Patent Office announced on June 30 the grant of a $2 million contract in equipment and services to the Recordak Corporation to have 325 million U. S. patents put on microfilm. This would cover all patents issued since 1790. A full set of these patents will be taken out of storage in a Pennsylvania mountain cave for the filming.

The first volume of a planned two-volume Bibliography of Official Publications of Kansas 1854-1958 appeared. This compilation by Bessie E. Wilder is entitled Territorial and State Publications and contains over 20,000 items.

Not as many regional union lists appeared this year as last. Among those published were the Tulsa Union List of Serials and the Memphis Area Union List of Serials.

Guides to Scientific Periodicals by Maureen J. Fowler was published by the Library Association, London. This very substantial book provides the first guide to bring together under country and subject headings publications which are useful in selecting and searching for information on current and discontinued scientific periodicals. Approximately 1,060 well-annotated publications are included. The index includes author, title, subject, geographical and form entries.

The current catalog of the National Agricultural Library, National Agricultural Library Catalog, will be published on a monthly basis and contain all books, periodicals and serials added to NAL during the previous month.

The National Science Foundation granted the Special Libraries Association $80,530 to support the compilation and publication of a cumulative index of translations of scientific, engineering, and technical articles, patents, monographs, and proceedings.

A consumer survey is being made of New Serial Titles to determine its effectiveness both as a record of serials published in 1950 and later and as a tool for locating serials in U. S. and Canadian libraries.

The Sectional Committee Z39 on Standardization in the Field of Library Work and Documentation of the American Standards Association (ASA) established a National Clearinghouse for Periodical Title Word Abbreviations (NCPTWA) for the purpose of providing a single source of standard abbreviations for periodical titles not included in ASA Z89.5-1963, the "American Standard for Periodical Title Abbreviations."

Several bibliographical guides to foreign publications important in serial work were issued this year. Among these were Willing's European Press Guide 1966/67;
Guide to Reprints 1967 covering 69 publishers and containing 12,000 entries arranged alphabetically was published this year by Microcard Corporation.

The Subcommittee on the World List of Serials of the Joint Committee of the Union List of Serials is working on a Serials Data Program in an effort to find ways to develop a machine-readable world inventory of serials.

The past year has witnessed some change in the emphasis on serial activities. In place of the appearance of a large number of regional lists and special guides, as has been true the past two years, major listings have come out such as the third edition of the Union List of Serials mentioned earlier; Chemical Abstracts 7th Collective Index at a whopping $1,800 per copy; and the 1966 subscription to Chemical Abstracts which costs $700 as compared with the much smaller and less inclusive edition which sold in 1946 for $12, in 1955 for $60, and in 1958 for $80 before it soared into the three-figure bracket.

Present prices reflect not only inflationary trends but also the vast number of serials now published and the greater “in depth” indexing and abstracting necessary today. Concern for serial control is further reflected by the publication New Serial Titles 1961-1965 identifying over 107,000 serial publications from all over the world and The Standard Periodical Directory (second edition) which has expanded to an annotated listing of over 39,000 periodicals for the United States and Canada. The publication of two volumes and a supplement of Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory when compared to the first edition in 1932 covering 6,000 titles, provides some concept of how high the serials barometer has risen over the past several decades.

In the preceding chronology, mention of Serials Section program meetings was omitted in order to permit the focusing of attention on changes in emphasis over the years. The development and growth was not in just the fact that in the mid-forties SRT had a membership of 50 as compared to the present Serial Section's membership of 3,035, but in the scope of concern. The following programs (1957-1966) show some of the newer areas of interest:

1957 (Kansas City, Mo.)

“Union List of Serials, A Discussion”—Wyllis E. Wright; “Long Term Periodical Subscriptions, a Report”—William H. Kurth

1958 (San Francisco)

“New Serial Titles”—Mary E. Kahler; “Air University Periodical Index”—Virginia A. Staggers

1959 (Washington, D. C.)

“From the Editor's Viewpoint”—by an editor of Americas; “Report on the U. S. Book Exchange Survey”—Edwin E. Williams

Volume 11, Number 3, Summer 1967
1960 (Montreal, Canada)

“The Program of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials”—F. Bernice Field; “Canadian Cooperation with the New Serial Titles”—Martha Shepard; “What the Proposed Revised Catalog Code Will Mean to Serials Librarians”—Dorothy Comins

1961 (Cleveland)

A joint meeting with RTSD Acquisitions Section consisting of 22 “Discussion Groups” covering various phases of acquisitions, binding, cataloging, documents, equipment, microforms, photoduplications, and other areas of acquisitions and serials work.

1962 (Miami Beach)

Joint meeting with RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section, “Automation and the Future of Cataloging”—Jesse H. Shera

1963 (Chicago)


1964 (St. Louis)


1965 (Detroit)

“Serial Microfilming Projects at the Library of Congress”—Charles LaHood

1966 (New York)

“Great Expectations of Serials Librarians and Subscription Agents for Cooperation with Each Other”—a panel: E. Marietta Chicorel, Frank F. Clasquin, Richard W. Dorn, Ralph Lessing, Harriet Goode

In looking back over the SRT and Serials Section programs the base of operations appears to have broadened over the years. The emphasis on major problems of bibliographical control and handling of serials has moved from narrow provincial lines to broad international concerns; from an unfounded, but sincere, belief that if we could just “get together” things could be solved to the later realization that even well-funded councils and national foundations were not able to produce full-blown solutions for such complex problems as the old “bugaboos” of serial indexing and abstracting services gaps and overlaps, international bibliographical control of serial publications, consensus in cataloging and acquisitions procedures, etc. Beginning in 1953, the reduction by 50 percent of the number of SRT program meetings turned attention to other points of concern.

The search for solutions to these problems and others continues, the outlook becoming brighter as the result of the technological advances.
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computerized control will eventually provide. It would seem that we are indeed in the midst of developing and preparing ourselves to accept and adjust to a whole new concept of librarianship, a concept in which serials will play a major role just because of the "nature of the beast."

As a final observation on this past decade of LRTS, I would like to point out that since 1958 the Spring issue of Library Resources & Technical Services each year has carried the "Year's Work" series. This year the pattern was broken—symbolic of the profound disruption that occurred in the LRTS family of "Year's Work" writers with the death of Esther Piercy in January, 1967. She was deeply involved in RTSD activities and seemed to have an insight into the needs and hopes of the Division, which were expressed editorially in the first issue of LRTS:

Ten years later this prophecy was indeed a fait accompli.

Many things are anticipated for the Division: that serials people, catalogers, order librarians, book selectors, and the others will not only have a forum for exchange with those of like interests, but also an opportunity to work closely with those of related interests (serials people and catalogers working together on the cataloging of serials, for instance) and as an entity working in ALA and the profession as an important segment of library planning and professional achievement. Great days are ahead, and Library Resources and Technical Services anticipates being a part of them!

Technical Services in Libraries, 1956-1966

MAURICE F. TAUBER, Professor
School of Library Service
Columbia University, New York

IRLENE ROEMER STEPHENS, Professor and Chief Librarian
Richmond College of The City University of New York

Annual Reviews of Developments in technical services in libraries have appeared in Library Resources & Technical Services since 1961. The purpose of the present special review is to summarize the significant developments in technical services over the past decade. During the years intervening between 1956 and the present, there have been
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conspicuous changes in practice in the acquisition and organization of library materials which have affected not only the operations and procedures in technical services, but those in other functional units of libraries, as well. In many libraries, the accomplishment of increased efficiency in technical services operations has given the librarian time for the extension of reader services. The space provided for this review does not permit recounting all of the important developments in the theory and practice of technical services in libraries, nor is it possible even to cite all of the advances judged noteworthy. The full consideration of developments in technical services in libraries and their role in the overall enhancement of library service could fill a book, and will be a part of the second edition of Technical Services in Libraries, scheduled for publication in 1968. Inasmuch as there are reviews of other special areas of library service in this issue, the present paper has been restricted to discussion of developments within the scope of the following topical headings: (1) general overviews of technical services; (2) organization and administration of technical services; (3) centralized and cooperative processing; (4) documentation and information storage and retrieval; (5) personnel and training; (6) quarters and equipment; (7) binding and the preservation of materials; and (8) standardization.

General Overviews of Technical Services

During the past ten years, there have been a number of publications and conferences which have included discussion of the broadscope activities referred to as library technical services. One of the more comprehensive reviews was published by the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science as the March 1960 issue (revised, 1963) of Occasional Papers.2 This general overview includes reference to the general literature as well as to papers on acquisitions, cataloging and classification, serials, document reproduction, interlibrary cooperation, and library resources, and in some areas brought up-to-date the literature as treated in Technical Services in Libraries.1

Another general overview, which includes detailed instructions for procedures in the various areas of technical services, is the late Esther Piercy’s contribution to Local Public Library Administration.3 In 1962, Wynar prepared a Syllabus for Technical Processes in Libraries,4 which is in outline form and follows rather closely the format of Technical Services in Libraries, cited above.

Wulfekoetter’s Acquisition Work5 and Piercy’s Commonsense Cataloging6 include comprehensive information on operations and procedures in two areas of technical services. The number of papers on classification of library materials which have appeared during the ten year period under review is quite large; many have offered a discussion of the use of classification systems in information storage and retrieval programs. A general work of this period is The State of the Library Art, edited by Ralph R. Shaw,7 which despite certain shortcomings, includes a useful summary of technical services activities for students and practitioners.
The volume by Verner W. Clapp, *The Future of the Research Library*, is another general work which is regarded as a significant contribution to the literature. This relatively short book is important not only in that it raises questions about practices, but it offers a penetrating statement of problems facing the profession. Librarians might well refer to this volume constantly to review the areas of technical services which require study.

Many developments affecting technical services in libraries during the period cut across the various areas. A mere mention of some of them reflects the vitality of the field, and the efforts of librarians to improve library procedures, equipment, and organization. The Council on Library Resources, Inc., through the provision of funds for studies of library problems, has not only enabled librarians to prepare new codes of cataloging, but has prompted exploration of new ways of providing library services. One of the Council-supported activities is the ALA Library Technology Program (formerly Project), which has been engaged in experimentation in various segments of the technical services. The series of activities of the Resources and Technical Services Division of ALA has been directed at improving technical operations in libraries. The establishment of the ALA Information Science and Automation Division suggests a further approach directed toward solving problems facing the profession. The June, 1967, issue of the *ALA Bulletin* contains a series of articles relating to library automation, as well as an extensive bibliography on the field. Various other library associations, as well as the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, the National Agricultural Library, and other Federal libraries have promoted projects which have implications for libraries in general. The new rules for cataloging, the revision of the *Dewey Decimal Classification*, the increased use of the Library of Congress Classification and its new list of subject headings, the installation of many commercial processing agencies as well as centralized and cooperative cataloging projects, improvements in photographic copying, the advent of Xerox, introduction of mechanization and computerization of certain library operations, experimentation in preservation of paper, examination of binding durability and the preparation of binding standards, and the production of new equipment are examples of the progress being made. Recent activity in shared cataloging is another important approach which should increase efficiency in the processing of library materials.

In this general section, note should be made of the fairly large number of surveys of library technical services. Not only processing centers have been subjected to review, but also the operations of state, county, and city public libraries, as well as the processes of academic, special, and school libraries. Sections of a volume on *Library Surveys*, edited by the authors of this review, contain material on relevant issues of concern to technical services personnel. The volume is expected to be issued by the Columbia University Press in September, 1967.
Organization and Administration

In the general works cited in the previous discussion, the organization and administration of the technical services are treated as major management problems. Library surveys have invariably been concerned with proper adjustment of professional to clerical staff ratios, the full use of available centralized services, the effective utilization of equipment, the provision of adequate quarters, and the development of efficient operations and processes. The establishment of processing centers throughout the country has emphasized the requirement of well-defined organization of operations and effective administration. There has been no diminution of the need for technical services directors or supervisors. Indeed, one of the apparent needs in the library profession is the training of firm managers who are not afraid to make the decisions required to clear bottlenecks and eliminate arrears in the technical services.

It would not be possible to list here the many articles which have appeared in LRTS, as well as in other library periodicals, dealing with production in the technical services. Some of these articles have claimed more attention than they warranted, but, on the whole, the literature presents the definite attitude that slow processing means poor service to readers. The volume by Dougherty and Heinritz on processing may be referred to as a general work in streamlining management.

Centralized and Cooperative Processing

In view of the planned issue of Library Trends (July, 1967) on "Centralized and Cooperative Cataloging," this topic will not be explored in great detail. The issue will include a discussion of such matters as evaluation of processing centers, types of centers (including commercial and non-commercial agencies serving different kinds of libraries on a national level); processing centers for different types of libraries, e.g., school, public, and academic libraries; developments abroad; and the increased production of book catalogs. This issue will provide readers not only with detailed outlines of the variety of problems in each of the approaches to centralized and cooperative cataloging, but also with an analysis of the literature of the field.

With respect to the development of book catalogs, it should be pointed out that a relevant study by Matta of the catalogs in the New York Public Library is significant particularly in the direction of defining, measuring, and analyzing the problems inherent in old, large card catalogs. Matta estimates the costs of rehabilitation of a heavily-used main catalog, explores the possibilities of preservation, and computes the present card catalog production and maintenance costs as a basis for projecting costs for continuing present practice over the next decade in comparison to costs for book catalog production. Although the statistical aspects of the study may be subject to revision as time goes on, the methodology of the study, and the identification of the many variables requiring consideration in arriving at firm conclusions, should be of interest to others who are concerned about the future of the card catalog.
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The possible conversion to book catalogs is an important part of the investigation. New patterns of cataloging in consonance with those of the Library of Congress are being developed by the New York Public Library, partly in response to the recommendations of the Matta study.

The Library of Congress has, in the past, assisted librarians in technical processing through the issuance of printed cards and various catalogs. In March, 1967, it was announced that as a further aid to libraries, the National Union Catalog (16 million cards) would be printed by Mansell Information-Publishing, Ltd., London, a subsidiary of the British printing group called Universal Printers, Ltd. The automatic Abstractor camera, which selects what must be photographed, handles 600 cards an hour. As Weber¹² points out in his paper on book catalogs in the July 1967 issue of Library Trends, we have not yet seen the end of innovations, and solutions to problems may be the result of new methods not yet used. Weber, who conducted a questionnaire study of book catalog development, reports that during the two-year period from 1964 to 1966, 29 of the more than three-dozen libraries now using book catalogs started their production.

**Documentation and Information Storage and Retrieval**

Any serious effort to cover the literature and events in the areas of documentation and information storage and retrieval for a ten-year period would require a full issue of *LRTS*. As indicated earlier, the establishment of the ALA Information Science and Automation Division (ISAD) promises that systematic attention will be given to the “development and application of electronic data processing techniques and the use of automated systems in all areas of library work.”¹³ The group will also be concerned with the fostering of research, promotion of standards, dissemination of information, and discussion of common problems.

In the reviews of this topic during the last six years, it became clear that with the American Documentation Institute and its publications, the Special Libraries Association and its publications, and various other outlets for studies of related problems (e.g., National Science Foundation, U. S. Air Force Office of Research, the U. S. Office of Education, as well as institutional and industrial concerns), the interest in information storage and retrieval had increased gradually, even though it has also been clear that many librarians are still unimpressed by either current activity or the potential of documentation. The summary articles on various aspects of the technical services, included in *LRTS* over the past few years, represent a direct effort by Esther Piercy to provide technical services personnel with the latest and the most pertinent information in this area.

One of the obvious developments in library services in recent years has been the emergence in full force of information centers, although it is apparent that similar service patterns have been followed in special libraries for many years. Even this designation is subject to various definitions, but “information centers” have been described by Simpson as
“Government, association, or privately supported organizations, usually mission-oriented, accomplishing in-depth acquisition, storage, retrieval, and analysis of significant information or data pertinent to the mission.”

The literature on information centers is extensive; monographic works as well as shorter papers have been written to summarize, synthesize, and analyze research on the systems of information storage and retrieval which have been developed in these centers. The report of the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information (COSATI), and the activities of the Association of Research Libraries, the United States of America Standards Institute (Committee Z39), and the American Documentation Institute are directed toward projects designed to explore the development of systems. The Library of Congress, among other libraries, has supported specific efforts to establish systematic automatic programs. It is quite possible that the next ten years will be crucial ones in the isolation of new techniques for carrying on the work of individual libraries as participants in library systems. The project MARC (Machine Readable Cataloging Data) is one example of the application of automation in the preparation of cataloging copy for new titles and in the distribution of this copy to libraries across the country.

