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Facsimile Transmission in Libraries: A State of the Art Survey

SHARON SCHATZ, Research Analyst
Information Systems Office, Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Facsimile Transmission is the rapid transmission of printed pages from one point to another using electronic devices. All facsimile transmission methods require converting the original picture into an electrical impulse which is then transmitted over telephone lines, private lines, microwave, or a combination of these communication links. The receiving unit reconverts the electrical impulse into an exact duplicate of the original document on a screen or in the form of a hard copy.

The use of this technique in libraries has been rare and primarily on an experimental basis. Major non-library use of such systems has been confined to newspapers, wire services, and companies which can afford the high cost of such services. The technique has now reached a point of development, technical competence, experimentation, and lower cost to warrant a thorough investigation of the feasibility of its use in a library environment.

There are certain basic characteristics of facsimile transmission which should be taken into consideration when contemplating the use of this technique for library applications:

1. Facsimile equipment is available that can accept and transmit any type of information which exists on paper and will do so without any intermediate transcribing or processing.

2. Facsimile systems will operate over any available communications medium including telephone lines, overseas cable, radio, microwave, and COMSAT satellite.

3. There is no technical limitation to the distance over which facsimile can be transmitted.

4. Most facsimile systems are designed to accept and transmit standard 8-1/2 × 11 inch pages. Production equipment is available which will handle engineering drawings or other copy up to 18-3/8 inches in width and unlimited in length. Facsimile recorders are available which are 36 inches in width.

5. Most facsimile recorders utilize special electrosensitive or pressure sensitive paper not unlike special papers used in many copying machines. Currently available papers are suitable for most applications; however,
photographic means are used where extra-fine resolution and/or subtle tone shadings are required.

6. For copy of average nature, such as a printed page, the time to transmit a page over telephone lines varies between three and six minutes. Production equipment is available that will cut transmission by as much as 20 times, but this requires substantially more expensive communication facilities.

7. Where extra-fine copy is involved or where very high quality reproduction is desired, facsimile equipment with resolution up to 1,000 lines per inch is available.

8. Facsimile can transmit from colored originals, but the received copy is all of one color. Tone shades may be received on many systems. To date practical economic considerations have ruled out color reception, although it is technically feasible.

9. Facsimile scanners are available that operate with microfilm chips or slides. They can be used to transmit microfilm records and reproduce them in enlarged form at remote locations.

10. Information in facsimile form can be stored on magnetic tape where it can be manipulated.

11. Computer-generated information can be processed by an available “scan converter” and transmitted over telephone lines in facsimile form.

12. Facsimile signals can be digitized and encrypted for secure communications over telephone lines.

13. Facsimile network switching systems may be as automated and flexible as those for other types of communications networks. Switching techniques employed today are, for the most part, quite simple because few large or complex networks have been placed in operation.

In a facsimile network extending over any reasonable distance, the cost of communications rather than equipment may become the major factor. The best way to reduce the cost per page is to design equipment which can operate over less costly types of lines. Speed of document transmission, copy resolution, and overall system cost are interrelated. If one wishes to increase speed from 12 pages per hour to 24 pages per hour, he may do so by cutting the resolution in half (producing a coarser receiver copy) or by using a transmission line of greater bandwidth and consequently increased cost. Because of these interrelationships, a facsimile communication system should be carefully tailored to the intended application. In many instances, facsimile has been pronounced a failure simply because it was being used to transmit copy requiring finer resolution than the particular equipment and transmission lines were designed to handle. It is possible to pay a prohibitive premium in system cost by specifying higher speed equipment and more lines than may be required.

The Reno-Davis Experiment

The University of Nevada conducted a 30-day test of the Xerox
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Magnavox Telecopier, a relatively simple, low-cost telefacsimile system that uses ordinary telephone handsets as the connecting link between machines. The study was conducted between the Reno and Las Vegas campuses of the University of Nevada and the Davis Campus of the University of California. The equipment consisted of a transceiving unit and a telephone coupler at each station. The transceivers are portable desk-top units comparable in size to an electric typewriter. There is no installation procedure necessary other than plugging a cord into a regular 110-volt outlet. The communication link is effected by first establishing voice contact via a telephone call from one station to another; when one operator has copy ready to transmit and the other is ready to receive, both operators place their telephone handsets into the phone couplers. The transmission link is then established and the transcribing automatically begins. Copies of printed pages, typescript, manuscript, or illustrative material may be transmitted any distance over a single voice-grade telephone line to any location where there is a telephone and a corresponding telecopier unit.

This equipment will accommodate single sheets only and will not copy directly from books. A full 8½ x 11 inch page may be transmitted in less than six minutes. Scanning proceeds at the rate of 180 lines per minute at 96 lines per inch, transmitting a page with five vertical inches of transcript in less than three minutes. Copies are received on ordinary paper, as the facsimile is produced by pressure of a stylus through carbon paper.

Results of the Nevada experiment indicate that the system is feasible and convenient for routine interlibrary use provided that improved reliability and consistency of copy quality is attained in later production models. Transceiving time for an average 10-page request is about one hour. An average total elapsed time of four hours for compilation of requests can be achieved. Total cost per completed 10-page transaction, excluding telephone line costs, is approximately $6.85 at a volume of 1,000 pages or 100 average transactions per month. Telephone line costs range from 0 to $30.00 per transaction. Copy quality appeared to be adequate for most library materials when the equipment was performing properly. Realibility of the equipment was poor, with inconsistent quality and frequent breakdowns. Since the machines used in this test were early production models, it seems reasonable to expect considerable improvement in their performance as experience is gained in the manufacturing and servicing of the Xerox Magnavox Telecopier.

The University of California Experiment

In June 1966, H. G. Morehouse and R. M. Shoffner of the Institute of Library Research, University of California, prepared an interim report for the Council on Library Resources entitled An Experiment in Library Application of Xerox LDX Facsimile Transmission Equipment. The report was an effort to describe in broad terms the framework and scale of library operations appropriate to the LDX system.
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In terms of typical library equipment, the LDX (Long-Distance Xerox) is a relatively sophisticated, costly system with a scanner (transmitter), transmission link, and a printer (receiver). The scanner and printer are comparable in size to the Xerox 914. The scanner operates by sweeping a narrow light beam back and forth across the page to be copied. The reflection of this beam is focused into an electronic system where the variations in light reflected by the image on the page are converted into electrical impulses. These impulses are transmitted via either cable or microwave signals to the printer, where they are converted back into light by a cathode ray tube. This tube projects the light impulses onto a drum, from which a finished copy is produced by the conventional Xerox process. The scanner will accommodate single pages only and is not capable of copying directly from books. Pages may range in size from a minimum of 3¼ inches to a maximum of 9½ inches wide by any length. Original copies, Xerox or photocopies of printed pages, typescript, manuscript, line drawings, or maps, of any color may be transmitted. Copies produced by the printer are positive (black on white) and comparable in appearance to the copies produced by the Xerox 914.

Single sheets to be transmitted are manually fed into the LDX scanner’s document conveyor one at a time. Copies are produced by the printer on a continuous strip of paper, which is automatically cut to size. No operator is necessary for the printer after its initial daily warm-up cycle. In spite of its apparent costliness, speed is the essential capability which makes this equipment potentially valuable for library use. The volume of traffic in interlibrary transfer of information is constantly increasing and procedures now in general use are slow and cumbersome. The average elapsed time for an interlibrary loan transaction between University of California campuses is now six to seven working days. This time could be reduced to less than three hours for most periodical articles, technical reports, and government publications (the types of material which are now usually copied by Xerox and mailed). Such rapid interlibrary service is unprecedented and would make possible entirely new concepts of cooperative sharing and distribution of library resources.

The Morehouse report introduced the following major deviations from present interlibrary loan practices so that maximum benefits could be gained from the rapid transmission capability of the LDX system:

1. The requester is not required to submit his request to his campus interlibrary loan office where time-consuming procedures are normally required, but may telephone his request directly to the LDX office at the source library. If the information he supplies is not sufficiently complete or accurate to enable the source library to identify the item desired or if the item is not available, the requester is notified directly by telephone.

2. After the transmission is completed, the material is delivered to the requester, thereby substituting messenger’s time for requester’s time.

3. The American Library Association forms for interlibrary loans
and requests for photocopy are not used. (The represented codes place
time-consuming burdens on the borrowing library rather than the lend-
ing library. This is because the lending library is performing a service
for someone outside its normal clientele; therefore it should be burdened
with as little work as possible. Requests are carefully verified before sub-
mission.) With an LDX service and its obvious prerequisite of closely
cooperating libraries, a simple worksheet was considered sufficient as an
instruction for and a record of each transaction. Work measurement
studies could then provide the basis for budgetary transfers to cover the
work of the source library. Conclusions of the California study are:

1. The LDX system appears capable of providing rapid, high-quality
transmission of printed pages from one library to another, with elapsed
time for each transaction averaging two and one half hours instead of
the week or more now typically required.

2. The cost of an LDX system precludes its use in libraries at current
interlibrary photoduplication service levels.

3. There is great potential for expanding access to existing large
serials collections by establishing an LDX network serving several lib-
raries, each with smaller collections of the more frequently used titles.

Private Network Experiments

The Houston Research Institute, under contract with the National
Science Foundation, conducted a study of the feasibility of transmitting
technical information by facsimile between Houston and the major
centers of technical information in the United States over existing com-
communications networks, including those maintained by oil and gas utilities.
The study consists of an investigation of existing facsimile systems to
determine their applicability to oil and gas pipeline networks. Of the
major communication networks evaluated, three offered potential use for
a nationwide exchange of technical information—oil and gas pipeline
networks, NASA Mission Control Circuits, and Military Amateur Radio
Service (MARS). The project was initiated on the assumption that
transmittal of technical information was the major hindrance in the
exchange between Houston and other technical centers. When the prac-
ticability phase was reached, it became readily apparent that the actual
transmittal was not the major bottleneck. The big problem, which was
evident in most of the other studies, appeared to be the numerous steps
which both precede and follow the actual transmittal. Conclusions drawn
from Phase I of the study were:

1. Transmission of technical information by facsimile using existing
pipeline microwave links between Houston and the major centers in
this country is technically feasible.

2. There is unused microwave transmission time during off-shift
periods in certain pipeline systems and other major systems.

3. Pipeline officials are receptive to consideration of the use of
unused off-shift time.

4. With nominal or no charges for communications links, the cost
of facsimile transmission of technical information would be comparable with the present system of photocopy exchange if adequate loads can be achieved. As additional centers are added and the service expands, the cost would decrease.

5. There are no significant legal problems beyond those now of concern in the exchange of library photocopies.

Project INTREX

The Text-Access Program at M.I.T.’s Project INTREX is an experimental effort to devise a workable system that would provide guaranteed rapid access to full text of journal articles, books, reports, theses, and other library materials located at a central store. It became apparent early in the study that, in the immediate future, it would not be feasible to consider storing all the full-text information contained in a full-scale library system in a computer memory. After a critical examination of several possibilities, photographic film was selected as the most appropriate text storage medium. The high storage density of film and the well-developed methods for transforming paper copy into photographic copy, and vice versa, make this medium attractive until such time as massive computer memories become available at reasonable cost. Once the decision was made to store original text in image form, a facsimile-like system was proposed in which each text page is scanned and transmitted once, and the information is captured and stored at the receiver for transient viewing (soft copy) or printing (hard copy).

This text-access system is conceptually divided into four major subsystems: a central station; a transmission and distribution subsystem; several user stations; and a central computer.

The central station consists of a collection of documents, either in microfilm or microfiche (largely the latter), stored and indexed for easy automatic access; an access mechanism, which selects the requester document, presents it to the scanner, and returns it to storage; one or more scanners, which scan the requested pages and convert the image into a single-frame video signal; and a control unit, which communicates with the central computer and controls and coordinates the operations of the access mechanism, the scanners, and the transmission subsystem. The control unit also prefaces each transmission with an address code which directs the image signal to the proper user station.

The transmission and distribution subsystem consists of a transmitter located at the central station which multiplexes the video and control signals and generates an appropriately modulated transmission signal; a transmission channel which carries the signal to the various users’ stations; and a receiver at each user’s station which demodulates the transmission signal and reconstitutes the video and control signal.

A user station consists primarily of a device that, when addressed by the control unit, will reconstitute and display the image of the requested page in soft-copy form and an optional device to reproduce that page on film and/or paper.
The central computer serves to control the whole system and receives requests for accessing text from the users via their keyboards.

The single-frame microfilm facsimile system has now been assembled and partially evaluated. In its present configuration the system consists of three basic parts—a flying-spot scanner, a receiver, and a video transmission channel. The system is now able to transmit microfilm images and re-create them at the receiving station. The present quality of the re-created image appears to be high and quite adequate for most library requirements. A bandwidth of 4.5-MHz is required. The facsimile system is being used as a test bed to relate picture quality to bandwidth requirements for the various components that comprise the system. Although now operating as a microfilm facsimile system, the equipment is flexibly designed so that other kinds of image re-creation equipment at the receiving end can be substituted as they become available.

The New York State Library Facts Network

The Division of Library Development of the New York State Library is conducting a pilot program to investigate methods of graphic transmission as a means of improving research library services. Demonstration of the feasibility of graphic transmission as an efficient and economic improvement over present methods of document transmission during this study will result in the establishment of a statewide network. The facsimile transmission system pilot project known as FACTS (FACsimile Transmission System) is expected to be completed by the end of March 1968. The project encompasses fourteen stations, six of which have both receiving and sending facilities and eight which have only receiving equipment. The fourteen installations are: New York State Library, Albany; New York Public Library Reference Department, New York; Cornell University, Ithaca; Buffalo and Erie County Public Library, Buffalo; Monroe County Library System, Rochester; Columbia University, New York; Nassau Library System, Garden City, Long Island; Suffolk Cooperative Library System, Bellport, Long Island; Westchester Library System, Mt. Vernon; Mid-Hudson Libraries, Poughkeepsie; Mid-York Library System, Utica; State University of New York, Albany; State University of New York, Potsdam; and State University of New York, Binghamton. Those libraries in the network which constitute a major resource have been given sending capabilities. These libraries will answer the requests of the system. Requests will be transmitted over a previously established TWX network. A printed form is completed and filed at the State Library which gives a history of the particular transaction and all statistics pertinent to it.

The information flow in the system is as follows: All requests go initially to the State Library in Albany. The State Library will attempt to fill the request. If the request cannot be filled at the State Library, then the library most likely to hold the material among the other libraries with sending capabilities is queried. When the material is found, the holding library is connected directly to the requesting library by
means of a switching center at the State Library in Albany. There can be no station-to-station communication within the network without first going through the State Library Switching Center.

The pilot project is testing the facsimile transmission equipment of two manufacturers. Eleven of the participating institutions are using Stewart-Warner (Datafax) units and two are employing Alden Facsimile Devices; the State Library will utilize both kinds of equipment. The major objectives of the New York study are:

1. From the standpoint of library service rendered, to analyze and evaluate the pilot experience and ascertain the feasibility of an ongoing facsimile transmission network for the libraries of New York State.

2. To determine the extent to which the number of facsimile sending and/or receiving devices at each participating library is adequate for the transmission volume experienced.

3. To establish whether, in the various regions of the State, the location of the pilot project's receiving units is appropriately related to the process of referral and the varying amounts of facsimile copy received by libraries in the area.

4. To ascertain whether the State Library's grant to participating institutions fully covers their additional clerical and copying machine rental costs during the pilot period.

A technical evaluation of the system is being conducted by the Division of Library Development and Office of General Services staff. The evaluation will cover the competing facsimile equipment, the competing transmission lines, and the switching mechanism. Statistics are being compiled on down time, ease of operation, amount of utilization, resolution, material not transmittable because of mechanical limitations, transmission speed, switching mechanism, staffing requirements, and requests being sent by high-speed facsimile equipment or TWX.

In order to obtain these statistics each of the FACTS stations is being asked to keep a log on all machine operations. This includes a record of all transmissions, difficulties encountered, and a file of unacceptable copy. Constant liaison is being maintained between central station representatives and the other FACTS stations.

A system function evaluation is being conducted by Nelson Associates, Inc. It is planned that the technical evaluation being conducted by the Library will be published concurrently with the Nelson Associates functional evaluation report.

Some observations which have become evident during the running of FACTS are:

The equipment has been down very little. The greatest problem with resolution is the quality of the original copy. Xerox copies are sometimes too light for good transmission over Stewart-Warner equipment. Automatic document feeders are considered a must. Acoustic silencing hoods seem to be desired. The ability to transmit continuous tone illustrations is a necessity. A very large number of the requests handled is clustered around illustrations. Large libraries do not need
extensive receiving capabilities; small libraries do. The greatest difficulties encountered with FACTS have to do with receiving requests, retrieving the material, and getting it into the machine, rather than with the actual mechanical processes involved.

As a clause in a final, if any, FACTS contract, the equipment supplier would have to agree to produce, within two years, a machine that would transmit directly from bound materials. It is encouraging to note that both Stewart-Warner and Alden seem to be making progress in this area.

Conclusions

During the course of research for this survey, several conclusions have become evident. The facsimile industry, which has remained static at a level of $15-18 million for several years, appears to be on the verge of a substantial expansion. The recent entries of Xerox and Magnavox into the facsimile field is symptomatic of great and accelerating interest displayed by commercially oriented companies in “remote copying” techniques.

Major users and potential users are now engaged in systems planning to integrate facsimile transmission techniques into a corporate structure.

Developmental programs promise to result in terminal equipment that will process the facsimile signal so that it can be transmitted more efficiently over existing facilities.

Service has been an important problem in commercial facsimile installations. Because installations have been scattered, inadequate field service has led to poor equipment performance. This situation will improve however, as the number of installations increase and supervision and training programs are upgraded.

Although no one manufacturer has equipment currently available to meet all requirements for an acceptable interlibrary facsimile transmission system, it is evident that through a combination of various types of equipment and continued advances in technology, facsimile transmission is technically feasible and economically desirable for many large library systems. As the appended bibliography indicates, the current literature and the consensus of individuals working with facsimile systems demonstrate that facsimile in libraries is fast becoming a reality. The essential feature missing from currently available machines is the ability to scan directly from the pages of a bound book. Fortunately, several manufacturers are making progress in this area. With electronic transmission devices improving at the present rate and the unit operating cost of such systems decreasing proportionately, facsimile will soon become a major technique for controlling and disseminating the ever increasing volume of published information.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1967

“Publisher Printer Linked to Facsimile; Material for National Restaurant News.” Publisher’s Weekly, v. 191, Feb. 6, 1967: 117.

Volume 12, Number 1, Winter 1968


1966


1965


1964


...


1963 and Earlier


"Telephone Circuits Used to Transmit Drawings and Documents." Bell Laboratory Record, v. 41, June, 1953: 235.


CALL FOR IDEAS

The Planning Committee of the Resources and Technical Services Division is interested in hearing of new needs and problems within the responsibilities of the division. The committee is inviting librarians with ideas for studies or projects which can best be handled through cooperative action within the RTSD framework to present their ideas at a meeting during the Kansas City Conference.

This is an experiment launched in an optimistic effort to enlarge participation in RTSD's goals, to give an opportunity for participation to all who wish to work in the division's program, to involve in projects those most interested in them, to coordinate activities and avoid wasteful repetition, and to gain the advantages of discussion. The experiment grew out of an observation that a good idea has sometimes faded and disappeared without full exploration simply because a committee chairman appointed to carry it out has lacked interest and understanding to give the necessary energy to push it forward. The outcome might have been productive, if the originator of the idea had carried it out.

In order to structure the meeting, the Planning Committee is requiring a not-more-than-one-page description of the proposal, stating (1) the name and address of the person (or persons) presenting the idea, (2) the problem to be solved by the proposal, and (3) the general plan of procedure. Anyone is invited to present a proposal. The only restriction is that it must lie within the division's areas of responsibility: acquisitions, cataloging, classification, serials, reproduction, and resources.

Projects will be presented and discussed at a meeting of the Planning Committee during the ALA Conference in Kansas City. The meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 26, 1968 at 4:30 p.m. The place will be listed in the Conference Program and will also be reported to those sending in proposals. Available at the meeting for consultation will be members of the Policy and Research Committees of the RTSD sections—Acquisitions, Cataloging and Classification, Serials, and Reproduction of Library Materials—as well as a representative of the Resources Committee.

When a proposal is accepted, action to set it in motion will be taken. If it falls within a section's responsibilities, it will be referred to the appropriate Policy and Research Committee. It might go to one of the divisional committees. It might warrant a recommendation to the RTSD Board that an ad hoc committee be created. In every case, the intention is that the person making the proposal be a central figure in the implementation of his idea.

To be included in the Kansas City meeting, the proposal must be received by May 15, 1968. Descriptive sheets should be addressed to Helen M. Welch, Chairman of the RTSD Planning Committee, University of Illinois Library, Urbana, Illinois 61801.
ATTENTION MEMBERS OF THE ACQUISITIONS SECTION

From the time of its organization the Acquisition Section of RTSD has concerned itself with numerous worthwhile projects and studies.

I am most anxious that the Section continue to pursue a program that will be of help in solving problems facing our profession. I therefore ask your cooperation in defining the areas upon which we should concentrate. What questions would you like to hear discussed? What studies would you like to see the Section initiate? Please let me have your suggestions.—Felix Reichmann, Chairman, RTSD Acquisitions Section.

The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging: A Progress Report on Developments under the Title IIC of the Higher Education Act of 1965

Edited by Norman D. Stevens
Acting University Librarian
Rutgers—The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

ON BEHALF OF the Association of College and Research Libraries and the Resources Committee of the Resources and Technical Services Division of ALA, I want to welcome all of you here tonight to this program. The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging has certainly been one of the most dramatic national library programs developed in this country, and for many of us its impact upon acquisitions and cataloging procedures has already been quite substantial. Tonight’s program should be both instructive and useful for in addition to having a progress report on developments of the program at the Library of Congress, we have asked three speakers to describe how the shared cataloging program has affected the internal, technical operations in their libraries. I will attempt to summarize briefly and comment upon the remarks of our four speakers and, if time permits, will also make a few very brief comments of my own.

This is an edited version of a program at the San Francisco Conference of ALA on June 29, 1967. The Program was organized by Dr. Stevens in his capacity as Chairman of the Resources Committee, and the introduction and summary contain his remarks.
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Title IIIC of The Higher Education Act of 1965 charged the Library of Congress to acquire, so far as possible, all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship and to provide catalog information for these materials promptly after receipt. The bill was signed into law on November 8, 1965. It was not until May 13, 1966 when the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 1966 was signed, that funds for NPAC were made available. Those who have been intimately involved with the program, and there were many, know that intensive preliminary planning and considerable work took place not only during the seven month period between passage of the authorizing legislation and passage of the enabling legislation but also prior to that time. Sympathetic and imaginative administrative support aided and encouraged a remarkable effort, which, beginning with the London Conference on Shared Cataloging held on January 13, 1966, developed a momentum still very much in evidence.

What have been the developments at the Library of Congress? In May, 1966, Cataloging Service Bulletin 75 announced that “In order to ensure the most efficient cataloging treatment possible, the policy of the Library of Congress will be to use shared cataloging techniques wherever feasible in cooperation with national bibliography authorities.” In these past twelve months, agreements have been made with a number of national bibliography producers for pre-publication bibliographic information, and seven shared cataloging offices have been established in Europe to cover the publications of Great Britain, France, West Germany, East Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Yugoslavia, the Netherlands and Belgium.

A Shared Cataloging Division, now numbering some 70 persons, was established at the Library of Congress to give special handling to catalog entries provided from these overseas offices and to process outside library reports from the 92 cooperating libraries.

In order to assure that the Library of Congress might provide cataloging information for those materials that it had not obtained, but that other research libraries had obtained or were ordering, arrangements were made, starting in August 1966, to distribute full depository sets of LC cards to some 92 libraries with the understanding that they would report those titles that they had ordered or received from shared cataloging countries, for which they found no cataloging information in the depository set.

Speed, which is of critical importance to the program, has been emphasized. Shared cataloging information is obtained from the national bibliography producers at the earliest possible time, either in typescript
or in printer's proof. Selections are made on a scheduled basis in a matter of hours with book orders going out to our dealers by air mail. This alone represents a considerable improvement over the previous method of circulating the printed bibliography through the hands of a large number of recommending officers before placing orders. Books and catalog information travel back to the Library of Congress by air. Special arrangements have been made with the U. S. Customs for rapid clearance, and incoming materials are picked up daily at Dulles International Airport. Printing of the catalog cards has been speeded up by the addition of a full second shift at the Government Printing Office Branch which assures rapid handling of catalog card copy and eliminates the previous need to establish priorities for various types of card setting and printing.

A regional acquisitions office was set up in Nairobi, to cover East Africa, and another was set up in Rio de Janeiro to extend coverage in South America. The latter office, in less than a year, quadrupled acquisitions from Brazil alone. Though the Kenya office primarily represents an acquisitions effort, cataloging coverage is also envisioned, and arrangements with several African institutions have been made for advance bibliographic information and the cataloging of vernacular language materials. These institutions include the Institute of Ethiopian Studies and Haile Selassie I University and the National Archives of Malawi.

Other efforts to assure fuller implementation of the program continue. Arrangements have been made for receipt of printer's proof sheets of national bibliography entries from Canada, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand. Negotiations about possible programs have been or are currently being carried on with a number of countries, and expansion of the program in the coming year will depend in large part on the availability of funds. The existing PL-480 programs in India, Indonesia, Israel, Pakistan, Ceylon and Nepal have also been meshed into the speed-up as much as possible.

There is an understandable temptation to dwell upon the overseas aspects of the program. The idea of international shared cataloging is attractive, and the implications of the program are clear as regards the possible development of a bibliographic information network. The major effort and emphasis, however, has been at the Library of Congress to build up speed and to increase the capacity to perform descriptive and subject cataloging, L. C. and Dewey classification, shelflisting, catalog card printing, etc.

NPAC has also provided the opportunity to undertake further cooperative endeavors between the three national libraries: the National Library of Medicine, the National Agricultural Library and the Library of Congress.

The National Library of Medicine and the Library of Congress have initiated an experimental project to print National Library of Medicine classification numbers and subject headings in brackets on Library of Congress catalog cards for medical titles that NLM is purchasing in.
Great Britain. If the project proves feasible, we expect to expand coverage to materials received from other shared cataloging countries, and, eventually, if everything goes well, to all current materials received by the Library of Congress and classified in the “R” collections.

Discussions have taken place with the National Agricultural Library, and we expect shortly to enter into a similar experiment with materials that NAL is purchasing in France. Like the NLM materials, they would be flown directly to Washington, rush cataloged through the shelflisting stage, then delivered to NAL for addition of NAL headings and class numbers before the printing of the LC card. At the present time the Library of Congress is borrowing books from both libraries for shared cataloging treatment when necessary.

What have been the concrete results of the program to date? The time lag in availability of LC catalog cards for current foreign trade publications from shared cataloging countries has been reduced considerably. I would estimate, on an average, that catalog cards for such materials are now available as much as one to four months earlier than before, and in some instances appreciably more if we consider the number of Priority-4 titles and other processing arrearages which were accruing previously. In one year, we have increased acquisitions of monographic materials by almost one-third again, and cataloging output, where we have concentrated about 70 percent of our expenditures, has climbed significantly.

In fiscal 1965 the Library cataloged slightly under 110,000 titles new to the library. In 1966, about 125,000 titles were cataloged. The 15,000 increase represented the early impact of Title IIC funds combined with increased production from additional catalogers authorized by Congress in the preceding year. In fiscal year 1967, the Library will catalog about 150,000 new titles, primarily as a result of the addition of more catalogers under this program, and the introduction of the shared cataloging concept.

In the ten years prior to the program, research libraries not only had to do about 50 percent original cataloging, but they reported that their cataloging arrearages had increased about 160 percent during that time. NPAC not only puts current books under early catalog control, thus making them much more quickly available to researchers and students, but also frees catalogers in the research libraries to help reduce arrearages. In addition, the Library of Congress is accepting reports for any title from a shared cataloging country with an imprint date from 1956 to 1965 for which no LC card has been printed, and, if the title is in the LC cataloging arrearage, we are retrieving the book, cataloging it and printing cards. Some 5,000 titles have already been cataloged as a result of this effort alone.

The participating libraries indicate they are finding at first search LC copy for about 70 percent of the current trade publications they are ordering or receiving from shared cataloging countries. They have been reporting to us, as part of our cooperative effort, those titles for which they have not discovered catalog copy and we have taken steps to assure
that such copy will be made available as quickly as possible. An analysis of these cooperating library reports shows that of 62,547 reports received, 24 percent (over 15,000 reports) were found to have catalog cards available by the time of searching here. Almost 17,000 reports, or 27 percent were found to be for titles that had already been received and were in the process of being cataloged. Slightly over 50 percent of the reports, therefore, represented titles for which catalog copy was available or was soon to be made available. In addition, some 14,000 titles, or 22 percent, had already had orders placed for them by the Library of Congress. Thus we may say that of some 62,547 reports checked, we could expect immediate or early availability for some 46,225 or 74 percent. Orders were placed for those titles represented by the 16,322 reports, or 26 percent, not found in the other three categories, and we would expect to receive and catalog almost all of these titles.