Personnel and Training

The need for more qualified personnel in technical services has been apparent for many years. The great demand for catalogers—always in short supply—has, for example, created constant and increasing problems. The scarcity of well-trained catalogers represents a signal inadequacy on a national basis, as well as on an individual library basis. The Library of Congress, in its extended program of shared cataloging, has been making an effort to enlist the aid of catalogers. Similarly, large libraries, with ever-growing funds for the acquisition of publications from all parts of the world, have found it increasingly troublesome to recruit new catalogers, replace them, or employ personnel for supervisory posts.

In earlier reviews, attention has been called to programs in library schools designed to train personnel not only for what has been called traditional library service, but also for the field of information science. Programs have been altered in library schools to admit new content, and some institutions have established entirely separate units to train individuals in this special area. The evaluation of programs goes along slowly, and the various conferences on the different training programs are not likely to end in the near future.

In any review of the recent developments in the array of areas of interest to technical services librarians, it becomes quite clear that the content of library school curricula should include consideration of major problems in the development of resources, documentation in all of its various aspects, systems analysis, broadly-based administrative efficiencies (such as regional and centralized processing), and the related areas of indexing, abstracting, and bibliographical control. The need for librarians with technical backgrounds, administrative ability, and interest in the
development of library systems is apparent. The employment in some of the larger libraries of non-librarians to develop programs for the application of data processing to library operations emphasizes the need for training librarians in the new technologies.

Quarters and Equipment

Despite the fact that much has appeared in the literature decrying the history of bad planning of quarters for technical services personnel and operations, new libraries are built every year with inadequate space for technical services. In many of the surveys of the field in recent years, one of the major problems identified has been the lack of space for easy handling of materials. Production is hampered by this failure to provide adequate room. Catalogers have been forced to carry on their work amid cluttered desks and full book trucks and shelves, in facilities too small to permit location of staff members within a convenient distance of files, materials, and required reference tools. Librarians who have the responsibility of writing programs for new library facilities might well examine the space allotments in recent structures in which the provision of space for staff was regarded as of primary importance, to make certain that sufficiently spacious quarters are included in their plans.

Library building requirements are affected by developments in equipment technology. Accordingly, plans for new buildings should reflect an awareness of the latest electronic and other instrumentation if the implications of new equipment are to be utilized in construction. Conduits and electrical outlets to carry extra loads are commonly installed in anticipation of future requirements. Lighting, sound control, and ventilation should be adequate to afford comfort; architects and librarians, alike, have given attention to these matters in recent buildings.

The research of the Library Technology Program of ALA, directed toward the development and production of new equipment, has been mentioned previously. The cataloger’s camera as an idea, related to cataloging-in-source, still appears to many as a device of considerable potential importance. Photographic aids of various kinds, designed to enable librarians to assist users effectively, as well as those developed for the electronic transmission of information on a wide scale, are among the new types of equipment which have been extensively discussed in the literature of the decade and will undoubtedly be studied in the immediate future. The implementation of service to readers afforded by recently-developed equipment provides a basis for prodging new explorations.

Binding and the Preservation of Materials

The deterioration of collections in major libraries of the country was recognized by the Council on Library Resources, Inc., as a severe problem. The support which the Council has given to W. J. Barrow in his laboratory in Richmond, Virginia, has resulted in a series of publications\(^{18}\) presenting positive findings and recommendations for the preservation of paper and specifications to provide for the durability of bindings.
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The Library Binding Institute also has been conducting periodic studies of binding materials and durability, as well as of the procedures of libraries in binding preparation. Both the American Library Association and the Library Binding Institute have been concerned with binding standards, and publications have been issued based on recent projects.19

Both the New York Public Library and the Library of Congress have appointed officers who are responsible for the systematic study of the preservation of collections. This increased attention to the care of materials, so costly to acquire and organize, reflects, in part, the development and application of cost accounting in technical services activities.

**Standardization**

During the period under review, there has been a steady attempt to arrive at standards for the different types of libraries, as well as for certain types of activities and operations. The issuance of standards for public libraries, now being revised, has been followed by standards for school libraries, college libraries, junior college libraries, state libraries, institutional libraries, and special libraries. Although these standards are of varying specificity, it is apparent that all of them were published in response to expressed needs for guidelines. The ever-changing library scene would seem to require continuous revision of standards. At the New Orleans Midwinter conference of the American Library Association (January, 1967), the University Libraries Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries scheduled a session to examine university library standards. The university group of the Canadian Library Association has recently evolved a tentative set of standards for university libraries.

Consideration of standards for materials used in libraries, as well as of those for operations, is included within the scope of activities of members of the United States of America Standards Institute. Similarly, the Library Technology Program has promoted studies of binding, as well as of equipment, in order to provide libraries with guidance for selecting efficient services or instruments.

**Summary**

In a sense, the foregoing section represent summaries of the developments in the several areas of technical services designated for inclusion in this review. The next few years offer great challenges to the library profession, and no group of librarians is closer to the firing line that those administering and performing technical service responsibilities. The imagination, dedication, and earnest application of so many individuals during the past decade are obvious. Esther Piercy was among that group which helped to advance our work in the field.
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Developments in Copying Methods & Graphic Communication, 1966
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Review of the Decade, 1957-66

IN Assessing Technology Transfer, Richard Lesher and George Howick provide an arresting illustration of man’s changing rate of knowledge acquisition over the seemingly long period of 50,000 years:

Eight hundred lifespans can bridge more than 50,000 years.
But of those 800 people, 650 would have spent their lives in caves or worse; only the last 70 had any truly effective means of communicating with one another; only the last 6 ever saw a printed word or had any real means of measuring heat and cold; only the last 4 could measure time with any precision; only the last 2 used an electric motor; and the vast majority of the items that make up our material world were developed within the lifespan of the 800th person.

The shorter and nearer the time span is to now, the steeper is the rate of change, so that events within a mere decade stand out in bold relief. After half a millenium of world domination by the written word, Marshall McLuhan, in The Gutenberg Galaxy, conjures up for the reader an old-new world in which the oral-electronic element asserts supremacy. In the face of these cosmic comparisons, can one say much about a decade’s developments in copying and communication? Look back to 1957: The first commercial jet had not yet spanned the Atlantic, nor had any communications satellite been orbited. Surface pictures of the moon or other planets and interplanetary travel by men were still confined to the comic strips. Computer applications to libraries were largely the wild imagination of dreamers, in the opinion of many, and electronics bore no significant relationship to publishing. In libraries, there was no automated xerography, only expensive time-consuming, wet process photocopying, or inconvenient, time-consuming microphotography, with no cheap means of providing enlargements. The automatic sequence camera for making book catalogs did not exist, and there were no reader/printers to help the student or researcher. Hardly anyone in this country had the slightest idea what a microfiche was, and certainly no one could use
a fiche even if he possessed one. The Council on Library Resources had just begun to look for that still evasive goal, the "cataloger's camera," and had begun sponsorship of numerous other research projects in copying and microreproduction. (The now indispensable Guide to Microreproduction was an early child of the CLR). Except for the Library of Congress itself, there was no significant federal aid for the nation's libraries.

While European libraries continued to recover from World War II, America's unscathed book collections were fast decaying from within, but the causes of paper deterioration were not immediately isolated. The alarming announcement that microfilm, considered an important means of preservation, was itself not immune from deterioration, drove home the message that without preservation there would be no copying and no communication. Fortunately, both these problems were vigorously and quickly attacked, the former by W. J. Barrow's work on deacidification and his development with Standard Paper Mfg. Co. of Permalife, the latter by intensive cooperation between government and industry leading to improved processing and storage methods for microfilms. Finally, significant advances were made towards desirable standardization by publication of Specifications for Library of Congress Microfilming, Microfilm Norms, and Federal Microfiche Standards.

It does seem as if those were the Dark Ages! In spite of 10 years of rapid progress, still remaining to be successfully achieved are the vest pocket micro-libraries, suggested over a century ago by Sir John Herschel, and cheap, fast, facsimile transmission of bound materials. Fortunately, modern research now seems to be on the verge of achieving the first goal, and given imaginative leadership, it has the capability of providing the second.

Continued Growth of Total Systems Concept

The marriage trend in electronics, publishing, and graphic communication outlined in last year's review continued: Litton Industries bought the American Book Company, Raytheon purchased D. C. Heath, and Newsweek and 3M agreed to work together on a weekly magazine, News Focus, designed to combine text and visual materials suitable for classroom use and to promote the use of 3M transparency making and projecting equipment. General Electric and Time, Inc., established the General Learning Corporation, "to make a joint venture on equal terms, so that publishers and electronikers could work together and explore, and at the same time make some money." At a panel discussion before the American Book Publishers Council, George Haller, a vice-president of General Electric and director of the new firm, said: "We are not interested in the book business. We are interested mainly in the information business. I predict that you people [the book publishers] will be chiefly information publishers in the future." Mr. Haller did concede that some books will be around for a while.
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Printing and Publishing Developments

Two revolutionary, fully electronic typesetting machines were developed by Firma Dr.-Ing. Rudolph Hell of Germany. The Digiset sets 400 characters per second and has no moving parts other than the film which records the images. It can set the full text of a 20-page newspaper in ten to eleven minutes. Still faster is the Videocomp, a version marketed in the U.S. by RCA; in setting 600 characters per second, it does the work of 100 manual linecasters. In both machines, characters are drawn from magnetic core storage rather than from film matrices, as in earlier phototypesetting devices. Because there is no physical motion and the machine operates independently of matrices, any face, alphabet, or symbols may be generated, even Cyrillic or Chinese ideographs. The RCA unit is priced at $170,000 and rents for $4,975 per month. Might this kind of machine be used to prepare integrated bibliographies which require a multiplicity of alphabets?

The City of New York expects to save over $1,000,000 a year by using offset printing instead of letterpress to publish the city's 3500 page budget and the voter lists from one or two of the largest boroughs. The job will be done by preparing offset masters directly from the high speed printers attached to the City's IBM 760 computer equipment. Utilizing an RCA 501-301 computer and a Photon typesetter, the New York Telephone Company issued for the borough of Staten Island 91,000 directories, each containing 80,000 listings. By 1969 or 1970, all New York City directories will be computer produced, including the "yellow pages." Production time lag for the directories will be reduced from two months to a few days following final editing.

For some time University Microfilms has made available to the visually handicapped large type editions produced by Copyflo from microfilms. Micro Photo now offers this same service at 10¢ per page for any book listed in their DUOPAGE catalog. In a related development, the New York Times will offer this Spring a large type weekly edition of 24 pages in a two column tabloid format. This edition will be printed in 18 point type, photographically enlarged from pasteups prepared from the Times' regular editions. The annual subscription cost will be $29. A xerographic novelty is also available from the New York Times: a full size xerographic print of any front page from 1890 to date for $1; for $15 the page will be laminated onto walnut-finish masonite. The service is intended to appeal to personal vanity for birthdays, anniversaries, etc., but it is quite likely that some academic usage may creep in. Unfortunately, only front pages are offered.

Office Copying Equipment: Xerography, Other Electrophotographic Processes, and Adherography.

In the Summer of 1966 Xerox suffered the worst stock plunge in its history, going down 15 points in one day. In explaining the losses which involved $20 million worth of trading, Xerox President Joseph Wilson indicated that Xerox was not having the marketing success it had an-
ticipated with the Model 2400, which it had developed expressly to com-
pete with spirit and offset duplicating. “It is a complicated market and
we have found it more resistant to change from traditional methods than
we had expected,” he said. Xerox knew that spirit and offset duplicating
held 50 times the volume of all photocopi-ers, and expected the 2400 to
be its biggest selling machine. By the fall, Xerox had introduced two
newer models of its highest speed copier, perhaps in the hope of stem-
mimg its reverses: a speeded up 2400, the 3600, which can make one copy
per second, and the 2400-III, designed to reproduce half-tones. At the
same time, it brought out the Xerox 1000, 50% faster than the 720 (su-
cessor to the 420), and the 660, twice as fast as the 813 desk copier. The
venerable 914, now the slowpoke of the firm’s line, was offered as a coin
operated model for public use.

After much delay, IBM entered the office copying field with the Doc-
ulith automated offset duplicator. This unit is a web press which runs
at 900 feet per minute, and can print in one or two colors. An optional
attachment automatically punches holes into the printed sheets before
cutting, which is also automatic. The Doculith, which is expected to sell
for from $15,000 to $17,000, is being field tested by the Ford Motor
Company.

3M Company now features three major processes: the established in-
frared system, used in the familiar Thermofax, the Dual Spectrum sys-
tem, which employs a two step process, and the newly introduced Ad-
herography process, embodied in the Model 74 Speed Copier. Spirit
masters and short-run offset plates can also be made on some of the 3M
equipment. In “System A-09” 3M offers two machines on one rental: the
Model 209 Dual Spectrum machine for making 1 to 25 copies, and the
Model 74 for the 5 to 200 copy range. The rental is $.015 per copy for
the first 10,000 copies, $.01 each for the next 15,000, with a monthly
minimum of $75; all rates exclude supplies.

The Bruning Division of Addressograph Multigraph brought out two
new electrostatic copiers of possible interest to libraries: the 3000 desk-
top copier which handles originals up to legal size, including books, and
the 2100, a floor type console machine, which can reproduce full-size
copies of 11 x 17” documents and bound volumes up to 3.5” thick with
double spread opening to 11 x 17” or less. The 2100 is the first office
copier to feature large format reproduction. Dennison introduced a desk-
top unit to complement its established floor model; a flow through
machine designed for copying office correspondence, it is not suitable for
books. With reference to the SCM Coronastat 55 mentioned in last year’s
review, a specification sheet for the unit indicates it will reproduce
prints as small as 3 x 5”—this may be of interest to technical service li-
brarians and Library Technology Reports will undoubtedly evaluate the
machine’s performance in this application. The Graphic 200 Electrosta-
tic Copier will copy originals up to 11 x 16”, including book material;
large format originals are reduced 50%. Similar in principle to the Den-
nison copier, the Graphic 200 can be purchased or leased.
The microfiche enlarged its rapidly achieved domination of the micropublishing industry. 3M Company entered the micropublishing business with 3M International Microfilm Press. Among its offerings are: annual reports of companies listed on the New York Stock Exchange and Amex, the Federal Register, the New York Law Journal, Chemical Abstracts, all U. S. patents for 1966, plus a variety of highly specialized documentation aimed at medical and pharmaceutical researchers. Materials are offered as 16mm roll microfilm (conventional reel format or 3M cartridges) or 4 x 6” microfiche.

Anyone still skeptical of the future of the microfiche should read the long and detailed story, “Wallet Libraries,” in the Wall Street Journal of September 28, 1966. This article recounts numerous industrial and business applications among large and small companies, which are using fiche to record or publish specifications, hospital records, credit ratings, and product catalogs. To promote its PCMI SYSTEM (PhotoChromic MicroImage) microfiche, a high reduction process, the National Cash Register Company placed a full page advertisement in the December 1, Wall Street Journal, claiming that 8.5 x 11” pages numbering up to 3200 could be printed on a single 4 x 6” fiche, which could be copied for one dollar, mailed for a nickel, or read in a reader renting for $10 a month. The PCMI system is being tested by Ford and Boeing, and “a number of educational societies.” The firm’s copywriter must have had in mind Sir John Herschel when he wrote:

The possibilities are endless. Technical and scientific reference libraries are prime applications. Educational use of the PCMI system can be extended into the computer-aided instruction field. Extremely inexpensive home viewers are in the offing. The complete works of Shakespeare, the great recipes of the world, an unabridged dictionary would each fit a single transparency. An encyclopedia would take only eight. These and all the great books of the world can be stored in the corner of a desk drawer.11

It is already possible to carry about the novelty Bibles distributed by NCR as 2” square microfiches. It remains to be seen whether the housewife will go to that corner in the desk drawer to retrieve a recipe, or whether we shall read the Shakespeare in our wallets. The human being is such a marvelously talented and adaptive information processor that he will probably always want a variety of systems to serve his needs. I believe the following, written in January 1965, is still valid for the future of microphotography:

A high reduction microstorage medium in association with a computer may one day be part of every research library, so that upon command a user can have displayed before him the information that he requires, perhaps in his home or study. Before such results can be achieved for the new information being produced by the modern scholar, much needs to be done to channel the output of the scientific and the humanistic community directly into the information complex at the point of its creation, in order to avoid the high input costs
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now associated with the insertion of retrospective data into automatic mechanized stores. Once this has been accomplished, the cost of converting data from an existing system to a new one should be reduced and the library will have something it has never previously enjoyed—an element of protection against system and equipment obsolescence. Until that time, the conventional book will reign supreme as the medium of teaching and research. Long after automatic information retrieval is a reality, readers will still turn to the codex book for education and entertainment.12

Among the other microfiche developments were the following: the Houston-Fearless FilmCARD Camera-Processor was completed in 1966 and delivered to the UCLA Library for field testing. A European microfiche service center has been established with the cooperation of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) and the member libraries of the Association d’Universités Entièrement ou Partiellement de Langue Française (AUPELF); the agreement provides a facility for member libraries to share their resources by making and distributing microfiche. Several manufacturers introduced new readers: IBM brought out Models I & II which differ mainly in screen size; Atlantic Microfilm marketed an under-$100 reader, and Bell & Howell offered the “Headliner,” which features image rotation and a loading system which requires handling the fiche only by the title strip portion. For further information on readers, consult Library Technology Reports and the latest Supplement to the Guide to Microreproduction Equipment. A convenient tabular summary of the features of nearly 125 readers and reader/printers may be found in Systems magazine for March, 1966, pp. 35-41. Librarians wishing to know some of the details of microfiche production and manufacture may read John T. Salisbury’s A Study on the Application of Microfilming to the Production, Distribution, Use and Retrieval of Technical Reports. This unclassified report is available as AD 615 800 from the CFSTI.

In microfilm materials, Recordak has introduced a unique new copying film: Special Direct Duplicating Film. This is a silver film which provides a negative copy from a negative original without reversal processing; in fact, it uses the same Micro-File Developer/Replenisher employed to process Recordak camera negatives. Heretofore, the only methods of making direct negative copies required the diazo process or the Kalvar process, both of questionable permanence. The new film is supplied in 16mm, 35mm, and 70mm widths as product SO-156, and also on a thicker base for microfiche publishing, as SO-220.

At the fifteenth convention of the National Microfilm Association, Sir Frank Francis, Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum, addressed the Association on the responsibilities of librarians, users, and producers, in securing the best and most suitable microforms for scholarly use. In recognition of their contributions to microreproduction, the rank of Fellow of the National Microfilm Association was bestowed upon Sir Frank and William R. Hawken, the Library Technology Program’s consultant. C. S. McCamy pinpointed excess humidity
as a major contributing factor to microfilm blemishes. He also indicated that chlorine in urban water systems is a factor.

Publications

William R. Hawken's Copying Methods Manual was issued in 1966 by the Library Technology Program. An encyclopedic survey of processes, methods, and techniques, the work contains two important introductory chapters, “Factors Affecting the Characteristics of Copies,” and “The Physical Characteristics of Research Materials.” Together, these two chapters supply the missing links in earlier works which have dealt with photocopying research materials. They explain the optical limitations and physical characteristics which contribute to the most irritating aspects of scholarly reproduction: high costs, and relatively slow delivery. While the bulk of the book is for the technician, the first two chapters are highly recommended to the librarian who faces student and faculty complaints about certain reproduction costs. The Manual contains appendices dealing with copyright, standards, and the acquisition of reproductions.

After many years of delay, Microfilm Norms was issued and is now available for $1.75 from ALA. Good advice for the amateur copier who has only a hand camera is contained in Kodak Handbook News, issue 66-2. In the June 1966 issue of Photo Methods for Industry, Lloyd Varden discusses the many prevalent fallacies about copyboard lighting; this article is recommended to the reproduction laboratory manager.

For archivists and manuscript librarians, I can recommend Microreproduction of Archives for Reference and Publication Purposes: Selected Aspects of Microreproduction in the United States. Prepared by Albert H. Leisinger of the National Archives, for the International Council on Archives, Extraordinary Congress, held in Washington, in May, 1966, it thoroughly documents the history of microphotography at the National Archives and deals with many economic aspects in the most difficult of all micropublishing areas. Included is analysis of a questionnaire sent to 146 United States repositories on the microfilming of archives and historical manuscripts.


The National Register of Microform Masters 1966 cumulation contained over 250 pages, representing approximately 25,000 titles, both monographs and serials, available as some kind of master reproduction film for making further copies. The bulk of the entries are by Library of Congress card number, after which is cited the main entry. Works for which no card numbers are assigned and serials are listed in two separate sections at the end of the main section. Both commercial and academic repositories are cited.
In a Library Journal article, "Reproduction vs. Preservation," John Alden, Keeper of Rare Books at the Boston Public Library, counterposes a conservative view against indiscriminate photocopying, which he feels may endanger some original material. It is good to have this reminder that photocopying is a privilege, not a right, and that the copier must always be vigilant against the depredations of careless machine operators.

Facsimile Transmission

Practical, economical facsimile transmission of pages from bound volumes remains little more advanced than it was a decade ago. Facsimile transmission has been commercially established for over forty years, believe it or not! By late 1926, the American Telephone & Telegraph Company had in operation a facsimile network connecting New York, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, and San Francisco, and early in 1927, service had been extended to Atlanta, St. Louis, and Los Angeles. The time required to transmit a document from one station to another was about an hour. It is interesting to note the kinds of documents cited in early promotional literature: "Portraits of any size or kind, scenic views, mechanical drawings, fashion sketches, sport contests, legal documents, X-Ray pictures, textile designs, banking papers, and so on, are daily being reproduced in distant cities by this process." Obviously this comprehensive list might have included nearly anything in a library collection. Despite recent technical improvements in quality and speed of transmission, the utilization of facsimile for library materials is little advanced over those early beginnings. To be sure, limited experiments have been conducted recently, but most have foundered on lack of an interface device which brings the bound volume to the electronic transmitter.

In short, manufacturers have not come up with devices which can scan book pages for transmission; all existing apparatus first requires making a cut sheet copy on regular copying equipment, and then feeding that copy through the facsimile transmitter. Furthermore, rapid high quality transmission of large quantities of text gobbles up huge portions of bandwidth, equivalent to several dozen telephone lines in simultaneous operation. The cost of these transmission facilities and the volume requirements of the facsimile machinery are so high that only a high volume operation is economically feasible. This is the situation with Xerox's LDX (Long Distance Xerography). At the other end of the scale is the Xerox Magnafax Telescopier, which, though cheap, still requires the user to make a regular cut sheet print first; the machine then produces copies at the very slow rate of one per six minutes, not counting dialing and setup time. The copy produced is impacted from a sheet of carbon paper; it smudges easily and is not suitable for any permanent use. Yet the makers, Xerox and Magnavox, foresee potential sales for this unit of $400,000,000 per year!16
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The Alden Company of Westboro, Mass., has pioneered numerous advances in facsimile transmission. Alden equipment participated in the transmission of a weather map from Washington, D. C. to Paris via the Early Bird satellite; transmission time was four minutes for a complete Northern Hemisphere weather map 40 inches in diameter. At the Redstone Arsenal, Alden equipment is being installed to enable rapid dissemination of graphic data to any part of the Huntsville Space Complex. To keep in repair every make and model of Army helicopter serviced on a floating repair ship, the U.S.S. Corpus Christi Bay, closed circuit television is used aboard ship to view and select drawings for use on any of the six repair decks and 36 shops in the ship. Once selection has been made, the desired drawing is transmitted by facsimile equipment. Aboard the ship are 1.2 million documents, half a million drawings, and 75,000 specification lists. Supplementary documents are available via radio facsimile transmission from shore bases. Similarly, an Alden equipped weather network is in operation throughout the United States; each day the U. S. Weather Bureau assembles 2 billion bits of weather data (both maps and words) and transmits it to over 1,000 locations for use by local forecasters and aircraft pilots. Alden and Kodak have collaborated on a “dial-a-document” system, which is a marriage of Eastman Kodak’s Miracode and Alden equipment. Documents stored on 16mm film are located in a Lodestar viewer, scanned and converted to digitized form on magnetic tape, which is then transmitted over telephone lines and reproduced by a facsimile receiver. One page can be sent in 30 seconds with broadband equipment, or in three minutes with conventional phone lines. All material must, of course, have been previously filmed, a condition unlikely to prevail for the foreseeable future of the research library’s retrospective holdings.

Generally, all the makers of photocopy and facsimile equipment are missing the boat as far as the library market is concerned. There would be more business for them, vastly improved service to the library users, and less damage to library materials, if industry would consult ahead of time with qualified librarians and custom-design the equipment to do the job. The market is there, waiting to be tapped. Technical problems have been solved; we need only overcome the inertia which has inhibited the development of devices to scan the masses of data held in our bound volumes. It is this same inertia, or lack of interest by manufacturers, which has prevented the development of adequate book holding devices for microfilm cameras and other photocopying equipment. The past decade has seen virtually no progress in these two important areas; librarians are among those who can assert the critical need for apparatus which can increase the usefulness of their collections without contributing to their damage or destruction.

Research & Development

Loral Electronic Systems has developed a “frozen polarization” technique which enables visual information displayed on a cathode ray tube
to be stored almost indefinitely on an auxiliary device. The storage device is interrogated later and a duplicate picture displayed on a second cathode ray tube. Of possibly greater interest is a "fly's eye" compound electronic lens developed by the General Electric Company. Two inches in diameter and one-half inch thick, the device has 32 rows of 32 lenses, 1024 in all; each lens behaves like a miniature television camera tube. Experiments have been conducted using the lens to record on a variety of media, including photographic emulsions and thermoplastic films. GE is reported as believing that the device would eventually permit "recording the contents of three 1000 page dictionaries in the area of a postage stamp." Each of the 1024 lenslets has a potential storage capacity of 100 million bits, according to Sterling P. Newberry, a GE physicist. (It is not clear from this statement whether data are stored in the lens itself or merely recorded by it.) From Kodak comes another high density storage device: a diffraction grating memory for recording computer data; no details on the capacity of the memory have been released.

The Council on Library Resources agreed to support for one more year analysis of reproduction equipment and updating of the newly published Copying Methods Manual; a third area of work will involve an intensive, empirical study of factors in the microreproduction of research materials. All three areas will be supervised by William R. Hawken. The Council also awarded a contract to Republic Aviation to determine whether Republic's Micro-Vue system, a very high reduction, chip film technique, might be adapted for library purposes. Test charts, readers, and hard copy printouts are among the items to be investigated under the contract.

David Sarnoff, Chairman of RCA, proposed using the latest communication techniques to bring about a world-wide patent system, arguing that the "fragmented array of national patent systems that now prevails in the world inhibits the swift and equitable worldwide distribution of patent benefits." (In this country, the Commissioner of Patents awarded to the Recordak Division of Kodak, a $2,000,000 contract to convert to microfilm aperture cards over 3 million patents so that distribution copies can be readily made in response to the 25,000 orders that pour into the Patent Office each day.)

IBM and Mosler Safe Co. have devised microstorage magazines which permit rapid, random access to microfilmed engineering drawings. The Mosler system uses cartridges containing 100 standard size aperture cards; IBM's unit holds thirty-two 70mm x 35mm film chips coated along the 35mm dimension with a magnetic strip holding 100 eight-bit characters. The Mosler system can handle up to 2,000 cells of 100 cards each, and the IBM system about 16,000 cells. Another research development, invented by John F. Dove, and described at the IEEE convention in New York, is said to accommodate 20,000 volumes on an 8 x 10" piece of aluminum or nickel foil. Images are recorded by a laser beam.
Copyright

On October 12, 1966, the House Judiciary Committee issued a report on the new copyright bill, H. R. 4347, which provides copyright protection for the life of the author plus 50 years. It recognizes the judicial doctrine of “fair use” and offers guidelines to the courts for interpretation of this doctrine. Specifically exempted from the bill’s protection is use for criticism, comment, report, teaching, scholarship, and research.

The copyright issue received a great deal of attention at the annual meeting of the American Book Publishers Council, where publishers of scientific journals and specialized books expressed fears of decreasing sales as a result of institutional copying. Lee Deighton, Chairman of the Macmillan Company, is quoted in the *New York Times*: “Any compromise which grants an exemption from copyright to educational institutions will be a serious erosion of our property rights.” Bernard F. Gallagher, publisher of a series of confidential newsletters, advertised a reward of $10,000 “for evidence leading to the conviction of an individual and his company for reproduction of any of the Gallagher newsletters in violation of the copyright law.” The Ford Foundation’s plan to launch an educational satellite is worrying some segments of the publishing industry, owing to the new bill’s built-in exemptions for broadcasts aimed mainly “for reception in classrooms or similar places normally devoted to instruction.” For their own internal use, the American Book Publishers Council and the American Textbook Publishers Institute distributed to their membership a report on the copyright implications of the new technology: *An Economic-Media Study of Book Publishing*. As yet, no plans have been announced for public distribution of the 283 page report.

Personnel

Charles Z. Case, retired Director of Sales Research for Kodak, died in 1966. He brought to this country from Britain a microphotographic technique to convey mail to the military services; the method gained fame in the United States during World War II as V-mail. Earlier, he was responsible for popularizing 35mm roll microfilm to store and publish newspapers.

A false pioneer, alas, remains with us! He is René Prudent Patrice Dragon, an imaginary hero of the Franco-Prussian War, who is supposed to have utilized carrier pigeons to transmit microfilmed messages to and from besieged Paris. In spite of the best efforts of many authors, including Frederic Luther in his well documented *Microfilm, a History 1839-1900*, the genuine hero, René Prudent Patrice Dagron, seems to have been turned into a monster! Dagron is cited as Dragon in publications of the National Cash Register Company and 3M; I hope the “dragon” will be slain and the evil spell broken within the next decade.
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The Regional Groups: Opinions of a Past Chairman

DORIS RANSOM
Descriptive Cataloging Division
The Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

WHAT ARE THE REGIONAL GROUPS? Where did they come from? What makes them tick? Where are they headed?

These questions are basic to any expression of opinion on the regional groups affiliated with the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association. To have an opinion one must or ought to have some knowledge of the subject. It has been assumed that I, as a recent incumbent of the RTSD office charged with oversight of the regional groups, am most likely to have the requisite knowledge to harbor and impart an opinion. This assumption is open to question, but I do have opinions about the regional groups; I do not consider myself expert enough to have a single opinion about them. To me, after three years of learning something about these affiliates of RTSD, they are still, or perhaps even more than before, an unhomogeneous group and I find it impossible to offer any single opinion on them. To answer my initial questions as best I can will help to explain their diversity and my dilemma.

The regional groups are corporate entities with memberships of cataloging, acquisitions, and serials librarians, limited geographically. But not all of them include acquisitions and serials librarians and in most of them the catalogers outnumber the members of the other subprofessions. Geographically they may be representative of an area as large as New England, the Pacific Northwest, and the Southeast or as small as Nashville, Chicago, and the Twin Cities. Administratively they may be completely independent, as is the Ohio Valley Group of Technical Service Librarians, which covers an area encompassing parts of three states and is affiliated with no other organization than RTSD, or they may be governed by the constitution of a state library association, as is the Technical Services Round Table of the Ohio Library Association. As for
temperament (if one may use such a personal term in describing corporate bodies), they may be as active as the New York State and New York City regional groups, which hold at least two meetings a year and keep in touch by letters in between. Or they may be apparently dormant, like the Twin Cities group from which I had no report during the three years I held the office to which the groups are expected to report. In size they may range from an active membership of as few as 10 or 15 up to one of several hundred.

The regional groups existed long before RTSD; some may be nearly as old as ALA itself. Previous to the ALA reorganization they were regional groups of catalogers affiliated with the former Division of Cataloging and Classification; it is indicative of their forward-looking attitude that all but a few changed their constitutions to include other technical service librarians when under ALA realignment they became affiliates of RTSD. But they have a justifiable pride in their history as early and strong evidence of the desire of catalogers above all other librarians to meet together and exchange views and information.

It is this desire to exchange information and to hear experts speak on subjects of interest to them that makes the regional groups tick. Since the days when Melvil Dewey explained his new classification to them, to the present when Ben Custer speaks to them on the latest changes in the old DDC, the regional groups have been hearing speakers speaking to them on the subjects closest to their hearts: from cooperative cataloging as first offered in the early twentieth century on LC printed cards to the latest and most glamorous of regional processing centers; from the substitution of the typewriter for the "library hand" to the replacement of the card catalog by computers and book catalogs. And in between speeches they meet for breakfasts, lunches, cocktails, and dinners to compare notes in smaller groups or tête à tête. And they go back to their libraries refreshed by tours of new and refurbished libraries and stimulated by the intellectual and other contacts. Perhaps of all attributes librarians must have, curiosity intellectual and otherwise is the overweening one. And the meetings of regional groups provide an outlet for that curiosity.