There are still many problems to be overcome. Procedural practices must be further refined. Many more catalogers with specialized language and subject skills are required. Acquisitions efforts must be greatly expanded, particularly in bibliographically underdeveloped areas. Shared cataloging arrangements remain to be worked out for many parts of the world. And, of course, a fairly substantial increase in funds is essential. For fiscal 1968 the Library requested the amount of $7,770,000 that appeared in the authorizing legislation. The House Appropriations Subcommittee allowed, in its report, the $4 million dollar figure that was submitted by H. E. W. and the Bureau of the Budget. The Senate Subcommittee has heard the Librarian’s request for restoration of the full amount, but the report of the Subcommittee has not yet been issued. If Congress appropriates $4 million, the existing program can be fully annualized at slightly more than $3.5 million and a moderate expansion can take place. It is estimated that funding of the program at this level would result in provision of sufficient catalog copy to meet about 76 percent of the current cataloging needs of U.S. research libraries. Funding at the $7,770,000 level would enable the program to be expanded to the point where from 90 percent to 95 percent of these needs might be met. These figures obviously can be only estimates, subject to the unknowns of price inflation, increased world-wide book production, the chances of establishing programs in certain areas of the world, etc.

The increase in speed and comprehensiveness of cataloging coverage benefit not just the research library, but every library that subscribes to our catalog card service, proofsheet service, or book catalogs. Though it is difficult to estimate all of the tangible and intangible savings accruing from this program, it is already clear that savings are being returned well in excess of the sums appropriated.

I should like to conclude with the observation that the initial establishment of this program represented the fulfillment of the efforts of many librarians. Perhaps the eventual success of the program may

2 The final appropriation bill provided $5 million.
be measured in the fulfillment of their hopes and aspirations for the future.

Developments at Cornell

Ryburn M. Ross
Assistant Director for Technical Services
Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York

It was originally believed that it would take many months for NPAC to show tangible results in direct labor savings for a large research library such as the Cornell University Libraries but there is already sufficient evidence available to indicate otherwise. The entire library staff has been both amazed and pleased with the speed and efficiency with which this program has been put into action by the Library of Congress.

Since August 1966 when the first package of Title II depository cards was received, several important developments have occurred as a direct result of this program:

1. Title II cards have been integrated directly into the selection process and are now used as the major selection tool by the Libraries.
2. The selection process using Title II cards has been coordinated with all Departmental and College Librarians and Area Bibliographers thus providing the Libraries a more uniform selection of materials.
3. Professional cataloging positions have been converted to sub-professional positions resulting in salary savings.
4. The average number of titles processed monthly by the departments responsible for acquisitions and cataloging has been increased.

The most outstanding aspect of the Libraries’ use of the Title II catalog card output has been the full integration of the depository catalog cards into the processing routines from the point of selection to completed reproduction of cataloging copy. Immediately upon receipt, each batch of Title II depository cards is screened for unwanted items (e.g., juvenile literature), sorted by the first letter of the Library of Congress classification number, and displayed in a fixed location in the Acquisitions Department. All Departmental and College Librarians and Area Bibliographers are asked, to review the cards weekly and make their selections by assigning fund numbers on the verso of the depository cards. All books received on standing orders are placed on shelves located in the vicinity of the Title II depository cards for weekly review by the same selection staff. At the end of each week all selections, both depository cards and books, are reviewed by the Assistant Director for Development of Collections, selections for the Olin Research Library are made and unnecessary duplication is eliminated. Title II cards for all items selected are then Xeroxed in the necessary number of copies to serve as a record of order for each Departmental or College Library order, and the processes of searching and ordering are started. There is
The cornell university Libraries' experience this last year showed an increase in the availability of Library of Congress catalog copy from 41 to 45 percent. Present indications are that this increase will rise to approximately 50 percent or more during the coming year. However, it will be a number of years before the full effect of the Program will be felt by a library as large as that of Cornell, which is still acquiring considerable quantities of retrospective research materials in diversified subject fields and current materials from far-flung geographical areas. The Program will have to be extended to other countries of Western Europe such as Italy, Spain and Portugal, the Eastern European countries, Latin America, and East and Southeast Asia before it will drastically cut down the amount of original cataloging the Cornell University Libraries will be required to do.

Developments at Stanford

KEITH C. BLEAN, JR.
Administrative Assistant, Catalog Division
Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California

In an attempt to assess the present effects and the future potential effects of shared cataloging at Stanford, I shall try to give you at least part of what we have been doing before NPAC, what we are doing with NPAC and what we think we will be doing in the way of ordering and cataloging at Stanford.

In the ARL study conducted in March, 1965, Stanford catalogers found that we had LC proof slips for 30 percent of all titles cataloged, and that data was found in the printed LC catalogs for an additional 20 percent. Further, help was found for 5 percent in the form of NUC entries in the printed catalogs. Original cataloging was given the remaining 45 percent.

Developments since March of 1965 have been quite dramatic. Of all the books cataloged last month (May, 1967) 66 percent were found either
in the Depository cards or in the printed catalogs, 6 percent had NUC entries, and only 28 percent were given original cataloging.

These figures are artificially low. They are skewed downwards by:

1. Disproportionately heavy acquisitions in non-NPAC areas with Slavic, Italian, Latin American cataloging accounting for 67 percent of all titles not found with LC data.
2. Deferred searching of U. S. standing orders.
3. Deferred searching of titles not found in LC at the time of purchase order.
4. Almost exclusive work by Stanford Catalogers with “original” materials; a fair percentage of which are from accumulated backlogs.
5. Accumulation of a backlog of titles found with depository cards due to illness and vacations in that section.

We can artificially create a more typical day by compensating for these factors. That is, we can consider figures relating to books received and distributed for cataloging rather than to books actually cataloged. To that end, distribution statistics were kept on incoming materials for a four day period in June.

During that period Depository cards were found for 25 percent of all titles received and entries were found for an additional 12 percent in the printed catalogs. The remaining 63 percent were then sent to “deferred searching.” The results of a “typical day” of searching these titles after a delay of one month are: 14 percent found in Depository set, 33 percent found in LC printed catalogs, 13 percent in NUC, leaving 40 percent with no help. U. S. scholarly press books in the deferred searching section are handled separately and required that we add one more set of figures to make complete our “typical day.” This group of books makes up 11.9 percent of the total daily distribution. Figures obtained over a period of one year indicate that either Depository cards or entries in the printed LC catalogs are found at the rate of 99.84 percent, which is to say for 11.8 percent of the daily distribution.

If we combine these figures we find that from the “Daily distribution” we receive 37 percent with LC, from deferred searching we add 30 percent with LC, and finally 11.8 percent U. S. scholarly press books yielding a current find rate of 78.8 percent with LC data and a “no help” figure of 21.2 percent.

All of these numbers and percentages have profoundly affected developments at Stanford. The center of the searching activity has moved from the Catalog Division to the Order Department. The Order Department has for the first time come to perform the “pre-cataloging” operations formerly a function of the Catalog Division. The Order Department reports that currently 40 percent of their labor effort is spent on bibliographic verification, which represents a shift in emphasis away from reliance on trade bibliographies. The nature of searching in the Catalog Division too has changed. There is no more “simple” searching except for holding books for eventual match with depository cards. There is a much greater reliance upon the data supplied by the Order Department,
and a great deal of duplicated effort has been eliminated. Far fewer titles require any sort of search by the Catalog Division. We are questioning the continued value of assigning deferred search titles to subject area specialists if 80 percent of current titles and 60 percent of older titles are essentially “pre-cataloged” within the normal one month deferred period. We have found too that what remains to be searched falls generally into the category of “advanced” searching and that consequently it seems less and less economical to assign this work as before to junior assistants.

We hope to further profit from NPAC feedback by matching report slips with orders not yet received, and holding books received to eventually match them with the NPAC reports. If this proves feasible new distribution categories corresponding to report status might profitably be established in place of earmarking each book for a specific cataloger. Thus those books in process or on order at LC would be held for the Depository card and only those titles not to be processed by LC would be distributed to our catalogers.

To go over the figures once more by way of final optimism and an estimation of what is about to come: recall the 66 percent found in LC in May and actually cataloged, add to it 75 percent of the NPAC titles as found by LC which amounts to an additional 7 percent of our current acquisitions, and add approximately 12 percent for U. S. scholarly books. On top of that, the opening of the Hague office this month adds a further potential overall find of 1.4 percent for our Dutch, Yugoslav and Belgian orders. At Stanford we are beginning thus to approach Mr. Applebaum’s hoped for 90-95 percent service.

**Developments at North Carolina**

**Clifton Brock, Associate Librarian**

*University of North Carolina Libraries*

*Chapel Hill, North Carolina*

Officially, we are here this evening to discuss “The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging: a progress report on developments under Title IIc of the Higher Education Act of 1965.” Unofficially, I suspect the session might well be entitled “What’s in it for us?” In other words, just how much help has NPAC been to participating libraries?

At the University of North Carolina we believe the payoff has been substantial. Ideally, data on this should be presented in conjunction with a detailed explanation of the procedures we follow in exploiting the cataloging information made available by the Library of Congress. These procedures are rather complex, and are still at least in details, in a process of evolution. Perhaps I can, however, summarize them briefly.

We search in the Library of Congress depository file any current title, domestic or foreign, for which we have reason to believe catalog copy may have been provided. The initial search is made at the time a book is ordered; if copy is found, card sets are immediately reproduced via
xerography, headings are typed, and the cards are thus ready for filing in the catalog as soon as the book is received and processed. If a card is not found in the initial search, a second search is made when the book is received, and card sets are reproduced if copy is found. If no card is found in the second search, books are numbered serially and shelved temporarily against the future receipt of copy. In these cases a copy of the order card is filed in the depository file; when a card does arrive, this order slip keys us to reproduce a card set, pull the title off the temporary shelf and process it. If copy is not received within a reasonable length of time, these titles are routed to the Catalog Department for original cataloging.

Throughout the stress is on locating LC copy, and, when it is found, using it without change. When copy is found, anywhere along the line, cataloging is accomplished entirely by clerical personnel without involvement of professional catalogers.

The depository file, of course, constitutes the data base to which our operation is geared. After a period of experimentation we have settled tentatively on the following exclusions: cards in languages using other than the Roman or Cyrillic alphabets, and cross reference cards for the excluded languages; cards for films, filmstrips, motion pictures and phonodiscs, and cards for music and juvenile literature. Separate files of some of these cards are maintained by specialized language catalogers or by departmental libraries. Overall we are filing 78 percent of the cards received and this filing costs the equivalent of two full-time clerical personnel.

With this brief introduction, let me now try to talk in terms of “payoff.” Our first attempt to exploit Library of Congress cataloging information comes with an initial search of the depository file at the time a book is ordered. This is a crucial search because, if we can find copy at this stage, the catalog cards can be produced before a book is received and the book can be completely processed and available for use within a few days after receipt. How successful, then, is this first search? During the period October 1966-May 1967 we searched 9,013 orders in the depository file and found, on the initial search, copy for 3,812 titles, or 42 percent. Our second effort comes when we have a book in hand, that is, a title received by blanket order, gift, exchange, or a title which was ordered but for which copy was not found in the initial search. In this category, from October through May we searched 4,621 titles and located copy for 1,273, or 28 percent.

These figures, of course, underestimate the ultimate payoff we receive through the depository file. Cards do come in sooner or later for many titles which could not be cataloged in these early stages and were shelved temporarily awaiting receipt of copy. Unfortunately, we have only recently begun to keep records on this “third-stage” payoff and have as yet no hard data to present.

The figures presented are also defective in that they do not differentiate between domestic and foreign imprints, specifically, those from
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foreign countries covered by the Title IIC program. Our initial recordkeeping did not provide for such differentiation, but we have gathered some data on this. During the six-month period from December, 1966, through May, 1967, we searched 3,644 domestic orders against the depository file and located copy for 2,175 titles, or 60 percent. Since user demand for current domestic books is higher than for other categories, we consider this a very significant payoff; it means in effect that we can have 60 percent of the current American titles we acquire cataloged and available for use within a week of receipt.

Of course, fast copy on domestic imprints has been available for some years in proof sheet form so this figure does not reflect a direct payoff from NPAC. During the same six-month period we searched 4,073 orders for foreign imprints in the depository file and located copy on the initial search for 1,008 titles, or 25 percent. During the second stage search, that is, with "book-in-hand," we found copy on 879 out of 1,552 titles, or 24 percent. Even this does not get down directly to the effect of Title IIC, since these searches encompassed current foreign titles generally, not just from those countries covered by NPAC. As indicated earlier, we notify the Library of Congress when we cannot find copy on imprints from the countries covered by the Title IIC program. Since November, 1966, we have reported 2,011 such items and have received 1,779 positive responses, indicating that the titles concerned are being or will be acquired and cataloged by the Library of Congress.

In summary, we believe that participation in the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging has been of substantial benefit to our library and that we have begun to tap a vein which, given the grace of the U. S. Congress and a hard-working crew at the Library of Congress, will prove even more productive in the future.

Summary

I would like to bring to your attention some additional information on the general effect of this program on other research libraries, as developed in the representations which were made in the spring of 1967 when full funding and a five year extension of Title IIC of the Higher Education Act of 1965 were sought in the U. S. Congress. This was largely summarized for a hearing by the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States House of Representatives on HR-6232, on April 20, 1967, by Dr. William Dix, Princeton University Librarian. For those of you who may not have seen that summary, I would like to bring out some of the salient points. A number of libraries indicated, of course, that it has been much too soon for them to have any real concrete evidence as to the improvements that the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging has brought about in their operations. Others, however, have already been able to make estimates of one kind or another, and they give a useful indication of the direction that the program is taking. At that time
five libraries were able to give any indication of what is probably the most useful and significant measure of success, which is the increase in the percentage of material cataloged utilizing Library of Congress copy. The Yale University Library indicated that since the inception of PL-480 cataloging and Title IIIC, there has been an increase 38.7 percent to 47.3 percent. The university of Chicago Library indicated that in the last fiscal year 53 percent of their material was so cataloged and that they now have Library of Congress copy for 63 percent of it. The University of Washington indicated that, whereas previously 30 to 35 percent of their cataloging was done using Library of Congress copy, 50 percent is now done in that way; and they note a steady increase in the availability of such copy. At the University of Rochester, the increase in February 1967 over February 1966 was from 48 percent to 66.5 percent; and the University of Wisconsin estimated that their increase has been from 50 percent to 75 percent. Other Libraries have indicated simply that they are able to use more sub-professional staff to do the cataloging for material covered by Title IIIC cards or have been able to save significant amounts through the decreased need for professional staff to handle cataloging of material, and have been able to make material much more readily available to their users.