And what of the relationship of the regional groups with RTSD? It is here that I must express opinions. Since no two of the groups are alike in all respects, they cannot be treated alike by the ALA Headquarters staff and the elected ALA officers. Each expects something different in its relationship with RTSD: this one wants nothing but the feeling of belonging to the national library movement; that one needs help in planning its annual program; another needs not just advice but perhaps financial help in attracting a worthwhile speaker; another may be so self-sufficient that all it wants is to give, to cooperate with RTSD in its programs. And next year the desires and needs will change with the change in regional group officers.

The one permanent aspect of this national-regional relationship is change and RTSD must remain flexible in its ability to respond if it is to give and receive the maximum benefit. Whatever the outcome of the
reappraisal of the RTSD-regional groups relationship now going on, the regional groups will continue, within or without ALA. I believe RTSD will best serve its membership by continuing to treat the groups as independent, co-equal affiliates and not by attempting to draw them into a more tightly controlled and cohesive subdivision of itself. The groups have often been called RTSD’s “grass roots.” In some ways this may be an apt metaphor, but RTSD must not expect the groups to act only as appendages of itself; their first duty is to their own members, many of whom are not ALA members, most of whom never attend ALA conferences, and all of whom are more interested in what is happening in their own region than in what is happening in the RTSD hierarchy.

How this relationship can be fostered and improved is the final question. I do not believe that the RTSD executive secretary should be required to carry the entire work alone, even though I do not consider the elected officer, the chairman of the Council of Regional Groups, a wholly satisfactory solution. This position, like most elective offices, is as presently defined too demanding to be held by most people with full-time jobs; unlike most elective offices it lasts three years. Probably the best solution is a realignment of the work, with the chairman serving principally as chairman of the Council and as a liaison between the regional groups and the RTSD officers, and the staff of the executive secretary handling the bulk of the paperwork.

Whatever the ultimate solution, I offer my best wishes for success in achieving the common goals of RTSD and the regional groups.

TECHNICAL SERVICES DIRECTORS OF PROCESSING CENTERS FORM DISCUSSION GROUP

The formation of “Discussion Group” under the auspices of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division has been announced, to serve the interests of the technical services directors of centralized processing agencies. An organizational meeting was held on July 14, 1966, in New York, attended by thirty-three librarians. Chairman pro tem for this meeting was John B. Corbin, then Director of Technical Services for the Texas State Library in Austin. Rudi Weiss, Chief of Technical Services, Westchester Library System, Yonkers, N. Y., was elected by the group as its first Chairman, under the new organizational structure.

The group plans to hold meetings in conjunction with the annual and Midwinter conferences of the American Library Association. Its announced purpose is to serve “as a clearinghouse for information on centralized processing . . .” and “as a pressure group on the Resources and Technical Services Division and on the American Library Association itself to focus the proper attention on centralized processing.”
Considerations on the Adoption of the Library of Congress Classification

WILLIAM J. WELSH
Associate Director, Processing Department
The Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

AS READERS of the professional literature are aware there is evidence that a growing number of libraries, both new and established, are adopting or considering the adoption of the Library of Congress Classification. The Library itself has additional evidence of this development: in letters from a wide variety of general and special libraries seeking advice on the selection of a classification system, in notifications of adoptions and questions on procedures for establishing or converting to LC, most emphatically perhaps in the request of the Cataloging and Classification Section of RTSD to participate in the preconference Institute on the Use of the Library of Congress Classification held in New York, July 7-9, 1966. The increase in the number of these inquiries has not changed the nature of the Library's response to them. Believing that local circumstances, which we in the nature of the case cannot evaluate, should determine the decision, we do not recommend the adoption of any particular classification, but confine our advice, when asked for it, to the exposition of general considerations affecting classification decisions. While the Library is naturally gratified that its classification has been found useful and has assumed a number of editorial and publication responsibilities as a result of that fact, it has never advocated adoption of the classification or taken steps to promulgate it as a standard.

The Library believes that it has an accurate apprehension of the nature of its classification system, of the ways in which it is like and unlike others, and that it has an objective view of the classification's strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, Library officers have not been silent in pointing out its shortcomings. Nevertheless, it is true that we have not made it a point to dispute every claim for the classification which we considered over-enthusiastic or of doubtful validity; nor is it my purpose to enter into such an argument now. What I am anxious to do, however, is to set forth certain aspects of the classification itself and of its development, revision, and application at the Library of Congress which we have reason to believe have not been taken into account sufficiently in considering the
adoption of LC. My basic purpose in these observations is therefore to make sure that important considerations adverse to adoption of LC, as we see them, are set forth, so that no adoptions will be made under misapprehensions which the Library could be charged with allowing to persist.2

Before proceeding, I should like to clear up a misunderstanding, which I hope is not widespread, about the purposes of the preconference Institute already referred to. As stated in the advance announcement and in the institute program, the objectives were "to identify the areas in which librarians experience difficulty in using the Library of Congress classification; to explain frequently misunderstood operations; to summarize the significant factors to be considered in adopting and using the Library of Congress classification."3 In accordance with the requests of the Cataloging and Classification Section, the planning and conduct of the institute involved extensive participation by LC personnel, but the institute was not held to promote the use of the LC classification, or "to advise on how to switch."4 This was reaffirmed by the Classification Committee of CCS, with which the proposal for the institute originated in 1965, in the report of its ALA Midwinter 1967 session, viz., "The Classification Committee agreed that the purpose of the Institute on the Use of the Library of Congress Classification was not to endorse a particular classification system but to identify problems in its use and to demonstrate the need for a manual of practice."5 (The Library believes that the need for a manual had been amply demonstrated and acknowledged before the institute, but that point is not relevant here).

The proceedings of the institute, now in course of preparation, can be expected to show the effort of LC speakers, in their prepared statements and in their answers to questions, to maintain the Library's policy and practice of objective explanation of the characteristics of the classification, and the manner in which it is developed, revised, and applied in the Library. Papers were also presented at the institute on the experience and procedures of other libraries in their adoption of LC, and the concluding paper expounded the views of a well known expert on classification on the general advantages and disadvantages of using the LC system. The proceedings will not show that LC officers asked for time in which to take exception either to the laudatory or to the critical estimates of the classification made in those papers. I am sure we shared with the organizers and registrants of the conference the unexpressed assumption that the relevance and validity of what was said was to be determined by each one for himself.

On this same assumption I think it proper to rely for the most part in these remarks on references to the professional literature for descriptions of the organization, structure, characteristics, notation and other aspects of the LC classification.6 I assume that the presence in some of the cited sources of passages praising the system will not be construed as an attempt to advocate its adoption indirectly. I feel all the more entitled to make this assumption because of the essential responsibilities the Library
has assumed in relation to the other major American system, the Dewey
Decimal Classification. We are aware, of course, that the literature on the
selection of a classification, for original adoption or reclassification, com-
monly makes direct or inferential comparisons between the two systems.
I do not propose to weigh the merits of any of these discourses, or to enter
into comparisons involving praise of one at the expense of the other, or
to indulge in “Yes, but . . .” argumentation.

In my opinion, many of the preferences expressed in these compari-
sions are not valid in absolute terms for the reason that it is not techni-
cally possible to have certain features in combination. For example, it is
stated of LC that class numbers are on the average shorter than those in
DC. Of DC it is stated that the notation is in general hierarchically ex-
pressive. Since you can not have both features in the same classification—
certainly if anything like precise (“close”) classification is contemplated—
these statements can become controversial only between protagonists
who would take one or the other as a feature to be advocated in all
circumstances.

Another example is the feature of LC referred to as variation in treat-
ment between schedules. To the extent that LC has used a chronological
division or area arrangement in a given field that its scholars and laymen
would prefer to single division tables applicable throughout the sched-
ules, this is an advantage. To the extent that it adds to the complexity
and bulk of the schedules and requires Library of Congress and other
classifiers to learn many variant systems, it is a disadvantage. The Library
is not disposed to say that its provisions in this respect are the best ones in
absolute terms. Neither is it inclined to the attempt to persuade any one
that these provisions represent a fundamental weakness in the classifica-
tion. We feel entitled to assume that those professionally competent to
make decisions on the adoption of a classification can assess the conse-
quences and value to their own situation of objective elucidations of the
features of each classification system.

At the same time it has been acknowledged that the circumstances
under which the classification evolved have led to certain dispositions
of material “which could not be defended or advocated as part of a classi-
fication offered for general adoption.” Among these are the provisions
for subject bibliography, fiction in English, and juvenile literature. The
separation of language and literature for the “major” languages has been
criticized. Other defects recognized and publicly acknowledged are: lack
of a schedule for law (about to be remedied for United States federal and
state law), lack of a consolidated index, and absence of a manual on the
use of the classification. It is true that the Library intends to fill these
gaps, but completion of all of the projects is some years off.

To sum up these considerations relating to the schedules themselves:
I believe the Library is entitled to feel that both the virtues and the de-
fects of its classification have been adequately expounded in the literature.
The proceedings of the New York preconference institute can be ex-
pected to contribute to that exposition.
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I turn now to certain aspects of the development and revision of the schedules and their application to the Library’s collections whose consequences are relevant to the question of the adoption of LC by other libraries. First of all, it should be noted that the schedules are being revised constantly, literally every day. It is incumbent on members of the subject cataloging staff, in dealing with the materials being added to the collections, to propose any changes necessary to accommodate a new work. After approval by the Editorial Committee of the Subject Cataloging Division, these changes are put into effect at once and published in due course in the quarterly *L. C. Classification—Additions and Changes* and finally in supplements to or new editions of the respective schedule. While some regard it as an advantage that LC schedules are not reissued in frequent new editions, the Library is not satisfied with its publication program in this respect. For some years it has been necessary to keep most schedules in print by issuing reprints, with supplementary pages containing the additions and changes, together with their index entries, made since the publication of the previous edition. This is now the status of all of the schedules except one: BL-BX (2d edition, 1962). A far more satisfactory program is now being planned to bring out new editions, with new material incorporated in the schedules and their indexes, at much shorter intervals than heretofore. It is intended to relate the length of time between editions of each schedule to the rapidity with which a substantial body of new material accumulates.

The extent of current revision of the schedules may be judged by the following statistics of class numbers established and changed in recent fiscal years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ESTABLISHED</th>
<th>CHANGED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>2,233</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As any issue of *Additions and Changes* will indicate, the individual current changes may range all the way from the addition of a single class number to a considerable expansion of a topic or the insertion of a new section. The changes are of five general kinds: (1) the addition of a new class or subclass for a wholly new topic; (2) the establishment of subclasses for material on specific aspects of a topic; (3) refinement of the scope of a class, resulting in the transfer of part of its population to an existing or a newly established class; (4) shift of classes from one part of a schedule to another, or to another schedule; (5) extensive redevelopment of classes for a subject area or class of literature. It is evident that all but the first raise the question of the reclassification of materials; the fourth and fifth involve vacating a class or classes and cancelling the numbers. The cancelled numbers may be left vacant or may be re-used at once. LC does not have a waiting period for the re-use of numbers with new meanings.

* Library Resources & Technical Services
Following are some recent examples of each of the five kinds of schedule revision:

1. New class or subclass. Notationally, these may appear, after the class letters, as an integer, as a decimal added to an integer (the decimal may or may not indicate subordination), or as a letter and decimal number (the so-called "topical cutters"). Respective examples are:

   GS 66 Manned undersea stations (Oceanography—Exploration)\(^{11}\)
   GV 1029.3 Drag racing (Automobiling—Racing)\(^{12}\)
   RS 201.A5 Ampuls (Materia medica—Pharmaceutical preparations)\(^{13}\)

2. Subclasses for specific aspects. This kind of change is made when it is observed that, in addition to the general monographs on a topic for which the class was established, separate treatises on special aspects of the topic are appearing. In the 5th edition of Class Q, there are two classes for Blood in QP, Physiology: 91 for the topic in general, 95 for White corpuscles, indented under 91. This topic has been expanded\(^{14}\) by the addition of whole numbers for such topics as Formation, Composition and chemistry, Corpuscles and platelets (retaining 95 for White corpuscles), and Blood groups; and by a decimal number for Special constituents, divided A-Z, e.g., QP99.9.B5 Blood sugar. This example illustrates, incidentally, the use of all three notational devices available for the introduction of new classes.

   Another example is the expansion of BF 98, Personality, in the classes for Psychology, to provide for subtopics and for an extensive list of special personality tests.\(^{15}\)

3. Refinement of scope of a class. Recent examples of this kind of change, in which some of the other kinds were also involved, resulted from the establishment in HE, Transportation and Communication (Economics), of an extensive development for Air transportation, HE 9761 - 9900.\(^{16}\) For the most part, material on the economic aspects of Air transportation had been classed in TL with Aeronautical engineering. Establishment of the HE classes resulted in the revision of TL from 500-723.\(^{17}\) Some of the TL classes were cancelled and cross references to the new HE classes substituted; for the most part, however, the TL classes were retained with the addition of scope notes, confer notes, or additional captions to make clear that the class was now to be confined to technical material.

4. Shift of classes. As already indicated, the TL-HE development involved this kind of change also. For example Air sports was developed at GV 750-770, with the consequent cancellation or redefinition of classes in TL.\(^{18}\)
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5. Extensive redevelopment. Perhaps the least common of the categories of schedule revision, this one is typically brought about by decisive changes in the Library's accession of material in a given class of literature, subject area, or discipline. Chinese literature, and the language and literature of Japan and Korea are recent examples. Since it is usually not desirable, even if possible, to change the general placement of the subject in the schedules, developments of this extent can ordinarily retain only a small number of the original classes without disturbance.

The statement above that "changes are put into effect at once" is subject to an important qualification. A new class number is assigned at once to the new work that provoked the change and of course to subsequent accessions of works belonging in the same class. However, reclassification of titles already in the collection that might be more appropriately classed in the new number is not undertaken immediately. Each pertinent shelf list record is marked "Better," followed by the new class number, and reclassification of the title is postponed until such time as the catalog entry is reprinted for some other reason. As a consequence of this practice, some of the cards obtained from Card Division stock will not be in accordance with the latest developments in the LC classification.

In the light of these observations I should like now to turn to a consideration of some of the reasons advanced for adopting LC which relate to the management of processing in the adopting library. They can be subsumed under two heads: Economy and Automation. Under the first several specific points are made. Since they commonly involve comparisons with the Decimal Classification, that will have to be part of our consideration.

1. LC and DC class numbers on LC printed cards. It is true that more Library of Congress printed cards have LC class numbers than DC class numbers, but the extent of the difference is decreasing. As of the spring of 1967, DC is being assigned to twice as many titles as a year ago, including virtually all current (1966 and 1967 imprints) nonfiction titles published in the United States in any language or published anywhere in English, and most current titles other than belles lettres in French, German, Portuguese, and Spanish, and some in Scandinavian languages. It is the intention of the Library gradually to increase this coverage until it is complete for current nonfiction titles in all Western and Eastern European languages. (It will be noted that the foregoing comparison deals only with class numbers, omitting mention of the fact that, for all titles added to the Library's collections, LC call numbers are provided. Some libraries consider this an advantage; others prefer to do their own "cutting" since LC's system of book and author numbers is a special one, not employing the Cutter-Sanborn tables.)

2. Literal use of LC numbers on LC printed cards. There are two aspects to the unquestioning use of the LC call numbers found on LC printed cards, expressed by one writer as "any title which has an LC card
and LC classification number [i.e. “Call number”?] could be handled by a clerk.”22 Apart from any general departures from LC provisions decided on by the adopting library, it is evident from the foregoing description of the Library’s practice in reclassification that as far as the class number proper is concerned the quoted observation could be accepted only for titles currently cataloged by the Library and not for the card stock as a whole, unless the library in question were prepared to accept the obvious consequence of placing material on the same subject in separate classes or even schedules, e.g., Air transport in both T and H. As far as the author and book number parts of the notation are concerned, if the statement means that LC cards can be “dropped in” the shelf list it should be borne in mind that as soon as any titles without LC call numbers are shelf-listed, the possibility exists that the Library, even though following the LC book number system, may arrive at a call number that will duplicate one assigned later by the Library of Congress. In a letter to the editor of the Library Journal, Phyllis Richmond of the University of Rochester Library, not regarded as anti-LC, commented on this point in the following elliptical but vivid terms: “Think you can take the LC call number right off the card and use it without checking? Ha, ha.”23

3. Comparative cost of original classification in LC and DC. We are not aware of allegations that LC is easy to apply, nor do we know of comparative studies of the cost of classifying in the two systems without the use of LC-assigned class numbers for either of them. We would not be inclined to speculate on the outcome of such studies, but we are quite prepared to acknowledge the validity of some criticisms of LC which are relevant to the cost of classifying by the system; for example, that the tables are difficult to use.24 For the present and immediate future the lack of a general index and manual—faults already acknowledged—are relevant here also.

Automation.

Since the Library is not often consulted in advance of the adoption of its schedules and not always notified afterward, it does not feel fully informed on the reasons for them. There is evidence, however, as reflected in inquiries to the Library, that one of the considerations in some cases is the assumption that adoption of the Library of Congress classification schedules will be a necessary condition for using its bibliographical services at such time as they are automated. It appears to the Library that this assumption could be valid only if the sole method of distributing its cataloging product were in machine readable form, and if the LC classification or call number were the only or principal means of identification of individual catalog entries.

It is clear that the present distribution of the Library’s printed catalog cards does not enforce adoption of either the LC or DC classification schedule or of the LC subject heading list. Libraries have been and are free to make as much or as little use of the information on the catalog en-
tries as they wish. The Library does not consider that the distribution of catalog data in machine-readable form need represent any basic change in this situation.

In conclusion, I trust it will be clear that the foregoing observations do not constitute an attempt to dissuade libraries from adopting the LC classification; equally, they are not made to encourage or advocate its adoption. Rather I have considered it important to set forth as clearly as possible certain features of the schedules, and aspects of their development and use at the Library, that appear not to have been given full consideration in some of the decisions to adopt the classification. We are anxious that no misapprehensions enter into adoption or reclassification decisions that would affect those decisions adversely and so result in disappointment with the schedules and dissatisfaction with our services.
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MY TENURE AS EDITOR, shaker, mover, target of bouquets and brickbats, chief cook and bottle-washer for the Dewey Decimal Classification has now run for more than ten years, and in that time it has been my good fortune to be associated with a considerable number of persons, both on the staff and outside it, who have brought grace and illumination to the DDC, and pleasure and guidance to me. Many are still associated with the enterprise, but it is not within my scope to write of them; even of those whose association with it has come to an end I can take space to write on only a few.

The first, as a matter of fact, I never worked with or even met, Melvil Dewey himself. Dewey died in 1931 when I was in library school, but I did once see Dorkas Fellows, editor from 1921 to 1937. This was in the late ’30’s at an ALA Conference, when she was introduced to a gathering of catalogers and classifiers. I was a very young sprout, and she appeared to be a very old lady, though she was only 65 when she died in 1938. Time changes perspective! But I must return to Dewey. Even after 35 years he remains a presence in our daily work in the DC Office. Time and again, we invoke him to prove a point, either, “Melvil would consider this basic innovation totally unacceptable.” or, depending on one’s point of view, “Melvil was a great innovator in his day, and he would be all in favor of this new gimmick.” Either, “Dewey was a prisoner of his times, and when he pledged stability of numbers and used them up too
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fast he only reflected an age that thought that all of natural science was
known at least in broad outline and that everything worth inventing had
been already invented," or "Dewey was betrayed by followers who didn't
fully grasp his concept of hierarchy in classification." Sometimes we re-
fer to him as "The Old Man," the name still used constantly by Deo B.
Colburn, who was brought by him to Lake Placid fifty years ago, fresh
from business college, to take on the commercial and financial end of
things. It is fashionable today to poke gentle fun at Melvil Dewey, and
we do it ourselves in the Office, but, kid yourself not, he was a real genius,
and, if a prisoner of his time in some respects, far ahead of it in others.

The second of my luminaries was a man I knew well and worked
with frequently, but never actually on the DDC; this was my immediate
predecessor as editor, David J. Haykin. There, in a small but vibrant
physical package, lived one of the most stimulating persons it has been
my good fortune to know. Dave's mind ran so fast that his tongue could
not keep up with it, and this sometimes complicated communication with
him. But it was he to whom came more than to any other the modern
vision of a modern Dewey for a modern age. He saw what really could
be done with hierarchical structure. In his scarcely two and a half
years as editor, 1954-1956, he generated most of the steam that made the
16th and the 17th editions the great ones that they were. He had, of
course, in various capacities at the Library of Congress, been in direct or
indirect charge of the classification of books by the DDC most of the
time from 1930 to 1953.

My third luminary is Godfrey Dewey, known to me as president of
Forest Press until 1961 and as a member of the Decimal Classification
Editorial Policy Committee until 1965. If one was a bit too young to
meet Melvil, how fortunate he was to work with Godfrey instead! Let's
face it honestly: Godfrey and I had some high old arguments, which he
always won, on such stylistic matters as punctuation and the spelling of
preterits the way they were "pronounst" instead of the way even the
permissive Webster 3 recorded usage. Godfrey is his father's son and
shares many of his father's enthusiasms. When it came to substantive is-
sues in establishing DC policy, Godfrey was a solid and welcome force,
sometimes balancing by his conservatism and strong personality a whole
group of supporters of what, later, after reflection, would be seen to be
half-baked ideas. Providing as he did the only link with the founding
father, he was a very necessary balance wheel to keep deliberations from
suddenly running away from reality. No matter how vigorous the debate,
and even though tempers sometimes frayed at the edges, Godfrey was
always calm and good-humored. I miss him.

The subject of my fourth vignette is Janet S. Dickson, who was
chairman of the Special Advisory Committee on the Decimal Classifica-
tion, 1954-1958, and, as such, a member of the Decimal Classification
Editorial Policy Committee. In this capacity she brought to the 16th
edition a vast amount of practical advice, based on her own considerable
experience but bringing to a focus also the experience of all the variety
of members of a quite large committee. Janet and I had had cordial relations for many years before I became DC editor, but at this time we had one battle so overwhelming that it almost wrote “phfit” to our friendship—almost, but I am glad to say not quite. In the event, I won the battle, but now in 1967, ten years later, it appears that Janet has won the war, in that the feature for which she fought has been accepted by the present-day DCEPC as a feature of the revised volume 2 of Dewey 17 and of Dewey 18 and subsequent editions as well: a separate list of relocations in addition to the notes scattered throughout the schedules. Good for you, Janet!

Fifth is Lucile M. Morsch, member of the DCEPC from 1956 to 1962, and its Chairman, 1956-60. Probably a great many of those who read these words know Lucile, and most of those who do not know her know of her. This being so, it is hardly necessary for me to describe what a dynamo of action and ideas she made of the Committee while guiding it through to solutions of numerous ticklish problems. Being especially interested in the international aspects of librarianship, she was the originator of the 1964 Field Survey of Dewey Decimal Classification Use Abroad, and in general strongly supported making Dewey internationally useful. She was the most forceful supporter of the substantially reorganized table of standard subdivisions in Edition 17, and of the need for a completely revised law schedule, which, unfortunately, it was not possible to prepare while she was a member of the EPC—not even yet. Most important of all, being immediately at hand in the Library of Congress, she was this editor’s strong support and persistent pusher and booster. Lucile could drive one to do better than his best, and she never did less than that herself.

The sixth and seventh luminaries are both deceased former members of the DCEPC: Harriet D. MacPherson, and Esther J. Piercy, to whose memory this issue of LRTS is dedicated. Harriet was first appointed to the original DC Committee in 1937, was reappointed in 1944 for a seven-year term, resigned in 1951, was reappointed to the reconstituted DCEPC 1956-1962, and was elected Vice-Chairman in 1957 and again in 1960. No other member of the Committee ever equalled this long and honorable record of service. Subsequently she participated in the planning for the Field Survey, and was its first director, but she was forced by failing health almost at once to relinquish this post to Sarah K. Vann.

Esther was a member of the DCEPC from 1961 to 1967, dying in the last year of her term. Because she came from a library that does not use Dewey, her contributions to the Committee’s discussions were never trammelled by any local considerations that might circumscribe her wide-ranging thoughts. She was, possibly, the most conscientious person I ever knew—too conscientious, as it turned out, for her own good. She was gifted with great imagination, always tempered by common sense.

My eighth and ninth luminaries can be thought of only together, like ham ‘n’ eggs or Baltimore & Ohio. They are, of course, Julia and Alice: Julia C. Pressey and Alice M. Kenton, who between them gave
60 years to DC at LC. Alice joined Dave Haykin in the ALA Office for DC Numbers on LC Cards in August 1930; Julia replaced Dave as head of the office in April 1932; both retired from the Decimal Classification Office in July, 1961. From 1932 until 1956 both, along with other staff members, kept the DC numbers rolling. At the same time they performed numerous editorial or quasi-editorial activities, such as advising the editors, comparing Editions 14 and 15, critically analyzing these for the benefit of the editors of Edition 16, modifying the spelling of Edition 14's index from "fonetic" to standard. In 1956, the same day I became Editor, Julia became Associate Editor, and she was responsible for much in Edition 16 that made it so acceptable to the public. Alice, too, performed chores for Edition 16, like indexing and proofreading, and together they provided the major continuity between the DC Section and the DDC Editorial Office, on the one hand, and the new (in 1958) DC Office. They were gracious, gentle librarians of the old school, and probably no one alive or dead ever knew more about the Dewey Decimal Classification than they. It was one of my greatest professional privileges to be associated with them, and I was lost indeed when they retired together to California, where they still live.

The tenth luminary is Marie M. Henshaw, who was appointed by Haykin as one of the editorial crew in 1954, and retired December 30, 1966, as the Assistant Editor. Marie was responsible for most of the improvements of Edition 17: the rigorous presentation of material, the emphasis on hierarchy, the subject integrity. In all this she was the follower of Haykin. But she was more than a follower. Her brilliance of mind, one of the finest I have known professionally, originated many new ideas and improved many old ones. Dewey's users for a long time to come will be indebted to her, and no debt is more substantial than mine.

Having disclaimed the intention to write about anyone still associated with the Dewey enterprise, I may appear to have ignored my own ground rules in turning now to my last luminary, John W. Cronin, and this may be technically true, but not actually, since for some years now John's associate, William J. Welsh, has been his surrogate in matters dealing with DC. But in the years when the editorial staff of five or six were working madly up to 90 hours a week toward what seemed an impossible deadline for DC 16, when DCEPC, Advisory Committee, Forest Press, and users were pulling the editor in all directions, no one was such a bulwark in a storm as John. Weekly and sometimes daily he listened to my problems, shouted commonsense advice with a pound of the table—as only John can pound—and bucked me up to carry on. Never was there a librarian who gave more of himself to get things done, never a librarian with greater vision; and he is still the same, only today it is the Shared Cataloging Program and the retrospective National Union Catalog, instead of Dewey, for which he shouts and pounds the table. I suspect that John is the greatest librarian of our time, as perhaps Melvil Dewey was of his. Have I not, indeed, been fortunate in my associations?
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SOMEONE HAS SAID there is always an easy solution to every problem: neat, plausible, and wrong. Among librarians the easy solution is suspect today and rightly so. Not only are our day-to-day problems increasingly complex but, as generalists, we feel uncomfortable in this specialists' world.

So frequently do our problems seem to require the care and handling of specialists that we are made to feel a little guilty if we attempt to do our own thinking. A superficial study of a day in the life of an administrator might lead us to the hasty conclusion that he was not paid to think for himself but to find the funds to find someone else to think for him. Perhaps we have been made overcautious by the appalling waste associated with duplicate research. However, sometimes it almost seems that, if two librarians working independently at the same problem reached the same conclusion, it would be reassuring, if costly.

But, of course, not only are our problems complex but the time allotted to their solution is limited. There is less time for every activity, including and especially thinking. No one outside a padded cell can escape experiencing the rat-race nature of our lives today. Some find it stimulating; others find it bewildering; everyone finds it exhausting.

Such is our optimistic nature, or maybe it is only because of a thorough grounding in reference work, that we never for a moment doubt that somebody has the answer to our problems. Lack of confidence in ourselves is matched by very great confidence in someone else, especially if he is somewhere else.

All we have to do is ask the right person. Since no Geiger counter has been devised for infallible selection of this knowledgeable creature, we sometimes take refuge in numbers. This may explain the popularity of one of our time-honored methods of reaping the harvest of someone else's thinking without overworking our own mental equipment, namely, sending out a questionnaire. We distribute this questionnaire to a select group of colleagues who, it is supposed, have a similar problem. It should come as no surprise to learn, when the returns are in, that our
judgment has indeed been keen and our choices perceptive. We wrote
to precisely the right people, i.e., those who have a similar problem to
ours. Chances are excellent that, if our colleagues have thought the prob-
lem worthy of study or even, in fact, labeled it a problem, their solution
in adequacy, imagination, and general brilliance matches our own.

More frequently than an answer or a suggestion of an answer comes
the response that Library X has no solution but they would be pleased to
receive a copy of our final report, i.e., a copy of others’ solutions that un-
doubtedly are going to be unearthed.

The chances of plowing fresh, new ground by this method are some-
thing less than excellent. (One colleague recently wrote us that he had
not known he had the problem until we mentioned it.) Some of the dif-
ciculty, of course, may lie with the poorly designed questionnaire. We
have all been told that a well-designed questionnaire is one that can be
answered quickly and the answers, when elicited, tabulated easily. Con-
sideration of the degree to which the tabulated information is likely to
reveal anything we need to know runs a poor third. Most of the ques-
tions are designed to learn what is being done, not why nor whether
there has been a suggestion for doing it differently. But of course this
type of answer could not be tabulated easily. The results of most such
inquiries must remind many of the comment made by someone that “A
consensus of worthless opinions can be no more than a worthless con-
sensus.”

Probably before we sent out the questionnaire—or maybe after we
got back the returns—we made something called a “literature search.”
This too can be a disheartening experience.

Our enthusiastic opposition to censorship extends to absurd lengths
when applied to our own professional journals, and evidence of selection,
either on the basis of content or style, is sometimes lacking. Anyone will-
ing to commit his thoughts to paper can get them printed—somewhere.
The question, “Is the author an authority on the subject?” seems to be
asked only if a book is being selected for the library’s collection. It ap-
parently is not always considered an appropriate question when deter-
mining an article’s acceptability for publication in a professional journal.

Sometimes an editor appears to be willing to accept, if not deliber-
ately encourage, superficial and thoughtless presentation of an idea in
the expectation that the ensuing and, he hopes, inevitable controversy
will be beneficial to all, including his circulation department, and that
the rebuttal by a responsible source will be eloquent and enlightening.

The current squabble, with the lack of dignity this word implies, over
the presumed demerits of the Dewey Decimal Classification, is a case in
point. The surprise, in this instance, is not that there is decidedly more
heat than light, but that the subject of the weaknesses and strengths of
two classification schemes should generate any heat at all. Personally, I
hold no brief for Dewey or the Library of Congress Classification, but I
am appalled—and I believe many others are too—at the emotional
tenor of the remarks of their proponents.
The pros and cons of various classification schemes are surely still taught in library schools (or are they?) and it would seem reasonable for a librarian to make his own choice of the appropriate scheme for his institution without shouting at the top of his voice that he hated the choice of his neighbor. Seldom has emotional response short-circuited so much rational thought about a professional issue. The reaction indeed seems far out of proportion to the cause or causes of the disputation. As in other instances, misstatements and misrepresentations can be stated in a few words; refutation, if carefully and accurately made, would fill a book. Not everyone has time to write a book, but almost everyone has time to make a wild statement sound authoritative.

In this current classification clash there is endless repetition of the same ideas. They were not factually correct or logically justified the first time they were presented, but repeated often enough they may sound convincing to some.

It could be maintained that our literature was never replete with profundities, but the more complex our problems and the more far-reaching the consequences of our decisions, surely the less we can afford the airing in our professional press of off-the-cuff comments on our current dilemmas.

But these days sending out a questionnaire or searching the literature is only for the budget-minded, and where do you find them? It is almost inevitable, when a problem larger than we are looms on the horizon, that someone will propose a survey. In this affluent age the financing of such a project usually poses no difficulties and a qualified surveyor can be lined up with little effort.

To be qualified a surveyor must (1) come from a distance and (2) be unacquainted with the situation to be studied. These requirements guarantee an objective approach, it is said. They may also increase the likelihood that the final recommendations will include suggestions which are not feasible given the particular set of local circumstances. A recent survey of the various departments of the City of Philadelphia resulted in recommendations that were unrealistic since they were made without regard to the City Charter, union contracts currently in force, and civil service procedures.

Basic to the employment of the survey technique is the assumption that the one selected to do the survey has both the time and inclination to be the honest, disinterested searcher after the truth that the librarian expects and needs. The surveyor himself may be in a hurry. In some cases the temptation to use a recommendation which he had worked up for another occasion must prove too strong. How else explain the recommendations arrived at before the surveyor reaches the locale to be surveyed? On other occasions it can only be presumed that the surveyor lent his name but delegated to subordinates the responsibility for collecting data and drawing the conclusions.

Affluent as our society is, most of us will have many more occasions for evaluating the findings made in libraries X, Y, and Z than we will...
for studying the recommendations growing out of a survey of our own institution. Difficult as it may be to evaluate a study made explicitly for our own situation, it is downright hazardous to evaluate a study made for someone else and to determine the degree to which the final conclusions are applicable to our problem.