As Mr. Ross has pointed out, at Cornell and at a number of other institutions, there has been increasingly wide-spread use of the depository cards in the selection process because of the prompt availability of the information, and because the cards give national bibliography citations and prices, which reduce the need for further searching. All in all, there is no doubt that this program has had, and will continue to have, a substantial impact on the technical processes in the 92 Participating research libraries of the United States, and I am sure that the impact has also begun to be felt in numerous other libraries that utilize Library of Congress cataloging copy.

As chairman of the Resources Committee I should point out that this program has had, and will continue to have, an equally important impact on the development of national library resources. From the standpoint of administrative economy, it would obviously seem desirable to have 100 percent availability of Library of Congress copy for local cataloging. From the standpoint of the development of a national resources program, however, a variety of libraries ought to be acquiring material not held in the Library of Congress or in other libraries, which they must, therefore, catalog themselves. Also, from the standpoint of administrative economy, it would seem desirable to use the Library of Congress Title IIIC depository cards as the primary source for the selection of materials. But here again, from the standpoint of a national resources program, I would emphasize the fact that the Title IIIC cards ought not to be the sole source of selection for the large research library. We need, I feel, a broader base for our resources programs. A 75 percent availability of Library of Congress copy, which the Yale University Library, for example, has indicated as a desirable figure would seem to
be approaching the upper limits of reasonableness for the large academic or research library. I also believe that we have been so relieved to find a major source of assistance for our cataloging problems that we have tended to overlook the far reaching implications of NPAC in the area of resources, particularly in terms of the development of a national program for resources. Let me simply compare two statements. The first is from the 1961 revision of the Farmington Plan Handbook: “Ideally it would make sure that one copy at least of each new foreign publication that might reasonably be expected to interest a research worker in the United States would be acquired by an American library, promptly listed in the National Union Catalog, and made available by inter-library loan or by photographic reproduction.” The second is from Dr. Dix’s testimony, to which I referred earlier, at the hearings on HR-6232 in the spring of 1967. “These foreign offices of the Library of Congress are purchasing for that library one copy of each of the new books believed important for American scholarship and research. One copy for the whole country is hardly enough, and we believe that the relatively modest added cost of depositing another copy in some institution in another part of the country as a national loan copy would be thoroughly justified. The Center for Research Libraries in Chicago would be an appropriate institution. It collects and makes available the sort of library books, journals, and documents which are important, but which need not be held by every local college or university library.” In a sense, both programs are attempting to achieve the same goal, and a thorough and detailed examination and study of all national cooperative resources programs would seem to be very much in order at this time.

**PROCESSING CENTERS DISCUSSION GROUP**

The Technical Services Directors of Processing Centers Discussion Group formed in 1966 within the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association aims to provide a forum for discussion of common problems encountered by cooperative regional centralized processing centers. As many of such centers were recently established and have the same or similar difficulties an exchange of ideas should prove useful.

Directors and assistant directors of such centers who are members of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association, are invited to join the Discussion Group. One of the first needs of the group is the establishment of an up to date directory of centers, regardless of type, school, public library, college or mixed. Centers are asked to send their name and address as well as the name of the director to the chairman of the Discussion Group, Mr. Rudi Weiss, Chief of Technical Services, Westchester Library System, 1500 Central Park Avenue, Yonkers, New York 10710.
A note under the above caption in the Winter 1967 issue of LRTS, p. 26, reported a study being conducted by the Institute of Paper Chemistry under the sponsorship of 20 manufacturers of rag paper, having as one of its purposes to determine the validity of accelerated aging for predicting the permanence of paper. The work to date, so the sponsors had reported, had “contradicted the basis on which the oven-aging test depended.”

A report from the sponsored study is now in hand. It is a paper entitled “The Prediction of Paper Permanence” prepared by B. L. Browning and W. A. Wink for the 153d Meeting of the American Chemical Society at Miami Beach, April 9-14, 1967. In it the authors, while admitting that precise predictions of life expectancy cannot be expected from the accelerated aging tests at the present time, conclude that nevertheless “the prediction of paper permanence from the results of accelerated aging is sound in principle” (p. 17) and that “the results obtained indicate a general validity . . . for estimating the relative permanence of paper during natural aging” (p. [ii]).

DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION ADDITIONS, NOTES AND DECISIONS

The first issue of this publication to appear since volume 1, no. 20/24, Dec. 1963/Dec. 1964 was distributed late in 1967: volume 2, no. 1, Spring 1967, referring to Dewey 17. It announced plans for its own semiannual publication, the imminent appearance of the revised index to the 17th edition (which came out in December), the constantly increasing coverage of Dewey Decimal numbers on new Library of Congress catalog cards, changes in the membership of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee, and the formation of a special committee to plan means for implementation of the recommendations of the 1964 Field Survey of the Use of DDC Abroad.

It also explained the differing bases for segmentation of DC numbers in printed schedules and on LC cards, requested advice on the preparation of a completely revised 340 Law schedule, and set forth correction notes for numerous errata in Edition 17.

DC& is sent free to purchasers of Dewey 17 and to subscribers to LC cataloging services. In order to receive it regularly a purchaser of Dewey 17, unless also a regular customer for other LC services, should: (a) return to the publisher (unless he has already done so) the postcard included in all new copies of the 17th edition, or, if the postcard has been lost, (b) write the Forest Press, Lake Placid Club, New York 12946, U.S.A., stating that he has purchased Dewey 17 and wants to receive DC&. The publication is not for sale.
Statistics of Collection Overlap at the Libraries of the Six New England State Universities*

WILLIAM R. NUGENT, Vice President
Inforonics, Inc.
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Introduction

As part of a design study to specify a regional processing center for the New England state university libraries, it was required to know the percentage of collection overlap with respect to each of the 30 ordered pairs of 6 libraries. Participating states were Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. This overlap data was needed to predict the degree of joint use of cataloging information and to estimate the efficiency of collective reclassification.

The results revealed a high degree of commonality in the 6 collections, showing, for example, that a random title from one library had a 40% chance of being present in another randomly selected library. When current imprint samples were tested, the figure rose to 47%. Rhode Island’s holdings were shown to be the collection of greatest duplication elsewhere.

Procedure

Two samples of 550 catalog cards were drawn from each library. Sample 1 was an unbiased sample from the general collection; sample 2 was current imprint cards only (1964, 1965, and 1966). The two separate samples were used to determine whether current acquisitions were more or less homogeneous than earlier holdings. The number 550 was chosen to insure that the empirical percentages of overlap were within 5 per cent of their true value with a 99% confidence level. This is explained in the appendix. Only monographs subject to L.C. classification were included. Microforms, government documents, etc., were excluded as were rare book collections, children’s literature, and similar material unlikely to be included in an LC-oriented cooperative system.

Main entry cards were selected to avoid the effects of subject or class bias. The number 550 was divided by the number of drawers in

* This work was supported by the Council on Library Resources, Inc. via grant CLR-354 to the New England Board of Higher Education.
the catalog, and this number, rounded up, was the number taken from each drawer. The distance between successive selections was kept approximately constant, and if a chosen card was inappropriate, successive cards were examined until a selection was made. Sample 1 and sample 2 were drawn separately; the cards were duplicated for distribution to the other libraries, and refiled. Selection, reproduction, and refiling time averaged 40 man-hours per sample.

Each library selected 2 samples, and received 10 samples to be matched. A total of 60 samples was ultimately checked, yielding the overlap for general collections and current imprints for each ordered pair of libraries. Checking time ranged from 6 to 12 man-hours per sample.

Results

Table 1 shows the percentage of overlap from library to library for the two samples. The overlap of sample 1, the general collection, ranged from 28.1% to 55.2%, and had an average of 39.7%. The current imprint sample, sample 2, had a greater range (25.1% to 70.6%), and had a higher average (46.9%). Table 2 lists the percentage probabilities of duplication in each of the libraries, and this appears directly related to library size, as might be expected, but with a shorter range of variation than size alone would cause. This is probably indicative of a "core" collection, common to all, which raises the lower bound of duplication in the smaller libraries. This is further evidenced in Table 3 which lists the expected number of duplications elsewhere of titles in a given library. Table 3 contains the row sums of Table 1. For the general collection, the average is 1.99 duplications, and 2.35 duplications for current imprints. Approximate library size is shown in Table 4.

The increased use of "standing orders" by all participants no doubt accounts in part for this difference. Rhode Island emerges as the most duplicated library, with 2.40 duplicates for the general collection and 2.72 duplicates for the current imprints. This high degree of duplication will result in more efficient use of shared mass storage in the regional center and indicates a high return on cooperative reclassification efforts. The number of uses of shared cataloging information for a title is equivalent to the number of different libraries holding that title. For the system as a whole, the expected number of uses is equal to the average number of duplications plus one. The "plus one" is to include the source library or first user. For the six libraries in question, information about a title in the general collection would have about 3 uses, and this would rise to 3.35 uses if current imprints only were to be processed.

Appendix: Overlap Probabilities

The overlap percentages of Table 1 may be interpreted as the conditional probability that a title in library i will exist, given that the title exists in library j, the card source, which we will express as:
The probability \( C \) that a selected library, \( l_i \), will contain a volume randomly selected from a different library is the sum of the conditional probabilities over \( j \); divided by the number of libraries less 1.

\[
P(l_i \mid l_j) \]

\[
The probability \( C \) that a selected library, \( l_i \), will contain a volume randomly selected from a different library is the sum of the conditional probabilities over \( j \); divided by the number of libraries less 1.

\[
C = \sum_{i \neq j} (P(l_i \mid l_j))/(L - 1)
\]

These results are shown in Table 2, and are the column sums of the entries in Table 1, divided by 5.

The expected number, \( D \), of duplications, i.e., the expected number of libraries that will have a title contained in a given library, \( j \), will be the sum of the conditional probabilities involving library \( j \).

\[
D = \sum_{i} P(l_i \mid l_j)
\]

For purposes of the experiment, multiple duplications in one library are not considered differently than one duplication. These results are shown in Table 3, and are the row sums of the entries in Table 1. The expected number of uses is the number of duplications plus one.

To obtain the basic conditional probabilities we take the ratio of the \( k \) matches found in library \( i \) that correspond to titles in the \( n \) samples from library \( j \):

\[
P(l_i \mid l_j) = \frac{k_{ij}}{n}
\]

the number \( n \) is constant for all libraries, and is chosen to be large enough to assure that the discrepancy, \( \delta \), between the actual percentage \( p \) and the measured percentage \( p' \), is less than a chosen amount with a chosen confidence level \( P \). A reasonable requirement for our study was to insure that our estimate overlap percentage was within 5% of the actual overlap percentage, with a confidence level of 99%. This is:

\[
P\{|p' - p| \leq 0.05\} \geq 0.99
\]

We use the normal approximation to the binomial distribution and first find the root, \( x \), of the normal distribution for \( P = .99 \), yielding \( x = 2.326 \). Then using the form:

\[
\frac{(n/pq)^{1/2}}{n} \geq \frac{x}{\delta}; \quad n \geq pq \frac{x^2}{\delta^2}
\]

We assume the worst case (requiring the largest \( n \)) for which \( p = .5 \), so that:

\[
n \geq .25 \left(\frac{x}{\delta}\right)^2
\]

For the case considered, with \( x = 2.326 \) and \( \delta = .05 \), we find:
Were we to reduce the confidence level to 95% and maintain a maximum error of 5%:

\[ n \geq 271 \]

The former figure is used, rounded up to 550, since we have no previous data to use as verification.

### TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td>(6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.7)</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERCENTAGE OVERLAP OF COLLECTIONS**

S1 = Sample 1, General Collection  
S2 = Sample 2, Current Imprints only (1964-65-66)

Parenthetical figures are additional percentages of imperfect matches (different editions, etc. separately noted by R.I. and Conn., considered as non-match by others).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.H.</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.I.</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conn.</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Percentage Probability of Duplication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Collection</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Imprint</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Probability that a Title in Another Library will be Duplicated in the Listed Libraries

S1 = sample 1, General Collection
S2 = sample 2, Current Imprints Only (1964-65-66)

TABLE 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.H.</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.I.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conn.</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Expected Number of Duplications (excluding multiple copies)**
- **General Collection:** 1.99
- **Current Imprint:** 2.35

**Average Expected Number of Uses of Shared Cataloging Information (excluding multiple copies)**
- **General Collection:** 2.99
- **Current Imprint:** 3.35

**Expected Number of Duplications in other Libraries of a Title in the Listed Libraries (excluding multiple copies)**

- **S1 = Sample 1, General Collection**
- **S2 = Sample 2, Current Imprints Only (1964-65-66)**

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Volumes Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>620,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Volumes Held in 1966 (Approx.)**

**TABLE 4**
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The Use of Title-Page Photography in Cataloging

PHILIP J. WEIMERSKIRCH*

LOUIS DAGUERRE’S INVENTION of the first practical method of photography in 1839 rapidly led to a number of improvements in the process, and to its application to a great many uses. Perhaps the first to suggest the application of photography to library work was a Dublin scholar, Albert Blor. In 1853, Blor wrote in Notes and Queries, May not photography be usefully applied to the making of catalogues of large libraries? It would seem no difficult matter to obtain any number of photographs, of any required size, of the title-page of any book. Suppose the plan adopted, that five photographs of each were taken; they may be arranged in five catalogues, as follows:—Era, subject, country, author, title. These being arranged alphabetically, would form five catalogues of a library probably sufficient to meet the wants of all. By adopting a fixed breadth—say three inches—for the photographs, to be pasted in double columns in folio, interchanges may take place of those unerring slips, and thus aid each other. I throw out this crude idea, in the hope that photographers may combine to carry it out.¹

Fifteen years later the noted bookdealer, Henry Stevens of Vermont, expressed a similar idea, though he seems to have been unaware of Blor’s suggestion. Stevens wrote an essay on this subject entitled “Photobibliography,” which he claims was first privately set in type in 1868, the substance of which appeared many times thereafter.² Stevens read this essay before the Conference of Librarians which was held in London in October of 1877, and it was published as a book by the Chiswick Press in 1878; he prefixed the essay to one of his catalogs, Bibliotheca Geographica. In ten copies of this catalog, one of which is in the New York Public Library, he pasted in photographs of the title pages of many of the books described therein. Because the reduction ratio was high and because these photographs have faded, they are now rather difficult to decipher. The experiment showed, however, that the idea was basically sound, that it would work.