Sometimes we evaluate a survey, not on the merits of the survey itself, but rather on the name and reputation of the surveyor or the prominence of the institution associated with the survey. The Enoch Pratt Free Library, with a reputation for bold action and forward-looking programs, decided, after a survey, to reclassify its entire collection by the Library of Congress Classification. Esther Piercy, at the time of this decision, expressed concern that public librarians in general would jump to the conclusion that since Enoch Pratt took this action, it was undoubtedly a desirable course of action for all public libraries. It would be easier to “reason” so than it would be to learn what kind of classification dilemma Enoch Pratt was facing at the time of their re-examination and, given their particular set of circumstances, precisely why this decision was considered advisable. But only by so doing can each of us know (1) whether we would have made the same decision given the same problem, and (2) whether our own problem, being different, could profitably use the same solution.

If one institution makes a survey and other institutions make use of the results, appropriately or inappropriately, they do so at their own peril. Fortunately, today reports of studies frequently carry the warning against copying too freely. For example, many eyes in the year 1967 are focused on the Los Angeles Public Library and its automation program, but advice emanating from this library is sound:

Since the Los Angeles Public Library first announced the inauguration of its data processing program, requests for information have come from various parts of the country. We have told our questioners that it is not possible to superimpose the Los Angeles Public Library system on any other existing system. There are involved detailed instructions to the machine that reflect only the policies and procedures of the Los Angeles Public Library; the system designed for us can work for a public library that has the same policies and procedures. There is no shortcut to the development of an automated system.

Every library which feels that its innovations are worth reporting assumes with its initial reporting the obligation to make future reports of progress. And if it is not progress they have to report, they will earn the gratitude of the profession if they would report setbacks, temporary or otherwise. The few such reports which have appeared in our literature are like a fresh breeze but they are far outnumbered by those describing in detail projects that sound operative but which are not off the drawing board.

Like all other large libraries, we at the Free Library of Philadelphia have our quota of visiting librarians, foreign and domestic. When we
have had occasion to talk about book catalogs, we have often referred the visitor to institutions where book catalogs were being produced by the use of computers. It took an Australian librarian, Harrison Bryan, writing in a recent issue of *Library Journal*, to inform me that a printed catalog of one library to which I had referred inquiries had not been cumulated for three years. Mr. Bryan, in this same article, in which he attempted an evaluation of "American Automation in Action," says: "Systems reported in the full flush of initial optimism are found abandoned or modified out of recognition." The rush to publish plans and proposals, not always unequivocally labeled as such for the speed reader, is not matched by the rush to explain why the plan or proposal did not work.

When the experimental program or study is subsidized or wholly funded by an agency such as the Council on Library Resources, the obligation to report to the profession is a particularly heavy one. The results of such a study were presented in the Winter 1966 issue of *Library Resources & Technical Services*. The article was written by Robert M. Hayes and others, and was entitled "The Economics of Book Catalog Production." A good portion of the report is composed of tables, equations and samples, twenty-four pages as compared with ten pages of text. I would be the last one to question Mr. Hayes's mathematics, but some of the cost figures in Table 19 representing "Comparative Costs: 3 Card Catalogs and 50 Book Catalogs" do come as a great surprise to me. One example is the figure of $2,400 for manually filing cards for 10,000 titles. Unlike filing costs, I am unacquainted with costs for designing computer programs, but again I was surprised—no, the word is disbelieving—when I read the figure of $3,000 for this service.

When I have asked some of my colleagues interested in this subject whether they checked out the equations presented in the article (four pages in all) I was met with a surely-you-are-not-serious look. I could not be certain whether they thought I was misjudging their abilities or those of the authors.

Daunted as I am by the mathematical equations, I can read the prose pages of this article and here too I run into difficulties, although they are difficulties of a different nature. Since the purpose of this study was "to evaluate the economics of various major methods of producing book catalogs" the authors need not have discussed the costs of card catalogs as opposed to book catalogs and, in my opinion, the article would have been stronger if they had not. Some readers of this article carried away the impression, not justified by careful reading, that the authors concluded that a book catalog was less expensive than a card catalog. This is not what is said. What is said is that "a book catalog would initially be $13,000 less expensive than a card catalog." In describing how they arrived at this figure, the authors state that for this comparison "to be fair, it was decided to compare three complete card catalogs (one on each floor of the building) with fifty copies of the book catalog." Granted one is comparing peaches and apples—and this is one of the reasons I do not
think the comparison is useful—using a 3/50 ratio, even though presumably based on considerations of access, does not seem to make the comparison “fair.”

The authors state that in later years, when costs would be admittedly higher for a computer-produced catalog, the “cost differential could be reduced by printing the complete catalog only every second or third year.” This comment invites the rejoinder that the cost of the book catalog as compared to the card catalog would appear in an even more favorable light if it were published once a decade. But “to be fair,” should we not compare—if compare we must—a catalog which retained some degree of currency with a catalog which aimed to do the same?

Regardless of the difficulties we encounter in trying to keep abreast of current developments in our field and make use of relevant data gleaned from experiences of our colleagues, one thing is certain: we must continue to do so. How can we do so more profitably?

We might decide to limit the use of the questionnaire to those situations which demand a census-taking technique, but not rely on it as a method of discovering revolutionary ideas.

So far as the quality of writing in our professional journals is concerned, it should be acknowledged that in some quarters impressive progress has been made. Perhaps at last our age is showing and maybe it is only a mark of journalistic maturity that we are shocked when intellectual responses are eclipsed by emotional reactions.

But these are secondary considerations when compared to learning how to evaluate and apply the fruits of research. It is assumed, of course, that the results of research will be presented in an honest, straightforward style and be as free as possible of bias. More research there must be and will be, but it remains for the practicing librarian-administrator to apply the results to a working situation. Otherwise the research remains “pure” in every sense of the word.

I trust that today’s library school students are receiving thorough training in research methods and on a much more sophisticated level than we received twenty years ago. I would make such a course a prerequisite for the course on management and administration. It should be encouraged as a “major.” A knowledge of research methods is important equipment for today’s librarians; it will be essential for tomorrow’s.

Only a small percentage of the theses prepared in partial fulfillment for a Master’s degree or a Ph.D. ever made any great contribution to knowledge, but it is to be hoped that the exercise of doing the “research” made the study of research techniques less an academic subject than it would otherwise have been.

Two of the finest teachers at Chicago one year were Ralph Beals and Leon Carnovsky. Some days they gave the impression that their vocabularies were limited to one three-letter word, “why.” In a loquacious mood this might become “How do you know?” It was sometimes exasperating, but it was effective. When we were consumed with curiosity to know their opinions, they insisted on our forming our own—carefully.
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I am sure they were not always impressed with what they had to work with, but work they did, as though each of us were a potential Librarian of Congress, and for that we were grateful.

The problems concerned with the operation of libraries will inevitably grow more complex and so our education will become obsolete more rapidly. The only part of that education that stands a chance of serving us throughout a professional lifetime is that part which has taught us how to recognize a problem, define it, study it, and learn how to walk around it or work our way through it. The future librarian is going to have a vast experience in doing this. I trust he is learning how right now.
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Cataloging—Study and Teaching
(Excerpts and Conclusions)

LAURA C. COLVIN, Professor
School of Library Science
Simmons College
Boston, Massachusetts

DR. WILLIAM WARNER BISHOP, when Superintendent of the Library of Congress Reading Room, gave what is now his well-known essay, Cataloging as an Asset, as an address to the New York State Library School, May 1, 1915, in which he said:

... as a sort of 'ultimate consumer' of the cataloger's wares, I may be entitled to say what I think of his product, and how much value I find it in my daily work...

But before we begin to talk about the relative value of the various phases of the librarian's calling, it is highly desirable that we ask ourselves just what that calling is. ... There is the actual performance of the technical processes of library work, the strictly 'professional' side. ... Just so the successful librarian is necessarily a compound of technical skill, acquaintance with technical processes, and administrative ability. ... In all this, of what value is a knowledge of cataloging?
But they [librarians] make catalogs for the use of their readers. The point is vital. Unless you think of the catalog as an instrument, you lose entirely the point of view of modern cataloging practice.

But why is the catalog a complex and difficult instrument?

... Catalogs are complex because people and books are complex.

But what of the subject side? Can that be treated 'simply'?

I might go on to show that in almost every branch of library work a knowledge of cataloging is practically essential.

... Moreover, there are certain indirect results of the study and practice of cataloging which I must at least name. Scores of abbreviated book titles come to us every day, and it is persons with a good knowledge of cataloging who must readily interpret them.

If, then, a knowledge of cataloging is a very practical necessity for a trained librarian—though by no means his sole necessary equipment, I hasten to add, lest we fall into exaggeration—it would seem to follow naturally that the courses in that subject in library schools should prove one of the most profitable and practical parts of the curriculum. Far be it from me to criticize the manner in which instruction in cataloging is presented! But I have a feeling that the method of approach on the part of both instructors and pupils has in many cases left something to be desired. The reader's point of view and the administrative point of view have been, I venture to say, rather frequently and unfortunately neglected in the instruction. The minutaie and the mechanics of cataloging (which must be acquired!) naturally loom large in the eyes of the teacher. And on the other hand the pupil is rather apt to be impatient of so much detail, so many rules, so many exceptions, so much that is plainly drudgery.

And what of the future? Are we to have practically the same sort of catalogs as in the past? Are there no signs of change? More and more the practical American spirit is seeking for co-ordination and cooperation. It is by no means certain that the card form of catalog will continue indefinitely as the chief tool of library workers. It is highly probable that selected catalogs will take the place of huge general repertories for most purposes. Dimly one can see possibilities of mechanical changes and alterations, of the use of photography, instead of printer's ink, possibilities of compression or even total change of form. Certainly our present card catalogs will require intelligent direction of the highest order to make them respond to the demands of readers, to the needs of the community.

And here we come back to our beginning, to your aim as students of library science. Nothing in the craft should be foreign to you, least of all the art of cataloging.

Re-reading this essay always proves fruitful—many aspects of it appear as fresh and as timely in 1967 as in 1915—especially when one reviews published addresses, articles, papers, etc., which treat of education for librarianship, namely the study and teaching of cataloging. Omitted in this survey are texts, manuals, etc. prepared for teaching purposes. The emphasis is generally American in point of view. It is highly subjective (therefore somewhat biased) and fragmentary (uneven in omissions) be-
ing a personal selection of excerpts, primarily, designed to give the distinctive flavor of the individual author, and yet to highlight the consensus or the unique, to delineate the recurring as well as the new trends, to demonstrate the fluctuating pattern of training versus education for cataloging—its study and teaching. We read which teachers are (in print) asking the questions, seeking the answers, creating the dialogue toward change.

Moreover, the intent, rather than to review the entire span of literature on teaching cataloging, is to include published material chronologically from 1953 and to supplement Tauber’s “Training of Catalogers and Classifiers,” appearing in Library Trends (1953) in which he synthesizes the studies of the early fifties: the Humeston and Pettus questionnaire surveys of instructional programs in cataloging and classification sent to accredited library schools; the observations on the problems of teaching cataloging, particularly Dunkin’s idea of “creative skepticism” on the part of both instructor and student, and his statement that despite changes in course names little else has been changed; the descriptions of changed programs at Columbia and Illinois; and the evaluations of Columbia graduates of the cataloging teaching program.

Still in 1953, at the symposium evaluating Lubetzky’s Critique or “Report,” Journal of Cataloging and Classification, Dean, representing cataloging teachers, seems worth quoting:

As a teacher of cataloging, my evaluation of Mr. Lubetzky’s report is based on the assumption that the future generation of librarians acquire in library schools an attitude toward cataloging which remains with them throughout their entire professional life. Especially is this true if they do not become catalogers...

On the whole Mr. Lubetzky is to be congratulated on his courage in showing us how a more logical and realistic set of rules may be devised along the lines of the “pragmatic” approach...

Dunkin’s synthesis, Journal of Cataloging and Classification (1955) of “The New-Made Mann: a Midwinter Symposium” at which catalog administrators, catalogers, and cataloging teachers (Doyle, Dunkin, Ladenson, Markley, Morris, Muller, Scott) discuss criteria for a new cataloging textbook, demonstrates the wide range of coverage desired. A sampling follows.

We want a new textbook on cataloging to reflect our own restless scepticism... [of the conventional and the traditional, of] the value of every step in the cataloging process...

... [We] urge that the history of cataloging and classification should be in the book...

... [and think] that the book should be written chiefly for graduate use... [as] the student must now think on his own... [about] many unsolved problems.

... The student-cataloger is to get the sense of working in a fluid situation—of living dangerously if he does not live alertly.
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We shall all agree . . . that catalogers must learn to look on the catalog as a means to an end rather than an end in itself . . . with more stress on theory behind cataloging practice . . .

. . . so the new cataloger [may] live with broad horizons . . . [through] the study of comparative cataloging and classification, the study of interdependence of cataloging, classification, and bibliography . . . [to] learn to be adaptable . . . [and to be receptive to new ideas.]

No one seems to want a how-to-do-it book . . . we seem to want both theory and techniques . . . the new book not to replace codes and lists . . . but to bridge the gap between theory and practice . . . [with coverage of] newer and more special technical problems: the use of machines for card reproduction [and other operations:] limited cataloging, recataloging, and reclassification . . . serials . . . non-book materials . . . [etc.]

It seems, then, that the new cataloging textbook should deal both in attitudes and techniques . . .

Can we expect any teacher worth her salt to depend on only one textbook for a graduate course? . . .

The next year, the Journal of Cataloging and Classification (1956) devoted six papers to the general theme of teaching cataloging and training catalogers, education versus training again, which provide insight into teaching versus library responsibilities, tending toward a more definite line of demarcation between the two areas of responsibility.

Strout in her "Cataloging in the GLS Curriculum" has presented cogent reasons and persuasive illustrations for integrating introductory Cataloging, along with Reference, Book Selection, and Readers' Advisory Services into a general course on librarianship, "Interpretation, Evaluation and Use of Library Materials."

At the Graduate Library School we are experimenting in carrying integration even further. It seems to us not only that practical and theoretical cataloging cannot be separated if we are to have intelligent librarianship, but, if we keep this same goal in mind, perhaps it is also hard to justify the traditional separation of some of our main library functions, such as cataloging and reference. Perhaps certain beneficial results would obtain from teaching all library functions as one procedure directed toward library service . . .

Actually, the theory which lies behind our experiment seems too simple even to justify the saying of it. It is based merely upon the belief that librarians ought to be librarians rather than catalogers, and reference librarians . . . that a cataloger ought to have the point of view of a librarian . . .

The practical criticism which could well be directed against this experiment in integration is, of course, that libraries are not organized in this way, that after all, libraries are divided into catalog departments and service departments . . .

If our schools were to exist primarily for the purpose of fulfilling the expressed needs of libraries, they would indeed be training schools . . . It may be that the needs which are expressed by libraries are not their greatest needs. Perhaps there ought to be people trained in theoretical concepts who might sometimes
point a questioning finger at the status quo, and think up new and possibly even disturbing theories of what libraries and librarians ought to be. Libraries are hardly in a position to do this kind of thing for themselves.

Later (1964) Strout’s “On the Teaching of Cataloging”8 issued by Mita Society of Library Science, a Keio University publication, enlarges on her theme above in further detail, but for a specialized clientele. She carefully and lucidly describes the cataloging course as it is developed within the subject areas of the social sciences, the sciences, and the humanities, integrating bibliographic and cataloging sources, tools, and services.

The second paper by Shera, “On the Teaching of Cataloging,”9 pleads for theory first, a basic foundation of why on which to build; rather than the traditional inverse approach of how, for successful practical application.

Now the theory of cataloging derives from the basic theory of bibliographic organization, and instruction in cataloging should be a super-structure founded upon a dual base of: a solid foundation, at the undergraduate level, in logic, the principles of reasoning, and the scientific method, and through instruction at the graduate level in the principles and theory of bibliographic organization and bibliographic method.

having mastered the theory of bibliography and the bibliographic system, the student may safely be introduced to traditional library cataloging and its exemplification in the dictionary catalog.

Finally one must not forget that cataloging is the heart and soul of librarianship. . . . The library catalog is a true bridge between acquisition and organization . . . a great cohesive force that binds the library into a unified whole.

The third paper by Tauber, “Teaching of Cataloging,”8 further develops the five basic objectives suggested in his “Introduction” to Library Trends, October, 1953, for the “Training of Catalogers and Classifiers”:

In terms of a teaching program they are:

1. Inculcating basic knowledge: . . . at Columbia we have come to believe that cataloging is only part of the training of the librarian. . . . We are not so much concerned with job training as we are with education—that is, that the library school graduate will be able to use basic knowledge of cataloging and classification in carrying out his work as a professional librarian.

2. Developing ability in orderly, analytic thinking: Too many students . . . have not had the intensive training in college of thinking in terms of principles . . . those students who have mastered these principles . . . have no difficulty translating principles into practice. . . . An effort is made to force students to think in terms of purpose.

3. Desire to grow in knowledge and keep abreast of changes: . . . The student is brought to the threshold of application of rules of cataloging, but he is also made aware of the developments in cataloging and related areas so that he will be ready for changes of the future. . . . The value of a cataloger to a library is probably in direct proportion to his ability to make sound initial judgments . . . decisions concerning the type of cataloging to be applied to certain materials is directly related to the purposes of the library. . . .
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4. **Understanding of economic and service viewpoints:** . . . Catalogers have a responsibility for the economic welfare of the library as a whole. . . . This is what is meant by a feeling for values—the ability to be flexible, to accept suggestions and study them, even if they are not eventually applicable, and to be objective in any appraisal and evaluation of operations. . . .

5. **Nurturing an understanding that will be useful in library-wide problems:** . . . Why do we have catalogers in libraries? To make records? To produce card catalogs? Yes, but only in so far as the records and the catalogs are useful to the readers and the staff in their efforts to assist users. . . .

The remaining three articles treat of the other side of the coin, the cataloger on the job; what training is expected and what training may be required. From the viewpoint of the non-research or public library, Burdick while acknowledging the need for the library school to provide the student with a thorough grounding in cataloging philosophy and principles, harps upon the same theme of “a flexible attitude . . . [to] enable him to adjust his thinking to the needs of his library’s clients,” and suggests that “the position which includes cataloging as a part of a larger field of activity can possibly be more readily filled.”

Fullerton deals in specifics, evaluating the usual and the unusual methods of in-service training within cataloging departments of college and university libraries, somewhat from the traditional point of view. “Cataloging is not dull, nor is the catalog department the refuge for those who can do nothing else. It is a place where some of the most fundamental, exciting work in the library goes on.”

The third paper, Morton’s “Induction Training of Catalogers” is a systematic and thorough literature search which defines, compares, and evaluates in-service training with induction training, as to purposes and programs, methods and devices. She indicates that little of the literature relates to training catalogers.

None of the standard texts on cataloging and classification gives attention to the problem of bridging the gap between library school and the first cataloging position. . . . No descriptions of actual or proposed programs for use in cataloging departments have appeared in print. . . .

He [Tauber] specifically mentions the existence of a staff manual and recorded decisions as factors in the development of new personnel . . .

But cataloging teachers are not alone in thinking that the library has a part to play in the training of catalogers. . . .

Her conclusions show that with the new library education programs, more carefully planned induction programs in libraries will need to be implemented for new catalogers.

Since the 1951/Humeston and 1952/Pettus questionnaire surveys directed to accredited library school instructional programs noted by Tauber in 1953, another survey, “Cataloging Courses in the Prescribed Curriculum,” was undertaken in 1957 by Young and published as an Illinois Occasional Paper. Noting the swing to more glamorous courses, from too much time devoted earlier to cataloging and classification courses and
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from their prominent place in the curriculum, Young surveys content and methods. With the purpose to take stock of teaching programs in 37 accredited library schools offering the fifth year degree, "the questionnaire was designed to measure scope of cataloging knowledge, not depth. Usable replies were received from 29, or 78 per cent, of the schools."

Results are tabulated in nine categories for the required cataloging courses with the following headings: (1) required number of semester hours of cataloging; (2) level of instruction; (3) areas of emphasis; (4) balance of theoretical and practical; (5) textbooks used; (6) required reading; (7) classification schemes included; (8) rules for subject headings taught; (9) miscellaneous cataloging topics included.

Young concludes it is likely that

... three out of every five library school graduates have had a minimum of two courses in cataloging. Although 62% of the schools require only one course of degree candidates, regardless of area of specialization, the 38% of the schools which require two courses account for 58% of the graduates. . . .

The cataloging knowledge of the graduate with one course may be described as broad in scope. Cataloging teachers apparently believe that there is a minimum of cataloging knowledge which every student should possess, and if only one course is required, then this minimum amount must be crowded into this course. Because the period of instruction is brief, the graduate's knowledge probably has little depth.

The scope of knowledge of the graduate with two courses is not double that of the graduate with one course. Perhaps it is one-fourth to one-third greater. The second course seems to be designed primarily to strengthen and deepen the knowledge gained in the first, largely within the same framework.

When reviewing in 1960 the early curriculum (1910) of the Wisconsin Library School, Schenk, Journal of Education for Librarianship, refers to cataloging, one of the Long Courses, and to the "technical courses" as the "dread and the terror," filled with details and routines. She confirms her belief in the reasonableness of our present programs, however, both from the Young study and from Shera and Strout, whom she quotes.

Dunkin, sketching "The Development of Technical Services Training," Journal of Education for Librarianship (1962) continues to ask questions:

1. The chain of command: Is the idea of technical services an intellectual concept or is it simply an administrative device? . . .
2. The routines and the rules: Can—or should—routines and rules be taught in school? Are they the stuff graduate study is made of? . . .

The history of the teaching of the technical services goes back . . . to . . . 1887. . . .

We began with a compromise . . .
The compromise lasted long and flourished. . . .

Then in 1941 appeared "Crisis in Cataloging." . . .
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But the spirit of revolution was in the air and it still abides with us. What is the theory behind the rule? . . .

He notes schools which list Technical Services courses and indicates the lack of any uniformity in content or program among these. He briefly evaluates the codes, the texts, the manuals, the lists familiar to all librarians. He concludes with his favorite theme of creative skepticism.

Teachers do need practical experience, a lot of it . . .

The teacher must be a revolutionary, not a preacher . . .

But he cannot revolt unless he knows precisely what he is revolting against and why. . . .

. . . he will begin with the basic techniques. . . . Then will come theory and devastating analysis.

Again, Dunkin speaks/writes, Journal of Education for Librarianship (1964) on “Cataloging and Classification,” indicating the three limitations of his paper.

1. It is purely personal opinion. . . .

2. It is prejudiced. . . .

3. This paper defines the beginning course in cataloging in terms of the objectives, content, and methodology outlined in the Morton-Prince-Dewey report. . . .

Outline in style, Dunkin expands his three-fold “definition,” then states the three problems in this definition, which are principles and practice, students, and omissions. The first, obvious principles and practice, he defines succinctly. The second problem, students in cataloging courses, he divides into three categories: (1) the small library librarians, (2) other students wanting only one cataloging course, (3) the “weird ones” who specialize and take the advanced courses. . . . So all three kinds of students will be served by a course which is chiefly practice. . . . the first two may need some mixture of principles and criticism of principles and practice. . . .” The advanced students will explore complicated techniques and “criticize constructively.” He then indicates the omissions that may occur in all three sections of the definition: objectives, content, and methodology.

Within the framework of the curriculum because “articulation is a two-way street,” Dunkin demonstrates how the basic cataloging course dovetails with other courses, under the following headings: (1) Advanced Cataloging and Classification, (2) Documentation, (3) Bibliography and Reference, (4) Administration and Cost Analysis, (5) History of Books and Libraries.

The curriculum . . . should try primarily to develop attitudes rather than to instruct or drill in techniques. . . . But . . . must be concerned chiefly with practice. . . .

This attitude should stress the central role of the catalog in the library’s work;
... it should seek the reasons for cataloging practice and welcome any change to a better practice.

Dunkin's articles in *Library Journal* usually contain some nuggets for evaluating teaching. In "The People That Walked in Darkness," 18 (1966) he continues his revolutionary text of "creative scepticism." He observes that "centralized services, commercial services, card services..." may decrease the demand for catalogers and may mean that in many schools cataloging will no longer be a required course; "perhaps it means that emphasis on 'laboratory work' will decline." But the demand "for prospective catalogers in centralized services" will likely be for high quality in cataloging.


The hypotheses or assumptions which I believe are valid are these:

1. Technical service operations in most library systems will become more complex because of the larger quantities of material to be handled, the greater variety... the [more] flexibility in processing procedures... [and] the need for differing degrees of precision in control dictated by the nature of the materials....

2. The movement toward the use of centralized or commercial processing services will be speeded up... because of the growth of library systems... [and] continuing personnel shortages will make it difficult to provide enough specialists... at the local level... the standard operations and procedures which have been given the most attention in library school instruction will be those which a library can buy from outside sources; the complex services which are now given less attention, except perhaps in some advanced or specialized courses or in post-graduate programs, will be those of greatest concern to each local library....

3. Developments in the past ten years justify the assumption that... [there will be] significant changes and some simplification in the standard cataloging codes. The classification systems and general subject heading lists... [may] change more rapidly... descriptive cataloging operations may well become a non-professional responsibility... more libraries will make more use of other existing schemes and lists... and additional tools of this sort will be developed... these developments will lead to codes and lists and schemes which are less prescriptive... and which may attempt... to outline and develop alternatives, leaving it to the judgment of technical service experts which... may suit best the local need.

... the library school will need to give more attention... to the history and theory of classification and to the application and use of these other schemes. Our present... emphasis on descriptive cataloging and subject analysis is likely to change radically and less teaching time will be given to [the former]... and more to subject cataloging.

4. Research and development in machine systems for information organization and retrieval is certain to lead ultimately to the introduction of appropriate
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systems to handle the more complex needs. . . [the library school] can and must attempt . . . the education of librarians who will understand the role of these . . . devices in library service . . . and who can direct their operation and use.

5. There will be continuing need to insure that the education of all librarians includes a firm foundation in the fundamentals of the technical services . . .

In conclusion Frarey has sketched the present and the future as follows:

. . . Courses . . . now endeavor to combine a descriptive approach . . . a theoretical approach . . . with a dilution of practical exercises. . . . I see no reason to suppose that this approach to teaching the technical services will change materially in the next decade except perhaps to place even more emphasis on theory, principle, and research and perhaps slightly less upon practical problems. The burden of providing practice will continue to lie heavily upon the individual library. . . . The objective . . . is to communicate an understanding of and a philosophy about the technical services, which . . . will give each student the basis . . . to develop into a practitioner of the arts, an effective user of these services, or a manager for them.

Advanced courses . . . are likely to become problem-oriented . . . in exploring and evaluating the avenues open . . . for solving some complex problem of procurement, organization, and preparation for use . . . [with] emphasis upon study, investigation and research . . .

. . . During the next decade we will certainly see increasing use of appropriate audio-visual aids, other teaching devices, and experimentation with different teaching methods, new and revised texts, and use of television for both intramural and extramural instruction . . .

. . . two variables which will be . . . influential in determining the future of teaching in the technical services . . . are, first, the perceptiveness of the profession itself to these developments and trends . . . and second, the standards or requirements for certification which now exist or may be developed . . .

Along with Dunkin's and Frarey's papers in the Journal of Education for Librarianship (1962) Boll has a brief article, "Teaching 'Efficient and Economical' Cataloging"19 in which he states:

We deal . . . with two entirely different problems: the administrative problem of arranging our work efficiently, and the bibliographic problem of deciding what information, and how many access channels, to provide . . .

The art of the cataloging teacher requires a delicate balance between standards and imagination, between cold rules and their application in a live organization . . .

. . . he must teach variety . . .

Only by showing the purpose of cataloging, only by showing that current standards are really not ironclad, can one create the emotional climate in which future librarians will dare to introduce a change, will dare to be brief rather than standardized . . .
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During the 1953/1966 period only one thesis, a master's essay, was listed, Mannlein's "Analysis of Content in the Core Cataloging and Classification Course in the Library Schools Accredited by the American Library Association," (1962). This was not read.

Lubetzky in his "The Quest for Catalogers" (1963), Library Journal and Catholic Library World, quoting from Shaw and Clapp agrees that traditional "catalogs will continue to hold the place they now occupy in our libraries," although mechanized book catalogs will continue to be produced successfully.

It is . . . predictable also that the need will be increasingly not for routine catalogers but for imaginative, progressive, and creatively thinking catalogers . . .

For the library school this means that the course in cataloging will need to emphasize more an understanding of the purposes, problems, and principles of cataloging and a critical evaluation of existing rules and methods rather than a tacit acceptance of and drill in these rules and methods . . .

. . . If the Library is to attract and hold the type of cataloger desired and needed, he must be offered a modern instrument which will make his work interesting, meaningful, and respected by the profession. That is what cataloging should naturally be, for it deals with the structure of the library's nerve center and has engaged some of the best minds in the history of librarianship. . . .

"On Teaching Cataloging," Journal of Education for Librarianship (1965) Lubetzky likens the "catalog . . . [to] a window through which a person can look into the recesses of a library." He continues his same theme with further comments on the limitations of the Red Book and points out the need for a "competent knowledge and understanding of the structure and use of the . . . catalog."

From the Canadians a panel (Bassam, Johnston, Hagler, Fraser) discuss "Training for Technical Services," reported in Library Resources & Technical Services (1964). Bassam asks and replies to questions illustrating "to what extent and how, cataloguing and classification should be taught in the Library School. . . ."

. . . Is cataloguing a basic subject required by all, or is it only for the use of a few? . . .

In the library, who is it who is concerned with the correct author entry, title entry, and the subject under which a user is able to find an article or a book? Is it only the people who work under the label "technical services"? . . .

. . . How much cataloguing does each librarian need? How much can you cover in a year's course which is very full now? . . .

Johnston deals with the cataloguer in a public library which has a technical services department. She says, "Good cataloguers, then, are essential; and if the newly-graduated librarian entering cataloguing is to become efficient, we need adequate inservice training . . ." mentioning the climate, the program, and the devices to achieve optimum cooperation and development.
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Hagler deals largely with areas [of technical services] other than cataloguing . . . acquisitions, gift and exchange work, circulation mechanics, photoduplication in and by the library, and binding problems . . . [which are often not treated by] formal education in library schools . . .

. . . Each is a rapidly changing field . . .

What we will be able to do . . . is mechanize many more of our repetitive, routine duties; and if we are to do this wisely we must acquire knowledge of machine techniques . . .

Who is responsible for providing these “extra-curricular” sessions, for installing the spirit of continuing education? The library school, yes, but . . .

Fraser deals with colleges and universities where Technical services librarians also need to know much more than they do now about bibliography, publishing, and the book trade . . .

The basic academic background necessary for all technical service work consists of sound bibliographical training, some degree of subject specialization and facility in languages . . .

Finally, if our technical services librarians are to be trained as planners for the future, they must learn about the future— . . .

With so much emphasis on the catalog, the dominant thread running through almost all the excerpts, it is a relief to read Foskett’s “Library Education: the Role of Classification, Indexing, and Subject Analysis,” the one Britisher who has been included, Library Quarterly (1964). . . .

. . . I believe that the study of classification and subject analysis represents the intellectual zenith of education for librarianship; but it is not, for librarians, an end in itself . . .

. . . Not every librarian needs to be able to make classification schemes, any more than he needs to make a computer. But every librarian needs to understand the nature of the techniques he uses, and to judge the appropriateness of each to his own needs . . . For basic studies, the comparative analysis of current trends and theories offers much more toward establishing fundamental principles than the study of individual schemes in isolation, without reference to any theoretical background.

In advanced studies, I think there is no doubt that classification has established its claim to an important place . . .

Fifty years ago Dr. Bishop envisioned the future of cataloging which we consider commonplace today. Five years ago Frarey pointed to the future teaching of the technical services in the next decade. His conclusions are reasonable and significant. Recommended changes or pleas for change in the excerpts culled for “Cataloging—Study and Teaching” show recurring patterns of thinking. They focus on major issues or raise searching questions which are still unresolved or unanswered.
Is it again time to recommend a further survey of cataloging courses in ALA accredited library schools? If so, what criteria would create meaningful evaluation of objectives, content, and methodology? Is a national minimum standard for cataloging courses the goal, or rather the unique contributions of the individual schools based upon their faculties and their facilities?

Should required basic introductory cataloging courses be keyed only to the functional needs of the non-cataloger? When we advocate knowledge of philosophy, theory, principles, whose philosophy, whose theory, whose principles? When we advocate knowledge of practical considerations—whose practice, whose procedures? On all counts, is the comparative approach the most viable clue? Are decision-making and value judgments the primary objective?

Can cataloging, classification, technical services be taught strictly on the graduate level? Only when audio-visual aids, expertly adapted as sophisticated instructional media, supplement traditional methods will graduate instruction be feasible. Automation is here. Moreover, we accept the machine with all it can be programmed to do for cataloging and for technical services.