Stevens advocated title-page photography only for “old, rare, beautiful, and costly books.” He wanted to establish “a Central Bibliographical Bureau, public or private, where librarians, collectors, and amateurs may

* Editor’s note: Mr. Weimerskirch was recently on the staff of the Columbia University Medical School Library, but has left to become a doctoral candidate at the School of Library Service, Columbia University.
buy descriptive slip or card titles of books as they buy postage-stamps, money-orders, or telegrams, at a tithe of the cost they would incur in making them themselves, and at the same time infinitely superior in quality."

The idea of a bibliographical bureau seems to have originated with Charles Coffin Jewett, who suggested that a central depository for stereotype plates be established, which could be used for printing a union catalog of holdings of American libraries and for printing book catalogs of individual libraries. To what extent Stevens was influenced by Jewett, with whom he was in close touch, one can only guess.

The bibliographical descriptions to be furnished by the bibliographical bureau were to be either on thin paper, for tipping into the front of a book, or on card stock, and could be furnished either with or without a photograph of the title page. The photographs of the title pages could be furnished separately, if desired, for pasting into existing catalogs.

As many early printed books are large, Stevens suggested that the cards be four by seven inches, and that the reduction ratio be three to one. Everything, regardless of size, was to be reduced exactly this amount. In the examples given by Stevens, the photograph appears at the left of the card, the bibliographical description to the right of center, and the tracings, where given, at the right edge. Across the top of the card, in larger type, is printed the author's name, short title, and the imprint. The photo-facsimile, which was of course printed from a plate, was to appear only on the main card. He also advocated printing the author and short title in red, blue or other colors for use as an "index title" or a "cross reference," i.e., as a title entry or added entry. To adapt the cards to any particular library, press marks and other additions were to be added by hand.

Detailed cataloging of rare books can be a very time-consuming process, involving a great deal of research, research which, regrettably, is often duplicated in other libraries because of the lack of such a central repository. True, there are a number of fine printed catalogs which contain detailed descriptive cataloging, such as the Church catalog, which incidentally was the first catalog based on Stevens' ideas, or the Pforzheimer catalog. If a cataloger can find the book he is trying to catalog listed in one of these, his task is considerably lightened. The cataloger of a rare book wants to know if and how his copy differs from the "ideal" copy or from those copies known to exist. Stevens wanted to make it possible to obtain this information by the simple expedient of writing to a central bureau.

The desirability of having a central bibliographical bureau was expressed as recently as 1961 by F. N. L. Poynter, who wrote,

The kind of scheme I have in mind is one where advanced students . . . might be required to submit, as part of their final training, a complete and detailed bibliographical description of at least one early English book which is locally available. After scrutiny by the professor, these descriptions could be
filed, say, in the Library of Congress, for reference by anybody who may wish to consult them or who may ask for copies of them.

As Stevens put it eighty-three years earlier,

What we want somewhere, not everywhere, is a full, clear, plain, practical, exact, precise, concise and comprehensive title, collation and description—that is to say, a real portrait and intellectual photograph of every one of the books in our libraries, true and expressive like the faces of our friends, and as readily distinguishable and recognizable. These titles should be so well executed as to become at once standard by the universal law of superiority and value, and to pass current like our coins.

Photographs of title pages have a number of advantages, not the least of which is their accuracy. The crowded, wordy, title pages of seventeenth century books are difficult to transcribe accurately. Some variant issues are distinguished only by changes in the spacing of type or changes in type fonts or type ornaments, which can be recorded accurately only by a photograph. It is much faster to photograph a title page than to write out a detailed transcription. Besides, some title pages almost defy transcription. As Stevens asked, how does one describe a book accurately when the title is curled in a spiral, or enclosed in a half-moon, or which has phrases in odd positions on the title page? A transcription of such a title page is bound to be very complicated and difficult to decipher. A photograph is simplicity itself.

The superiority of title-page photography over quasi-facsimile transcription was noted in 1941 by James M. Osborn in his review of Hugh Macdonald's bibliography of Dryden:

Reproduction of title-pages by photographic means has two advantages: it eliminates errors and reveals the identity of the pages better than any system of transcription. No man ever lived who could transcribe a series of title-pages without error, and even if one succeeded the result would be nothing but a translation of the type arrangement into a series of symbols... In my opinion, the use of quasi-facsimile transcription in published bibliographies will soon be generally recognized as an anachronism.

Osborn says that the principal objection to title-page photography has been the high cost of the plates for printing. He answers this by saying that the labor cost of making the transcription, reading proof and revising must be balanced against the cost of the plate. Henry Stevens' ideas about title-page photography received wide circulation, both within and without library literature, but despite this fact they had little immediate effect.

At the 1932 convention of the Association des Bibliothécaires Français it was suggested that catalogs of incunabula should contain a photo-facsimile of the title page, the colophon, and a few typical pages of each volume. In 1935 Léo Crozet recommended photographing the title pages of all books as a method of avoiding errors of transcription, of which he claimed the Bibliothèque Nationale catalog was full. Crozet introduced a novel idea for getting around the obstacle presented...
by the difference in format between the average book and the 3 x 5 inch catalog card. He designed a kind of photostat camera having a special prismatic lens which would split the image of the title page in two, and project this image so that the top half of the title page would appear to the left side of the bottom half on a photo-sensitized catalog card. Thus, for an average book, the author and title would appear at the left of the card; the imprint would appear at the right. Additional bibliographical data could be written on the negative photostat with white ink. A roll of paper the width of a catalog card would be used, and the camera would be adjusted to reduce the image to fit this area. After the roll had been developed, it would be cut to size, and subject headings, added entries, etc., put in by hand. Crozet estimated that six hundred catalog cards could be made in an eight-hour day with such a camera, including time for developing the cards. Although he made drawings of such a camera, and although he claimed that it was feasible from an engineering standpoint, no such camera seems to have been made.

The ne plus ultra of photo-facsimile cataloging was suggested in 1941 by an American, Robert D. Franklin, who proposed . . . that each non-fiction book submitted for copyright and each foreign title imported by the Library of Congress or a group of cooperating importers, be photographed with a minimum of four views, as follows: one of the book jacket opened out, one of the book as you would see it standing by itself on a table, against a background that measures it adequately; another of the title page; another of a typical page of the text, showing size of print, etc.; another of its table of contents if on one page, otherwise of a card which gives the table of contents and bibliographical data. Franklin recommended that these views be reproduced on one card whose uniform size would depend on how small the photographs could be made without sacrificing legibility. This scheme never seems to have been tried either. It would be expensive, and the cards would have to be excessively large. The idea of reproducing the table of contents of non-fiction works, however, has some merit.

Still another theoretical, but more realistic article on photo-facsimile cataloging appeared in 1951 in a German periodical, Bild und Ton. The authors, Hermann Raabe and Wilhelm Janiak, suggest that microfilm be used as the first step in the production of a card catalog. Title pages would be microfilmed and prints would be made on photosensitized card stock at the rate of about seven hundred per day. To these cards additions would have to be made, by hand or typewriter, of the authors' names, added entries, subject headings and additional bibliographical data. The authors say that while up to now an experienced cataloger can insert an average of forty titles a day into the card catalog, the same cataloger, using title-page photography, could insert an average of two hundred titles into the catalog per day. They get around the problem of reduction ratio and format by suggesting that 3 x 5 inch cards be filed standing or their smaller side, or, better yet, that a card of larger size, 9 x 12.5 cm., be used.
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The advantages of such a system, they say, are not only speed and accuracy, but the fact that it obviates the need for transliteration of titles in non-roman alphabets and for rules for the transcription of the title page. It would be very easy to make union catalogs using such cards since they could be adapted easily to any system of cataloging. Much of the cataloging work could be done by persons having neither library training nor subject knowledge, although the final revision of the cards would have to be done by a professional.

Perhaps the first to describe the use of this procedure in practice was Lisabeth Polly-Bassitta, who published an article in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* the following year. Miss Polly-Bassitta, librarian of the Pädagogische Zentralbibliothek in Berlin, estimated that it would have taken four catalogers ten years, working forty-eight hours a week with no time off for vacation or any other reason, to catalog the collection of 600,000 books in her library. She visited several libraries in Berlin which were using title-page photography in cataloging, and decided that this was the only method by which she could catalog her collection in a reasonable amount of time.

Using methods that were essentially the same as those described by Raabe and Janiak, she found that she was able to catalog five times as many books as she could in the traditional way. This figure corresponds exactly with the estimate given by Raabe and Janiak. Miss Polly-Bassitta found that experienced personnel could microfilm up to 1,200 pages a day, and that by using a reduction ratio of about nine to one, a fifty-meter roll of film would accommodate 3,000 exposures. She felt that the standard catalog card is too small to accommodate a readily legible photograph unless the photograph were placed sideways on the card. This, however, is impractical because the user would have to cock his head to one side to read it. Miss Polly-Bassitta recommends the international postcard format, i.e., a card of 14.5 x 10.5 cm. With this size, the right half of the card contains the photograph of the title page, and the left half contains the bibliographical additions. The use of title-page photography is not recommended by Miss Polly-Bassitta for small libraries nor for cataloging serials or multi-volume sets, where numerous additions must be made to the catalog cards. It is most advantageous where large backlogs of uncataloged books are present.

In the following year, 1953, Walter F. Broome described two cataloging uses of microfilm in London libraries. At the Central Lending Department at Lambeth, Mr. Broome was able to make available to the public a large backlog of uncataloged books by arranging them in alphabetical order by author, preparing them for photographing by placing on the title page a slip containing the accession number, class number and pagination and date, if it did not appear on the recto of the title page, and photographing them two at a time with a Leica camera. This was done at a rate of about two hundred per hour. The books were then released to the public. This procedure was regarded as a temporary expedient to make the books available. Traditional cataloging could be
done when more staff time would be available from the projected image of the title page, with the added bibliographical information, on a microfilm reader.

A method similar to the ones in use in Germany was developed by Mr. Broome, in cooperation with the Recordak Division of Kodak, for cataloging a large collection of books in the Evangelical Library, Chilton Street. The books were first classified, and the class number was written on the recto of the title page. Accession numbers were stamped on slips which were placed on the title pages, which were then photographed at a reduction ratio of fifteen to one. After being photographed the accession number was written on the verso of the title page. About 1,600 books could be photographed in a normal working day, and 2,400 exposures could be accommodated on a hundred-foot roll of 35 mm film.

The film was enlarged and could be printed on $3 \times 5$ or $3 \times 6$ inch cards, leaving room along the top edge for typing the authors' names or subject headings. The $3 \times 5$ inch cards were preferred and were put in sheaf binders. No difficulty, however, was encountered in reading the cards of either size. No figures were given for speed of cataloging, but the cost was found to be lower than that for traditional cataloging methods. Mr. Broome estimated that the cost of producing a catalog and accession record by title-page photography for 30,000 volumes a year would be less than 10d. (approximately 11 cents) per volume, allowing £600 for salary.

In 1954 Ursula Nitzsche reported using title-page photography for making an author catalog for a backlog of 35,000 older volumes in the library of the Deutsche Akademie der Landwirtschaftswissenschaften in Berlin. She also cataloged 42,000 volumes of periodicals in the same way. Unfortunately she does not give statistics for card production or cost. A number of other German libraries are using title-page photography in cataloging, including the Hochschule für Planökonomie in Berlin-Karlshorst, the Berliner Ratsbibliothek, and the Hoch- und Landesbibliothek in Potsdam.

In 1958, Robert E. Kingery of the New York Public Library described two ways in which that library was using title-page photography. Gift books are entered into an "in process" file by making catalog cards from reduced photostatic copies of the title pages. A black strip is placed along the outer edge of the title page to provide a white area for typing the filing entry. The wording of the title page thus appears sideways on the card. This is a temporary card, which is removed when full cataloging is done. Also, the library sends reduced photostats of title pages to other libraries as exchange offers. Kingery reported that a study was being made of the possible use of such photostats to provide copy for catalogers. It was hoped that by marking the photostats, much writing down then done by catalogers could be eliminated. The results of this study do not seem to have been published as yet.

The next library in the United States to use title-page photography
was the University of Kansas. Here, Earl Farley, Head of the Preparations Department, developed a technique called “brieflisting,” which uses a combination of Recordak Microfile camera and Xerox Copyflo to produce catalog cards. Instead of using a black strip along the edge of the title page, as was done at the New York Public Library, Farley employed a white strip on which was typed, with oversize letters, the author entry. This strip also included the accession number and a legend telling the catalog user how to obtain the book. Again, the title page copy appears sideways on the card. Cards are then filed in the catalog by author only, and the books are shelved in closed stacks by accession number. When a patron requests a brieflisted book, it is rush cataloged by traditional methods before being circulated.

In 1960-61, the first year that brieflisting was used, the University of Kansas library was able to enter in the public catalog 63% more volumes than it had been able to enter in any previous year. It was felt that brieflisting was preferable to a mounting arrearage of completely unrecorded books. One drawback was that brieflisting books could not easily be reported to the National Union Catalog.

When Robert Vosper, former librarian at Kansas, became librarian at U.C.L.A., he brought brieflisting with him, and the method has been used with success there. Rudolf Engelbarts and Harry Williams have described the procedures used at U.C.L.A., which are essentially the same as those used at Kansas. The basic steps are as follows: (1) arrange books to be brieflisted in three size-groups: average, miniature, and more than ten inches high; (2) determine the author entry (take this from the title page without further checking); (3) type the author entry on an insert and place the insert behind the title page with the author entry protruding beyond the right edge of the page; (4) stamp the insert and the book with a number, which will be used as a filing number; (5) microfilm the title page with the insert at an average reduction ratio of eighteen to one (the actual reduction ratio will depend on the size of the book; books larger than 9 x 15 inches are hand brieflisted); (6) develop the film and print by Xerox Copyflo at an enlargement ratio of seven to one (cards are cut to size and punched by the company doing the Copyflo work);* (7) alphabetize the cards and file them in the main catalog.

At U.C.L.A. about one hundred books are microfilmed per hour. About 60,000 volumes have been brieflisted at an average processing cost per card of six cents. To brieflist a book takes about ten per cent of the time it does to catalog a book fully. The chief drawbacks are that it takes up catalogers’ time (about ten per cent), it requires much additional filing, and it occasions “much unexpected duplication in book copies.” Also, books with colored title pages are sometimes difficult to

* Examples of the catalog cards produced may be found in the article by Engelbarts and Williams (p. 198) and in Laura C. Colvin’s Cataloging Sampler (Hamden, Conn., Archon Books, The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1963), pp. 331-333.
photograph. Brieflisting is used only for gift books and for bulk purchases. It solves the problem of making large numbers of books accessible until such time as full cataloging can be done. When called for, briefly listed books are circulated once, then given priority for standard cataloging.