When will education be differentiated from training for cataloging librarians? What is the responsibility of the library school to its students and to the profession—to provide catalogers or to educate librarians? Has the middle-of-the-road program been satisfactory to either group? All librarians must be concerned with education for librarianship and must take both responsible and appropriate leadership to meet the future.

Will continued teacher and student dissatisfaction with cataloging courses engineer a successful revolution in cataloging courses? Only when we add to Dunkin's “creative skepticism” an equal amount of creative innovation!
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The following references, although general in approach, have implications for the teaching of cataloging:


SINCE THE WORK OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE on the ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards¹ is nearly completed, this paper on the new edition of the rules will take the form of a summary final report on the work of the Subcommittee.²

A very thorough and extensive study of filing has been made, through (1) a perusal of the literature, (2) two questionnaires sent to a large number of all types of libraries, state library agencies, and library schools, and published in a number of professional journals, (3) a collection of some 65 different sets of filing rules, mostly from libraries, including all types from large universities to small schools, (4) talks given by members of the Subcommittee and discussion of filing at seven Regional Group meetings, (5) membership of the Chairman on Subcommittee 15 (Filing) of the Z39 Committee on Library Work and Documentation of the United States of America Standards Institute, (6) personal contacts and correspondence, and (7) regular meetings of the Subcommittee at all ALA Midwinter meetings and annual conferences plus a special meeting in November, 1966, at which all the rules were deeply discussed.

In addition to all of the above, close contact has been maintained with the ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee, through receipt of all of the documents of that committee and representation at all of its meetings. The Filing Subcommittee has considered all of the new catalog rules in relation to filing and has made representations to the Catalog Code Revision Committee concerning problem areas. There are many instances where the rules in the new cataloging code, Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, North American Text (Chicago, American Library Association, 1967), are more effective from the filing viewpoint than the old rules, because either the resulting order of entries is better, or the present order is achieved more easily and directly. Changes in the cataloging rules that

¹. Established as a subcommittee of the ALA Editorial Committee in September 1962.
². A report on the early work of the Subcommittee, along with some general considerations on filing, appeared in Library Resources & Technical Services, 8:15-25, Winter, 1964 (Seely, Pauline A. “ALA Filing Rules”)
will have an effect on arrangement of entries are noted throughout the new edition of the filing rules, and where pertinent, suggestions are given for incorporating new-form with old-form headings in the same catalog. It should also be noted that the filing system recommended in the new filing rules will minimize the effects of the heading changes and so facilitate adoption of the new cataloging rules.

The Subcommittee decided that the new edition should be a code of consistent, recommended rules, with no alternatives (in the 1942 edition 60 percent of the rules included alternatives). In some cases where other methods seem to deserve mention they are covered in descriptive notes, not presented as alternative rules.

Some of the rules studied were found to be needlessly complex and even inconsistent, and some seemed to go through painful contortions to arrive at weird results. The Subcommittee concluded, on the basis of the many pleas for simpler rules and a marked trend toward simpler arrangements found in the rules, even some from large university libraries, that the simplest possible arrangement should be presented. Therefore, it was decided that the basic order should be straight alphabetical, disregarding punctuation, with just a few exceptions, the major one being that personal surname entries are arranged before other entries beginning with the same word or combination of words. This edition will present the first known embodiment of that principle when applied consistently throughout all the rules where applicable. Although admittedly the results are not always entirely satisfactory, on the whole the advantages seem to outweigh the disadvantages. Some of the drawbacks could easily be overcome by simple changes in heading forms, both names and subjects. From the filer's point of view, the simpler arrangements of the straight alphabetical order should result in more accurately filed catalogs; from the user's point of view, the inflexible order of the alphabet presents a uniform order that can be easily understood. An attempt was made to develop an alternative code of rules based on a consistent regard for punctuation, but this too was not entirely satisfactory, because of lack of consistency in punctuation.3

The basic principle is that filing should be straightforward, item by item through the entry, not disregarding or transposing any of the elements, nor mentally inserting designations. The few situations where this principle has not been applied are usually due to the structure of the heading. All rules and examples are based on the form in which headings and entries are commonly made, according to standard cataloging rules.

3. The author has recently received a letter from H. Wellisch, who compiled Filing Rules, with Examples in Hebrew and Roman Characters (Jerusalem, Centre for Public Libraries, 1966), in which he states that there has been some criticism of those rules because of some places where straightforward order was sacrificed for another arrangement. "The trend is clearly to file as written without any frills and artificial 'logical' arrangements which are largely unintelligible to the public." In a reader survey conducted by Tel Aviv University, an overwhelming majority preferred straightforward arrangement of all entries beginning with words like "Israel," without any attempt to make a classified arrangement.
and practice. Serious consideration was given to the possibility of arranging certain types of headings exactly as written (e.g., M' and Mc as M and Mc, not as Mac; De Morgan as two words rather than one), but since these rules are primarily for manual filing it was decided not to make such a radical break with long established practice (besides, although theoretically the same name should always appear in exactly the same form, actually one cannot depend on this).

Mechanization of filing rules, when fully developed, will undoubtedly have far-reaching effects on both the filing order and the form of entries themselves. Before attempting to write the new edition of the ALA rules the author had not fully realized the extent to which our present manual filing is dependent on the mind of the human filer. Since a machine cannot apply the knowledge, reasoning, and interpretation that a human filer can, either some filing rules or some forms of entries, or both, will have to be changed before machines can do the job effectively. Those who have been working with the problem of developing a computer program for filing have found that such a program based on either the present ALA or Library of Congress filing rules is theoretically possible, but would present immense practical difficulties. Concomitantly, they are questioning the rules themselves—would the results always be worth the effort? One phase of the trend in mechanized filing causes the author some concern—that is the printing out of entries exactly as prepared for input, e.g., the omission of initial articles and the writing out of numerals (examples of problems which the human filer would handle on an “as if” basis); this does violence to the bibliographic integrity of the item, and is comparable to the concessions made to the machine back in the days when most catalog cards were prepared manually on a typewriter. Since there is still so much to be done toward standardization of mechanized filing rules, the Subcommittee was instructed to disregard the area of automation, but the trends were often brought into its consideration of a particular filing problem.

The draft of the rules developed into a very full and detailed code, covering as many specific filing problems as possible, with considerable emphasis on foreign languages and correlation with cataloging rules. Since a definite need for a simpler version for small and medium-sized libraries was recognized, it was decided that two separate codes should be published, one a full and detailed code, the other an abridgement. The abridged edition consists of the same basic rules as the full version, but with most of the specialized and explanatory material omitted.

The basic drafts of the two editions were approved by the Executive Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section and the ALA Editorial Committee at the ALA Midwinter meeting in New Orleans, January 1967.
Ralph R. Shaw  
Dean of Library Activities  
University of Hawaii  
Honolulu, Hawaii

This is a report on the application of a procedure combining manual and computer operations to control both total and departmental allocations of book expenditures at the University of Hawaii Library. This procedure has been in operation for more than a year and a half. It does not delay sending orders to suppliers and it provides better and faster control than was achieved by the manual accounting system previously used while costing about one-thirteenth as much.

The library rents an alpha-numeric keypunch only, at a cost of $633.00 per year, and it is used less than half time for this operation, the balance of its time being allocated to other functions. The computer service is provided by the University's Computing Center on a mor. It has averaged 17.3 minutes of computer time per month at a cost of $33.00 per hour.

In a fiscal year 1964/65 when the distribution of book expenditures was done by hand we spent $225,000 for books and the accounting required 2398 man hours. 1967 rates are used in all cases to maintain comparability and the rate used is $2.32 per hour. This rate was determined by dividing the beginning salary for the lowest grade of personnel used for this work by 1750 hours—i.e., 2080 hours, minus annual leave, average sick leave, and legal holidays. This loads the figures in favor of the manual system since not all employees are at the beginning of the grade. Supervisory costs, overhead costs and fringe benefits are taken as constant, even though it is obvious that more people means more overhead cost; this again loads the figures in favor of the manual system.

The 2398 man hours at $2.32 per hour made the direct accounting cost $5,563.36 for handling $225,000 worth of book orders, or $24.72 for accounting for each thousand dollars spent for books. Since the central order unit is currently spending $606,000 for books, if we handled it the same way we did two years ago, it would cost 606 x $24.72 or $14,980.32. Instead, as indicated below, it is costing $1154.00 or $1.90 for accounting for each thousand dollars worth of books purchased. The costs are as follows based on records of a full calendar year of operation:
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Keypunch operation 230 hrs/yr. at 2.32 534.00
Keypunch rental (half charged to this operation) 316.00
50,000 cards 53.00
1401 time, 17.5 min/month = 3.46 hrs/yr. at $33 per hr. 114.00
Manual pulling of punched cards to match bills 157.00
(Note: this is actually done by student help at $1.35 per hour or a total of about $91.00 instead of $137.00)

Total annual cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1154.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The cost of preparing and debugging the program was $85.63, of which $9.63 was the amount charged for time of the programmer and $76 was the cost for 1401 computer time. This sum, amortized over several years, makes no significant change in the cost of the mechanized process.)

The procedure is as follows. The orders are typed on standard fanfolds which are prenumbered. Punched cards are prepunched to match this numbered series. This occupies the first five spaces on the card. When an order is distributed the accounting copies go to the keypunch operator. The punched card bearing the same number is punched for the allocation code (a two-digit number representing the department or fund to be charged) and the estimated price—6 digit—usually the list price. Once a month the cards for books ordered are sent to the computing center on campus. They have a record indicating the allocation by code numbers, the amount previously obligated for each, the amount expended for each, the total obligated or spent for each and the balance remaining. This is put into the 1401 memory, which has enough space to store this information for all our funds simultaneously under a fixed address for each. This means that the punched cards need not be rearranged by departmental code. As each card is fed into the computer its departmental code joins the new data to the information in the memory for that department and the new commitment is added to the amount previously obligated.

As bills come in, the cards for each are manually pulled from the accounting file. These have the amount actually paid punched into the area following the amount obligated and this batch of cards also goes to the computing center monthly and is run through the 1401. As these cards go thru their information calls up the data from the pertinent part of the memory, but this time an additional operation is performed. The amount obligated is subtracted from the outstanding obligations and the amount paid is added to the paid column.

In either operation (new obligations or paid bills) the computer then adds obligations and payments to get the total spent or committed; it subtracts this from the amount budgeted and prints out the balance. It, finally, adds the columns vertically giving us the total amount budgeted, the total amount of outstanding obligations, the total amount paid, the sum of the total obligations and payments and in the final column, the balance of the total book fund still available.
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The manual system formerly used did not adjust the obligated amounts to true amounts so it was not as useful as the computer record. It would cost a great deal more to pull any one of 60 or more ledger sheets for each transaction and do the adjustment of obligated funds so, in fact, it had not been done and the information on departmental balances was not very reliable in our manual accounting system.

Whether or not this routine is suitable for other libraries depends upon a number of factors which would have to be studied in each case. If no other operations are performed on the keypunch it would be necessary to charge the total keypunch rental to this operation. Also if a commercial service center had to be used instead of the university's own center, that would about double the hourly rate for use of the 1401. Libraries that do not allocate funds, keeping the total book accounts as a single unit would not have as much to gain from this type of operation as one that distributes its book funds against many accounts. The size of the book budget, too, will be an important factor in determining the best method. Monthly reports are fully adequate to meet our legal and administrative requirements. If weekly reports were required the computer time costs would increase accordingly.

In sum, this routine has resulted in better control of our book funds and in a substantial saving that we can put to use in providing improved library service. Some of the subroutines, such as manual pulling of the punched cards, were studied to determine whether further saving could be effected by mechanizing them, and the results were negative at this time—so they continue to be done by hand. Anyone else contemplating the use of this or any similar system would have to base the decision on a full management study of the present and proposed procedures, under the conditions and requirements of their own situations.

COMPUTERIZED TECHNIQUES

The Council on Library Resources has given the Los Angeles County Public Library a grant of $38,000 to study computerized library applications. The major areas to be investigated are registration and circulation control, catalog production, and related activities. Prototype systems, utilizing such advanced techniques as optical character reading and line-printing in an extended character set, will be developed and tested as part of the program.

Results of the study will be utilized in the conversion of the entire Los Angeles County Library book catalog to a new computerized production method, in a program scheduled to begin in fiscal 1966/67. The County Library book catalog, a union list of more than 15,000 photo-reduced pages, is regularly updated with cumulative supplements and is available for public use at all 93 city and community libraries in the County system.

The Library will engage a firm of data processing consultants to work with the Library staff. Coordinator for the project for the Library will be Ronald A. Zuckerman, Research Assistant.

Findings of the study are expected to have application to centralized cataloging, processing, and circulation control activities of various types of libraries. The findings will be published for the information of other libraries.
Recollections

Orcena Mahoney Peterson
formerly Executive Secretary, RTSD

It is indeed a great privilege for me to be able to present a few recollections of the beginnings of RTSD and LRTS in this memorial issue. There are many of us who will remember that Esther Piercy's contribution to the strength of RTSD was almost as influential as it was to LRTS.

With great interest I read "In Retrospect: RTSD 1957-1967" in the Winter 1967 issue of LRTS, for it brought back memories of behind the scenes operations at ALA Headquarters. For me the idea of the new division was planted at the time of interviews with surveyors of the ALA organization (Cresap, McCormick and Paget). As Executive Secretary of the Division of Cataloging and Classification, I had for some time been discussing with a few of the officers of the Division the advantages of broadening the scope of the DCC. From my field trips to Regional Groups and to state meetings it was easy to observe that membership interest was broader than just cataloging and classification. At nearly all the catalogers meetings, acquisitions and serials librarians were present, albeit perhaps because they had no sessions covering their special interests to attend. Although I conveyed this impression to the ALA surveyors, they recommended two separate divisions, one for acquisitions and resources and another for cataloging and classification. Fortunately for the profession there were vocal leaders in the DCC who had a strong belief in broadening its scope, two I remember in particular: Benjamin Custer and Esther Piercy. There were others of course, and as Ed Colburn explained in his above-mentioned article, the membership was polled for sanction to establish a technical services division. My part in the establishment was purely one of enthusiasm and organizational assistance.

During formation of the Division life was rather hectic at ALA Headquarters for ALA was being reorganized as well as RTSD being established. Instead of responsibility only to division boards, the executive secretaries began reporting directly to the ALA Executive Secretary and at the same time continued working for elected division officers. It was my good fortune at that time to have as officers those who had labored
section omcers appealed to headquarters for guidance, which I hope was available when needed. Of the Executive Secretary’s time. I do recall, however, the stimulation it was to work in fields quite unfamiliar, such as ASA Section Committee on Photographic Reproduction of Documents, PH3 of the Copying Methods Section. There was a great deal of organizational work to be done for the new sections, Acquisitions, Copying Methods, and even Serials which had been a round table. Certainly these new section officers appealed to headquarters for guidance, which I hope was available when needed.

In the past few years when I read the reports of Section officers outlining continuing accomplishments of each Section, the effort put forth by everyone in those beginning years surely seems worth while. And how would members at large know about these remarkable achievements were it not for LRTS? Under Esther Percy’s faithful and accomplished editorship our periodical has continued to show to the profession the breadth and strength of RTSD.

Even before the poll of members to find out if there was a desire for a combined technical services division, Esther proposed that it be made known that the Journal of Cataloging and Classification would become an organ for such a new division rather than remaining just a magazine for catalogers and classifiers. It was her idea that there should be assistant editors for each of the new sections. Meetings of the Editorial Board were held at Midwinter and annual conferences, where the assistant editors were encouraged to find articles representing their fields of interest. The Executive Secretary’s participation on the Editorial Board was more for gaining information than anything else. All of the editorial work was always voluntary, as were the contributions of the Managing Editor and, later, the Advertising Assistant. Only circulation management was carried out in the Executive Secretary’s office.

In the first issue of LRTS Esther wrote an introduction which concluded with the prophetic sentence, “Great days are ahead and Library Resources and Technical Services anticipates being part of them!” In the past few years it has meant a great deal to me to realize that I was able to share in the formation of the “great days” and work with the founders of RTSD. Many times I have pondered the effectiveness of the executive secretary, both in the ALA organizational pattern and in the divisional operation. Should she, in a membership organization, strive to be a leader with inspirational guidance or should she attempt only to operate an efficient secretariat, holding the organization together and working under the leadership of elected officers?

From all reports and observations it appears that RTSD has an efficient and effective Executive Secretary, Elizabeth Rodell. I am grateful to her for enhancing the office which I had the good fortune to help establish.