Related to title-page photography, but beyond the scope of this paper, are the use of photography to catalog non-book materials and the various methods of microcopying whole documents, including the title page, such as the Microcard, microfiche and minature printing. Mrs. C. K. Miller suggested that catalogs of music might contain thematic incipits on the catalog card. Neal Harlow suggested putting reduced facsimiles of maps, especially rare maps, on the backs of catalog cards. H. Milhollen and Alma Eggleston have described the use of reduced copies of pictures as an aid to cataloging picture collections. Still another development is the aperture card, usually a punched card with a microfilm inset. This type of card is often used for cataloging architectural and engineering drawings, though it may be used to catalog documents as well.

William T. Mason described a method for cataloging documents and technical reports which is much like brieflisting. A template on which has been typed all necessary bibliographical information is placed over the abstract of the document; both are placed in a jig and microfilmed. If the document has no abstract, an abstract is made and typed on a tab attached to the template. The film is then enlarged to 5 x 8 inch size and printed on a continuous strip printer. The strip is cut and trimmed by machine. One exposure is made for each catalog card needed.

Although title-page photography is an old idea, it is just now beginning to come into its own. It is not a panacea, but, under certain conditions, it has proved to be highly efficient. In the United States it has been used only for temporary cataloging, whereas in Europe it has been used for full, permanent cataloging. It is surprising that no American librarians have tried to use title-page photography in full cataloging. It would seem that, with a little extra effort, brieflisting could be made full listing. The biggest obstacle, of course, is the necessity of adopting a slightly larger card format. If brieflisting, which has been shown to take ten per cent of normal cataloging time, can be changed to full cataloging by the addition of only another ten per cent of time (as shown to be feasible by the experiences of German librarians), does it not seem to be worth making the necessary change in card format?

Perhaps a still better idea would be to wed title-page photography to the book catalog. There is a periodical called Current Contents which attempts to alert scientists to new articles in their field with the utmost speed. It does this by reproducing, in reduced photo-facsimile, the tables of contents of current periodicals. By using page proofs of the various scientific periodicals, Current Contents can sometimes publish the table of contents of a journal before the journal itself is published. In August of 1965 the R. R. Bowker Company began publishing two short-lived
book selection tools which were intended to do essentially the same thing, Medical Book Profiles and Sci-Tech Profiles. These published, in reduced photo-facsimile, the title page, the list of contributors, the preface, the table of contents and all indexes of current scientific and medical books. The reproductions were printed four to a page and ran continuously for as many pages as were necessary. The pages were fairly large, so that the reduction ratio posed no great problem. Finely printed prefixes and tables of contents, however, were difficult to read with the naked eye. Both of these book selection tools had computer produced author and title indexes.

The possibilities for producing a book catalog for a library along similar lines are intriguing. The library catalog is, to a certain extent, a book selection tool, and the provision of at least the tables of contents of non-fiction books would certainly improve this function of the catalog. The use of a large page would eliminate the problems of format and reduction ratio which have vexed so many librarians. One might even imagine the Library of Congress issuing single pages for binding in sheaf catalogs, or possibly offset masters for libraries to print their own catalogs. Perhaps the ideas of Blor, Stevens and Jewett will find their full fruition in the last half of the twentieth century.
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**ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES: REVISIONS**

The first revisions to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules have been approved by the A. L. A. Descriptive Cataloging Committee and the Library of Congress. The changes and additions have been made to clarify intent or to define application. These revisions have been issued in Cataloging Service, Bulletin 81, available from the Card Division, Library of Congress, Bldg. 159, Navy Yard Annex, Washington, D. C. 20541.
Logical Flow Charts and Other New Techniques for the Administration of Libraries and Information Centers

C. D. Gull, Professor
Graduate Library School
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

The widespread introduction of electronic digital computer systems for information processing has produced significant advances in management theory and practice in recent years. For example, two management devices, PERT and CPM,1 undeveloped and impractical before computers, have been basic to the success of our outer space program. It is perhaps overly in library development, but appropriate in this memorial to Miss Esther J. Piercy, to explore the application of new management knowledge and practice to the administration of libraries and information centers, and to sketch some directions in which research could be undertaken to benefit the management of information.

Librarians and information center managers are employing several devices or techniques to assist them in the operation and administration of libraries. Some of these techniques are relatively old, such as

1. organization charts
2. operating manuals (also known as staff manuals, divisional manuals, sectional manuals, etc.)
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position descriptions
personnel or job administration procedures
standardized forms;

others are relatively new and unusual in libraries, such as:
functional block diagrams
logical flow charts, or decision flow charts
decision tables, and
flow process charts.

A brief survey of the literature indicates that these techniques and devices have never been studied together to learn how they can be inter-related, nor whether they can be synthesized to provide an improved management package.

The following figures are introduced to show how the nine techniques could be integrated. The process of order-searching is used as the central example in the figures.

Fig. 1, the functional block diagram, is designed to show the relationships of the library, its operations, and its users. The process of order-searching occurs within the selection and acquisition box in this block diagram.

Fig. 2, is a hypothetical organization chart for a university library. The position of order-searcher is in the Order Division of this chart.

Fig. 3, is a logical flow chart for the process of searching monograph requests in any university library. The order-searcher should perform certain of the work on this chart, as determined by the many factors shown here and on the other figures.

Fig. 4, is a flow process chart. This type of chart is used in industrial engineering. It should be studied in conjunction with logical flow charts to learn which is more useful, whether both are needed, or if a combination is best.

Examples of text from operating manuals, job descriptions, and administrative procedures are generally available and unnecessary here.

Many of the problems of organization and of job performance are easily seen on the logical flow chart. If we assume that it is appropriate for the order-searcher to perform the activities shown in boxes 11, 22, 32, 42, and 54, and to make the decisions required in boxes 12, 23, 33, 43, and 44, who then should have the authority to approve the requests as asked in box 63? Should this approval be assigned to the order-searcher, a bibliographer, to an order-librarian, an assistant-order librarian, or the chief order librarian?

If logical flow charts are properly written, they will show all necessary actions and fundamental decisions. If these actions or decisions have been omitted from the operating manuals or the job descriptions, the logical flow chart will bring out the omissions. If the organizational positions of the actions and decisions are not clear, the logical chart will assist the librarian in choosing their placement and in selecting persons to be responsible for their performance.
Logical flow charts can be made extremely useful by adding information such as:

1. The name of the position corresponding to every action box and question box.

2. The status of each item on a flow line (for example, ART on line between boxes 63 and 73 stands for an approved request for a monograph not already in the library collection).

3. The number of items passing from one box to another box in a certain period (for example, RL 37/1965 between box 12 and box 2 means that 37 requests were returned in 1965 to requesters because the books requested were already in the library).

4. The average time per item required to complete an action or make a decision (14 min./request in box 22).

5. The equipment required. (A typewriter for box 91).

Some of the problems of organization, responsibility and job performance are not so easily seen on a logical flow chart, especially rearrangements designed to achieve optimal performance of library operations and services. The objective of optimal design can be expected to require applied research efforts, and gaps in the knowledge acquired through applied research can be used to suggest basic research programs.

The objective of this research is to learn if the techniques and kinds of data previously listed can be integrated and manipulated by manual or electronic methods to provide a framework against which the problems of attaining optimum organization of individual libraries can be solved.

While the actual steps in research must be developed during each research effort, the type of effort can be suggested here. For example, humanly produced flow charts are susceptible to errors which may not be found until experience shows up the errors during actual operations. An attempt can be made to develop a technique for checking the accuracy of humanly produced flow charts by computer methods. Let us assume that such checking can be done successfully with a computer, since programs already exist for the production of flow charts from input data.

Humans are readily able to vary the sequence of operations and the wording of actions and questions in constructing flow charts. They are, however, too easily lost in perceiving the effects of introducing this variety, and they tire easily if required to write down several different flows for comparison. It should be possible to program a computer to accept one or more changes, from humans or automatically, and print out the results as new flow charts or tables.

By introducing real or supposed quantities into the computer formulas and outputs, and solving for successive answers, it should be possible to obtain a computer produced flow chart which will provide reasonably optimum operations for a given library and its individual characteristics. This result is the objective of the research.

Even if the first research investigation is limited to a few departments,
such as technical processes, reference services, and circulation, there is such a variety of operations and such an extraordinary diversity of materials, records, and user requirements flowing through them, that it will be all too easy to create a model which will tax the capacities of very large computing systems. Considerable care must be taken to confine the model to significant decisions and operations.

At some point in conducting the research, it should be possible to achieve a reasonably complete one-to-one relationship among the organization charts, functional block diagrams, logical flow charts, operating manuals, job descriptions and job administration procedures; and then to report on the work. It should be possible to write the report to be applicable to both manual and electronic situations in libraries. Even limited research would encompass a sufficient number of functions, individual operations, and individual jobs to illustrate the applications in the principal areas of libraries.

Although examples of block diagrams and logical flow charts are extremely numerous in management literature and computer programming documentation, and are growing more common in the literature of librarianship and documentation, there are almost no examples of good directions for making block diagrams and logical flow charts. The following directions, used in my classes recently, are offered to fill this lack.

The Preparation of Block Diagrams

A block diagram is a graphic representation of groups of operations, processes, personnel, equipment, products, etc., which collectively are a system. It provides an overview of the system at the gross or macro level. It should be prepared in a clear uncomplicated format to show the whole system at a glance.

The primary objective of a block diagram is to indicate the paths along which information, control signals, materials, etc., flow among the parts of the system, although the exact relationships and specific flow directions need not be shown in full.

The preparation of a block diagram is an art, not a technology. The preparer selects the important operations, processes, personnel, equipment, information, control paths, products, etc., to put in the diagram. He selects the enclosure symbols or boxes from available templates, and artfully writes the labels for the boxes. Pictures, drawings, and cartoons can be substituted for the boxes. Connecting lines and arrows can be added to reflect the relationships among boxes and any of these can be widened, blackened or colored to emphasize relative importance.

The preparer can construct a block diagram from a written description of a system or from data gathered in systems analysis work, or he can create one from systems design work or from information in his head.

A handy technique for constructing a block diagram from a written text is to number every page and every line of every page. Read the text rapidly and write out appropriate boxes, etc., showing the page and line
numbers for each box. Use one small slip of paper for one box. Select only the most general and most important things in this reading.

Arrange the loose slips on a large surface to obtain a preliminary picture of the block diagram. Reflect on the wording, arrangement and relationships. Combine boxes where possible. Refer again to the written text to clarify understanding and to fill in significant gaps.

Affix the slips temporarily to a sheet of paper with rubber cement. Draw lines and arrows to show flows and relationships. Describe this draft to yourself or another person, and improve it further. Copy the improved draft, and add a descriptive caption, your name and date.

The Preparation of Logical Flow Charts

A logical flow chart, also called a decision flow chart, is a graphic representation of the flow of information, control signals and materials within a system. Such a chart is considerably more detailed than a block diagram, but less detailed than a computer program. Logical flow charts are based on two-value (or yes-no) logic which is basic to digital computer systems and to the representation of decisions in computer systems. Exact relationships and specific flow directions must be shown. These charts are particularly useful guides for writing computer programs, which must include instructions for literally every operation performed by the computer.

The preparation of a logical flow diagram is an art, not a technology, although there are a few rules to be followed. The preparer selects the important operations, processes, personnel, equipment, information, control signals, products, etc., to put in the diagram. He selects the enclosure symbols or boxes from available templates and writes the questions and actions within them. He adds connecting flow lines and arrows to show flows and relationships, and widens, blackens, or colors them to emphasize relative importance. The preparer selects the order of operations and organizes the placement of boxes to facilitate the users' understanding of the chart. The clarity of the chart is in direct proportion to the artistry of the preparer.

Flow charting symbols and meanings have been standardized since 1965 through the work of committee X3.5 of the United States Standards Institute. These standards have been published and most of the symbols are available in templates from the major computer manufacturers. The symbols used in this article are derived from these standards, with some modifications and additions.

Logical flow charting is an extremely effective graphical method to provide clear descriptions of information systems already in operation. This method is also very effective as a problem-solving technique in the design of new or improved information handling systems.

Logical flow charts reveal what decisions must be made, where or when they must be made, and what effects result from decisions.

Logical flow charts have this cyclic pattern: STATUS—DECISION—ACTION—STATUS—DECISION—ACTION . . . etc.
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Logical Flow Chart Symbols

Decision points are expressed as *question* or decision boxes in flow charts. While the diamond shape is standard, the large modified oval provides more space for text:

![Diagram of question box and question or decision box]

Once a decision is made, an action must be accomplished to implement the decision. Rectangles are used for *action* or process boxes in flow charts:

![Diagram of action box]

Explanations may be required to state what material is being processed, the condition of the material, etc. *Explanations* may be enclosed in irregular hexagonal boxes:

![Diagram of explanation box]

Since it is not possible to maintain a continuous flow of materials through an information system, delays can be represented within a *hold* box in a small modified oval shape:

![Diagram of hold box]

This symbol can be used also to represent other conditions, such as:

- **START**
- **STOP**
- **INTERRUPT**

Lines are used to show flow. Flow is in one direction only, as shown by arrows:

![Diagram of flow line]
Two small circles can be used as onpage connectors for a flow line broken by the format of a chart.

ONPAGE CONNECTORS

Since it is not possible or convenient to place all boxes for one information system on a single sheet, offpage reference symbols for IN and OUT are required.

OFFPAGE CONNECTORS

The basic symbol for input-output is the parallelogram.

SPECIALIZED INPUT-OUTPUT SYMBOLS

Rules for Making Logical Flow Charts

A. Question Boxes

A question box may contain only one question, and only two answers are permitted, Yes and No. Although several inbound lines are permitted, the preparer is restricted to using two outbound lines from one question box.
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If three answers are required, two question boxes must be used:

Always label the outbound lines with Yes or No.

All outbound lines must be connected to an action box; i.e., no loose ends are permitted on flow lines.

It is desirable to write a question in the form: Verb—Object—Question Mark. Modifiers can be inserted if needed. The subject noun is usually implied by the kind of chart, e.g. CLERK Stamp Accession Number?

B. Action Boxes.

Write directions in action boxes in this form:
Imperative verb—Object. Modifiers can be added if needed.

Several actions can be placed in one box if they all result from the decision taken in the previous question box, and if they do not require decisions of their own.

C. Identification of Boxes.

Identify all boxes. While numbers are simplest, a coordinate grid system is useful for large charts; i.e., letters on the horizontal axis and numbers on the vertical axis, with each box identified by the intersection of two axes.
D. Reference Boxes.

For onpage connectors, the OUT box contains the number of the box referred to, and the IN box contains the number from which reference was made.

The OUT box must contain the number of the box to which its line is to be connected:

The IN box must contain the number of the box from which the inbound line comes:

E. Direction of Flow.

Flow is only in one direction, and must be shown by arrows. While the customary direction on the page is left to right and top to bottom, other directions may be used for enhancing clarity.

F. Iterative Loops.

Loops are frequently required to show processes which are repetitive in nature:
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Loops may be connected forward or backward.

Beware of creating a loop in which the material never satisfies a question. The Yes answer must be possible to permit the material to leave the loop!

G. Identification of Materials

Identify the materials which proceed along flow lines with letters and other symbols, e.g., C for Catalog Cards, S for Slips. Show this identification for everything on every flow line. A negative status is shown by placing...
ing a bar over the symbol, e.g., RĀ can mean a purchase recommendation not approved by the order librarian.

\[ \text{C} \quad \text{S} \]

Yes

\[ \text{Overprint Call Numbers} \]

No

Show the meaning of the letters in a legend box.

Flow charts can be made more informative by adding quantities per unit of time, time to accomplish an operation, etc., along flow lines and in the various boxes.

**Hints on Making Flow Charts.**

It is often desirable to construct flow charts by writing each individual box, its text and connecting lines, on a 3 x 5" or 2 x 3" slip in whatever outline form is required and with whatever text is necessary. The slips can be fastened to a window, sheet of paper, the wall, etc., by means of Scotch masking tape or plastic cements which will peel off easily. This removability is particularly desirable for preliminary work in which errors are frequent, because the good slips can be removed and replaced in another position with the lines being connected up anew to show the changes, while the incorrect slips are destroyed and replaced by new, correct slips.

There is another technique for improving the arrangement of an unsatisfactory flow chart, or portion of a flow chart, on which the boxes are already numbered or identified on a grid. Establish the number of vertical columns and horizontal rows you have available in the new space for the work you are undertaking. Then label the columns with letters and the rows with numbers. On the new space work out a satisfactory arrangement by placing only the old box numbers in the new positions, as required. For example, temporarily put box no. 34 in column B and row 2. Put the corresponding grid number on the box of the unsatisfactory chart. Show the connecting lines on the new chart. Each box in the old and new charts then has a double number, here 34 and B2, and the transfer of slips can be made from old to new when the new format is satisfactory.

It is often useful to photocopy a chart in process, with date and number showing its sequence in development. If two photocopies are made, one copy can be cut up for transfer to improved drafts.

**Problems Encountered in Preparing Logical Flow Charts**

Since logical flow charts are often prepared from block diagrams, from
descriptive text, or from systems analysis data, there are often failures to transfer the operations from the sources to the draft flow chart. Such failures can be reduced by adopting a method of checking of the information on the sources to make certain each item is transferred.

The use of imprecise, misleading and confusing terminology in the boxes is another type of problem, perhaps indicating that the charter does not understand the operations, and at least meaning that the reader of the chart is hindered in comprehending the operations. The asking of the wrong kind of question, or the poor definition of the contents of a file are examples here.

The symbols used to identify materials and to show status are often omitted from flow lines. These omissions can result in serious and ludicrous errors. Without these symbols, it is all too easy to combine several classes of materials on one line and to process them alike, when at least one class is to be treated differently from the others; or to direct an action upon a class which never reaches the place where the action should occur.

It is easy to leave a flow line unfinished. While open-ended lines can be mistakenly omitted anywhere on a chart, they are most commonly found after a question box, where they are very serious, often leading to the omission of significant suboperations.

It is easy to direct an action that requires a significant decision and fail to put the question box ahead of the action. This situation is equivalent to leaving one flow line open after a question box.

Any failure to make outbound and inbound connections with proper grid symbols, and to check to see that both parts of a pair of boxes are filled out properly, results in an open flow line.

The loops required to perform necessary operations are sometimes omitted or they are connected improperly, forward or backward, with the result that the material no longer fits the chart as it is moved from box to box.

The following references are helpful:


REFERENCES
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Figure 1
Functional Block Diagram—A Library, Technical Information Center, or Storage and Retrieval System
Figure 3
Logical Flow Chart
Searching Monograph Requests in any University Library

Legend
A = Approved for Order
E = Entry Verified
L = In Library
N = Not in Library
LC = Library of Congress card order
R = Requests to order books
S = Order Slips
W = Wilson card order
Figure 3 (Continued)

NOTE:
CHART D = PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN SEARCHING DIFFICULT PROBLEMS.
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By asking key questions about each step...

Figure 4. Flow Process Chart
...these results were achieved:

Figure 4. Flow Process Chart (Continued)
The Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification is awarded in 1967 to C. Sumner Spalding who has accomplished a project of massive proportions in the completion of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, distinguishing himself as he has throughout his career by intelligent resourcefulness in analyzing problems, diplomacy in harmonizing disparate elements, and diligence in striving for the highest quality.

IN THE FOREGOING STATEMENT accompanying the award of the Margaret Mann Citation to Sumner Spalding, the Award Committee has effectively described the particular accomplishment for which he is honored and succinctly characterized the personal qualities which he has brought to bear on this and his other distinguished professional accomplishments.

An account of Sumner Spalding's career in the profession can properly begin with his appointment as a cataloger in the Music Division of the Library of Congress in November 1940. In June of that year he had received the B.L.S. from the Columbia University School of Library
Service. One can speculate that during part of the intervening period Library officers were satisfying themselves on the soundness of his qualifications: degrees in music from Harvard (A.B. magna cum laude 1933; A.M. 1934), experience as a music arranger in New York, and service as a library assistant at Cooper Union before and during the period of his study at Columbia.

Early in 1942 Sumner Spalding began four years of service as librarian and band leader in the United States Army, then returned to the Library of Congress in 1946 as a music cataloger in the Descriptive Cataloging Division. His high potential for broader responsibilities was recognized in 1949 when the Library nominated him for an extensive Civil Service Commission administrative intern program. Soon afterward Sumner Spalding became in rapid succession Assistant Chief and Chief, Catalog Maintenance Division, 1950-54; Chief, Serial Record Division, 1954-56; and Chief, Descriptive Cataloging Division, 1956-62, 1966-

It is the missing years, 1962-66, in the foregoing chronology that must engage our principal attention, the years of Sumner Spalding’s editorship of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. His relation to the code revision enterprise began, to be sure, much earlier; for, under an agreement of 1954 between the Division of Cataloging and Classification and the Library of Congress, the Chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division was, by virtue of the office, made a member of the Steering Committee of the Catalog Code Revision Committee. Joining the Steering Committee at the same time that Seymour Lubetzky became the first editor of the revised code, Sumner Spalding served as a member from 1956 to 1962. In this capacity, he drew on his extensive knowledge and experience as a cataloger and administrator to make uniquely valuable contributions to the frequent meetings of the Steering Committee and the semi-annual two-day sessions of the full code revision committee. He took part in the Cataloging and Classification Section’s catalog code revision institutes held at Stanford University in July 1958 and at McGill University in June 1960, presenting at the latter a summary of the working paper written jointly with the late Olivia Faulkner, Principal Cataloger of the Descriptive Cataloging Division, “Experiment in the Application of the Revised Rules.”

These activities made it natural that he should be on the United States delegation to the International Conference on Cataloging Principles convened in Paris by the International Federation of Library Associations in October 1961. Returning through London, he and other members of the delegation met with the Cataloging Rules Subcommittee of the Library Association, and so materially advanced the agreed aim of ALA and LA to achieve again, as in 1908, an Anglo-American code. A happy sequel to these meetings was the initiation of a series of visits to ALA midwinter and annual conferences by Noel Sharp, chairman, and other members of the LA Subcommittee. The associations formed on these occasions, both in and outside the formal committee sessions, brought Sumner Spalding in closer and closer rapport with the persons.
responsible for code revision in Great Britain and made him fully acquainted with their progress and their problems.

In the spring of 1962 when Seymour Lubetzky was obliged to relinquish the editorship of the new code, the other members of the Code Revision Steering Committee can hardly have hesitated about recommending Sumner Spalding to the full committee as his successor. This recommendation was readily approved at the Miami Beach ALA Conference. After arranging for leave of absence from the Library of Congress, Sumner Spalding became editor of the code on September 4, 1962, and at that time resigned the membership on the ALA Council to which he had been elected in 1960.

With characteristic vigor and enthusiasm Sumner Spalding embarked on the "project of massive proportions." He went off to a study room. He became inaccessible to his LC colleagues except as code studies required. At one period he even took a room nearer the Library than his home so that he could spend every week-day evening on the project. He took no vacations. One by one the chapters of the rules for entry and heading were prepared for the Steering Committee, considered at its special meetings and by the full committee at ALA midwinter and annual meetings. In May 1964 he went to London for a meeting organized by the Library Association's Cataloging Rules Subcommittee to consider and reconcile differences in the United States and British drafts.

Finally, the basic draft was completed and approved and in February 1966 Sumner Spalding was able to return to his LC position. But the chores of ensuring an integrated manuscript and seeing it through the press still remained. Characteristically, he left nothing to chance, concerning himself with every detail of the production from index to type style so that the format of the published volume would be both attractive and practical.

Thus, although numerous members of the cataloging fraternity in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, collaborated on the new rules, they bear the distinctive impress of Sumner Spalding's clear mind, comprehensive knowledge, and unflagging energy.

Among Sumner Spalding's many friends in the profession, members of the Catalog Code Revision Committee particularly have had many occasions in recent years to become familiar with those personal qualities which long ago won the admiration and affection of his colleagues at the Library of Congress: in discussion and debate, a keen and orderly mind that perceives essential issues and is not diverted from them; ability to present his views clearly, with full respect for those of others, never descending to trivial or personal argumentation. To serious involvement with the task at hand he adds a lively wit that brings pleasure to his collaborators.

In the award of the Margaret Mann Citation to Sumner Spalding the great body of members of the profession surely have in common a feeling of gratification that the honor has come to one who has served them long and well.
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Cooperative Research Facilities: One More Possibility

Michael H. Harris
Bloomington, Indiana

In a past issue of Library Journal, Walter Brahm voiced his concern over the information explosion "which threatens to swamp libraries." His venturesome remedy (possibly Mr. Brahm drew added courage from the knowledge that it was his last time "on the grindstone") is to make more use of the "town dump" now and in times to come. To weed and dispose of "the greater part of what has been, is now and in the future will be produced."

This challenge hurled so courageously to the winds will find few takers among college and university librarians, for today their status, locally and nationally, depends to a great degree upon the size of their collections. And yet most of us will concede Mr. Brahm's point: that a good deal of what is published today is of little value. Just as certainly, Mr. Brahm would undoubtedly agree, these materials need to be preserved, but not by countless libraries across the land.

This problem of the duplication of research materials is an old one and its evils have been treated oft times in the pages of our professional literature. And yet the problem is particularly pressing today, especially in regard to a certain group of American college and university libraries.

These libraries are of two general types: (1) libraries in new institutions of higher learning; and (2) libraries in older colleges and universities which have holdings of between 50,000 and 500,000 volumes. In the latter group there are literally hundreds of libraries whose parent institutions once were very small, but now due to the ever-increasing pressure for higher education are experiencing spectacular growths in enrollment. The libraries in institutions of this type are scrambling desperately to build up their undergraduate collections, while at the same time spending large sums of money for research materials to support graduate and faculty research in almost every field.

Special Problems

The collection building problems faced by libraries of the two types defined above are basically the same. They are:

(1) Existent collections are small and constitute a minimum of research materials to support the graduate and faculty research programs now mushrooming in every institution.
Even the healthy book budgets which these institutions now enjoy will not enable them to build the large research collections needed.

These larger book budgets, although not adequate to build strong research collections, are large enough to force the library quickly into new building programs.

This crush of printed matter comes just at the time when most libraries need every spare foot of space for seating even a small percentage of their student population.

This influx of materials and students creates an ever-increasing demand on the already understaffed technical and public services divisions of the library, with the effect of weakening both areas of service.

And finally, in libraries of the type mentioned above we find a special phenomenon present. It is that the faculties of these institutions are made up of two rather distinct groups: the first are the rising young scholars, in ever-more specialized fields, who are eager (and that is an understatement) to build collections in their special fields of interest and take great pains to do so. These same young scholars are usually not long for the institutions in which they get their start, and in most cases they leave highly specialized and often unused collections in their wake. The second group is that of the long-established faculty member who in most cases is relatively happy with what the library has, and is not too concerned with collection building. The overzealousness of the one group and the indifference of the other leads to lopsided collection building that is exceedingly hard to combat.

An Attempt at a Solution

In trying to formulate a solution to the collection building problems of the libraries mentioned above, which from now on will be called "cooperating libraries," let us take another look at the problem of library cooperation. However, this time instead of approaching it from the usual point of view—that which is based on the cooperative division of subject areas—we will consider it in terms of a rather different concept.

The idea here would be to select across the country a number of large, well-located, preferably state-supported research libraries, each to serve as "central libraries" for a group of our "cooperating libraries." In general, the system would be outlined as follows:

1. All of the "cooperating libraries" would stop (or simply not begin) their attempts at building large research collections. They would instead buy only those books which the faculty and library staff felt were necessary to support their undergraduate programs.

2. The "cooperating libraries" would then support faculty and graduate research by borrowing the needed materials from their cooperating "central library." This would be done on the following basis:

(a) Each "cooperating library" would establish a twice-weekly panel truck service to and from the "central library" to borrow needed research materials. This would assume, of course, that a special loan center would be set up at the "central library" to process the orders from "cooperating libraries." This center would be financed by the "cooperating libraries."
(b) Each “cooperating library” would contribute a small amount of its book budget to the book budget of the “central library.”

Benefits Derived from the Implementation of a Central Library System

To the Cooperating Libraries:

First and foremost, the “cooperating libraries” would have quick and easy access to far larger research collections than they could ever hope to amass on their own.

Secondly, those funds not spent in acquiring expensive research materials could be diverted to other library services. Among these would be:

1. Contributions to the central library’s inter-library loan program, i.e. the cost of extra professional and clerical help, transportation, etc.
2. Work on special bibliographic projects such as subject bibliographies and union catalogs.
3. Increased public service programs to better serve faculty and students, i.e. extensive orientation programs, increased reference services.
4. Strengthening the reference collections.
5. Developing strong undergraduate collections.

A third advantage is that a decrease in acquisition rates would mean fewer expensive building projects. At the same time it would allow libraries to devote more space to seating and study facilities.

A fourth advantage would be felt in the technical service departments of the “cooperating libraries.” Everyone is aware that it costs considerably more to select, locate, acquire, process, catalog, and store research materials as compared with those materials needed for the undergraduate collections. Fewer books purchased and the ease in which they could be handled from beginning to end would greatly reduce pressures on understaffed acquisition and cataloging departments.

And finally the possibility of a zealous faculty member spending large sums of money on highly specialized and relatively unused research collections would be minimized.

To the Central Libraries:

First, they would receive funds to support the increased inter-library loan facilities. Next, they would get money from each “cooperating library” which would supplement the central library’s book budget. And finally, the inception of such systems would greatly decrease the competition for, and thus the expense of, acquiring research materials.

Conclusion

The “cooperating libraries” will not, foreseeably be able to cut their budgets. The idea is not intended to save large sums of money for the state, at the expense of individual universities, but instead to allow for the establishment of a system that would make for better use of present
THREE SAMPLE SYSTEMS

Illinois
1. Northern Illinois University, DeKalb.
2. University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
3. Illinois State University, Normal
4. Western Illinois University, Macomb
5. Eastern Illinois University, Charleston
6. University of Illinois, Champaign

Michigan
1. Michigan Technological University, Houghton
2. Northern Michigan University, Marquette
3. Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant
4. Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo
5. Oakland University, Rochester
6. Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti
X. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Florida
1. New State University at Pensacola
2. Florida A&M, Tallahassee
3. Proposed state university at Jacksonville
4. University of South Florida, Tampa
5. Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton
6. Proposed state university at Miami
X. University of Florida, Gainesville
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funds, while at the same time greatly enhancing the opportunities of student and researcher alike.

The system outlined above is certainly not in line with traditional library thinking on the subject. However, anyone taking a realistic look at the problems involved with the current inter-library loan system will recognize the need for a change. This, coupled with the intense competition for research materials, their great expense, and the insufficient budgets that most of our academic libraries possess, suggests that we must consider a drastic departure from conventional programs.

Finally, I have endeavored to keep my treatment of this subject brief, for it seemed of more importance to avoid a lengthy and detailed essay in hopes of generating thinking on the part of the reader which would be unencumbered by a rigid systematization. At the same time it seems to me that the essential question is not that of the details involved—they can be worked out—but rather of the acceptance or rejection of the general principles defined in the preceeding pages. The academic libraries of this country are at a critical juncture in their developmental history; and now, more than ever before, it is vital for us to take a fresh look at our present and future collection building plans.

Note: The three maps accompanying the text illustrate possible cooperative systems for the states of Illinois, Michigan, and Florida. In these projected systems are included only state universities with libraries that hold fewer than 500,000 volumes. The libraries of universities such as Southern Illinois, Michigan State, and Florida State are large research facilities in their own right and do not fit the qualifications of our “cooperating libraries.” The inclusion of private university libraries in the above systems would greatly enlarge the number of “cooperating libraries”; however, it is my contention that the systems could work well if only state universities were to join. It will be seen that some states offer more difficult problems in regard to a shuttle service than do others. For instance, a car traveling from Michigan Tech to the University of Michigan would find it necessary to break the trip into two days, while delivery service in Illinois could be made from all points in one day. It should also be noted that a few states (such as North and South Dakota or Alaska) have no large research library upon which smaller state university libraries could depend.

REFERENCES

2. Ibid.

4. For examples of the first we might cite the new universities recently opened, or planned for the near future, in Florida, California, and Wisconsin. Examples of the latter can be found in every state, but special reference might be made to those in Illinois (Northern Illinois University: 5,125 students in 1959/60 to 11,956 in 1963/64; Illinois State University: 3,794 in 1959/60 to 7,110 in 1963/64) and Michigan (Western Michigan: 7,117 students in 1959/60 to 13,556 in 1963/64; Eastern Michigan: 4,070 in 1959/60 to 9,231 in 1963/64).

5. J. Periam Danton states that any university which cannot support the bulk of its faculty and graduate research from its own library “has no business pretending to be a research institution in the field.” This is well and good, but many of us find that our institutions are entering fields of research in which the library has only the barest materials and that Danton’s statement does little to impede the university presidents, deans, and faculty members bent on establishing graduate programs. (Danton, J. Periam. Book Selection and Collections: A Comparison of German and American University Libraries. New York, Columbia University Press, 1969. p. 129.) For evidence of the problem, see Downs’ assessment of the substandard state of the book collections of two-thirds of the current (1964) doctoral granting institutions. (Downs, Robert B. “Doctoral Programs and Library Resources,” College and Research Libraries, 27:129, 1966.)

6. A standard reply to this problem is to have the library staff fill in the gaps. However, the truth of the matter is that few librarians, despite much insistence to the contrary, are able to do in-depth collection building in special subject areas. On the one hand we are much too busy and on the other we simply do not know enough about anything other than library science. The Germans have demonstrated what subject-specialist librarians (Referenten) can do, but if we demanded such standards (all hold the doctorate in a subject field, have had two years of library education, and have passed a state examination) almost none of our present librarians would be able to qualify. For a description of the German system, see Danton, op. cit., pp. 35-43.

7. My idea, as in the case with most “new” thoughts, is only an adaptation of another. Dr. Ernest Cadman Colwell came close to it in his article, “Cooperation or Suffocation,” College and Research Libraries, 10:195-98, 207. 1949. And Donald Coney touched on the idea in the final sentence of his article when he said: “It seems apparent that one of the principal lines of development in the field of cooperation in the future will be the appropriation of substantial sums of money explicitly to the purpose of cooperation as a substitute for local acquisition.” (Coney, Donald. “The Potentialsities; Some Notes in Conclusion,” Library Trends, 6:385, 1958.)

8. Ideally there would be one “central library” per state. One of the road-blocks to any regional cooperative system is that one state is reluctant to contribute money to the regional library which happens to be located in another. At the same time, this system seems workable if only state institutions were to join. However, private institutions would be welcome if they were willing to contribute to the system and accept its principles.

9. Two highly respected librarians have given us some help in trying to establish just how large an undergraduate collection should be. (Clapp, Verner W. and Jordan, Robert T. “Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections,” College and Research Libraries, 26:374. 1955.) In regard to the system outlined in the present paper, I would suggest that “cooperating libraries” continue their efforts to assemble good periodical collections.

10. We are all aware that a great percentage of any research library’s collection circulates very rarely, if at all. Richard W. Truewell has done some admirable research towards establishing just what percentage of a large collection will circulate and how to establish which books they will be. He foresees that “it may be possible,” by using his formula, “to define quantitatively a core collection of well
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under 50 per cent of the present holdings that will satisfy over 90 per cent of user circulation requirements." Such a formula could greatly aid our "cooperating libraries" with their acquisition programs. (Trueswell, Richard W. "Two Characteristics of Circulation and Their Effect on the Implementation of Mechanized Circulation Control Systems," College and Research Libraries, 25:285-91, 1964.) The research done by Trueswell and others (notably Fussler and Simon) reinforces my belief that great research libraries (such as our "central libraries") could easily support the faculty and graduate research of our "cooperating libraries" without imposing a hardship on their own resident scholars. Gordon R. Williams presents a good discussion of the studies dealing with infrequently-used materials in his paper, "Library Cooperation—Key to Greater Resources," Special Libraries, 61:566-68, 1965.

11. It is interesting to note that a sizable amount would be saved simply by not having to pay postage and the expense of careful wrapping for materials. At Northern Illinois University, we spend an average of $260 per 1000 loans for postage; the same amount per 1000 loans could be saved if materials did not have to be carefully wrapped, as would be the case if a truck were delivering the materials directly to the library. The loan requests could also be delivered by the truck service; however, there could be further sophistication with the implementation of a teletype network within each system for the communication of inter-library loan information. This possibility and other matters such as the costs involved in the truck delivery of materials are treated in: Oehlerts, David E. A Study to Determine the Feasibility of Establishing a Cooperative Technical Processing Program and Direct Transmission of Interlibrary Loans. Denver, Association of State Institutions of Higher Education in Colorado, 1962. pp. 27-30.

12. It seems to make a good deal more sense simply not to buy the materials (if they are available in a system such as the one here described) than to buy them, move them about constantly, and then be forced to place them in costly storage facilities where it is as difficult to get at them as it would be to borrow them from a "central library."

EDITORIAL NOTE

A word of apology is due three of the authors whose articles appear in this issue. Laura C. Colvin and Michael H. Harris have patiently suffered the rescheduling of their papers for almost a year. Both articles had been accepted for publication by our late Editor, Esther J. Piercy, but, because of space problems, could not appear earlier. The paper by C. D. Gull was originally intended for the "Piercy Memorial" (LRTS, Summer and Fall, 1967). Once again space limitations prevented its earlier inclusion. Two additional articles, written for the "Memorial" by Ira W. Harris and by Doralyn J. Hickey, will hopefully find their places in the Spring 1968 issue of LRTS.
IN THIS PAPER I intend to explore three aspects of manpower utilization as it applies to technical services work. First, to summarize the results of a recent survey which, in part, dealt with the question of librarians' efforts to improve manpower utilization. Second, to examine briefly the role of automation and how it is likely to effect the current personnel shortage. And, finally, to suggest what seems to me the most promising short-run solution if we are to alleviate the present problem.

To review briefly, in 1964, RTSD established the ad hoc Coordinating Routines Survey Committee. The committee's primary objective was to gather data on what librarians had done in the last ten years to improve cooperation and coordination of operations among technical processing operating units, and between technical processing and public service operation units. The survey was a follow-up study to a study first conducted by the Division of Cataloging and Classification in 1955. In the original survey, a questionnaire was distributed to approximately 100 research libraries. The intention was to gather information concerning policies governing technical services operations and the ways in which these policies were implemented. The 1955 survey produced a mine of useful information.

In 1964, the Executive Board of RTSD decided the time had come to conduct a similar survey. Since the original survey had been conducted, the pressures on technical processing units have grown enormously. This, it seemed to the Board, was a compelling reason for initiating a follow-up survey. It may seem incredible, but in ten short years, the funds available for the purchase of books, serials, and for binding in academic libraries alone have increased almost fourteen-fold from $25,500,000 in 1956 to almost $348,000,000 in 1965-66.

The 1965 survey questionnaires were distributed to eighty research libraries of which 63 to 79 percent supplied usable data. I must stress

---

4 Resources Technical Services Division. Policies and Programs Designed to Improve Cooperation and Coordination among Technical Service Operating Units (Champaign-Urbana, University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science, Occasional Papers, no. 86, August, 1967).
that the survey concentrated more on identifying trends than on collecting and tabulating statistical data. This was not done through choice but through necessity. Standardized definitions even for some of the most commonly used terms are still lacking. For example, “order” and “acquisitions” are frequently used synonymously, but they do not always convey identical meanings. The term “preparations” is used by some to encompass all activities normally assigned to cataloging and related processing activities; others use the term in a more restrictive sense to denote the mechanical processes of labeling spines, pasting date slips, and gluing book pockets. The list of other examples that could be cited is depressingly long.

The questionnaire asked librarians to report what they had done to improve the effectiveness of manpower utilization. The question elicited a variety of responses. First, there were programs intended to improve effectiveness by sharing of personnel between administrative units, either acquisitions and cataloging or technical processing with public services. For the most part, these activities involved sharing of persons possessing special language skills, subject specializations or both. Naturally, such languages as Russian, Arabic, and Chinese were the most frequently cited. These programs limited to professional personnel frequently included non-professional staff and students as well. However, the questionnaire had intended specifically to extract information on programs aimed at extending or expanding the use of non-professionals in technical processing work. The responses revealed a general concern among most research librarians; attention was focused on four areas in particular.

In acquisitions work, twenty-three librarians reported that bibliographic searching was now performed by non-professional personnel. Four of the respondents noted that non-professionals were assigned to acquisitions departments and were used to perform some pre-cataloging searching (rest assured that “pre-cataloging” can convey a variety of meanings); a number of respondents noted that students were used to search materials in exotic languages. On the other hand, two libraries noted that only some searching had been turned over to non-professional workers. Apparently, in these libraries, professional librarians are still expected to gather pre-order bibliographic data.

Eight librarians reported that binding preparation procedures had been turned over to non-professionals; but here again, one library pointed out that a professional had been assigned to binding preparation work for the first time.

As one might expect, use of non-professionals to catalog when Library of Congress copy is available was cited most frequently as a conservation measure. Thirty-five respondents indicated that non-professionals were now cataloging books when accompanied by LC copy. A number of librarians also stressed that non-professionals were also performing other work related to cataloging. Among these activities cited were: (a) descriptive cataloging of materials written in difficult
languages (3); (b) processing of added copies and added editions (3); (c) cataloging of fiction (2); (d) shelf-listing (3); and (e) processing of Microcards (1).

Filing of cards in the public catalog was also frequently cited. Twenty-two libraries noted that this work had been turned over to non-professionals. On the question of revision, twelve of the twenty-two stated that clerical personnel were performing all revision, four stated that professionals were revising, and, in one case, the work was divided between professional and clerical staff. Finally, one respondent reported that revision was no longer performed, and this library went on to add that after a trial period, no increase in filing error rates could be detected.

The survey demonstrated—and I believe this to be significant—that librarians are actively seeking ways to conserve professional manpower. However, it was not possible from the survey responses to measure the effectiveness of the conservation programs cited. For example, it would be interesting to know what new duties were assigned to those librarians who were relieved from clerical tasks. This data would yield clearer insights as to the progress that has been made actually to improve manpower utilization in technical services.

The Role of Automation

The survey did not intend to explore in detail the use of data processing equipment in technical services operations, but one question did ask librarians to describe their automation and mechanization activities. It was interesting to note that the projects reported ran the gamut from bookkeeping, ordering, serials, and circulation to more ambitious undertakings labeled, generically, "automating technical services." In all, forty-two libraries of the sixty-three respondents indicated automation activity, but the vast majority of the projects were still in the planning stage. The results seemed to support the conclusion that there was still more smoke than fire where automation was concerned. This conclusion, though probably no longer completely valid because a great deal has happened in the last eighteen months, is by no means invalid. The current status of library automation was cogently summarized recently by Harrison Bryan, a visiting Australian librarian, who related his impressions after visiting some of this country's more widely publicized projects. Still more smoke than fire. Although literature abounds with articles promising the millenium, I believe that the honeymoon flush with automation has passed and, personally, I cannot think of a healthier development.

Developments in library automation during the last ten years, in my opinion, are analogous to one of China's first Great Leaps Forward. At that time one of China's most pressing problems, if she were to develop an industrial potential to rival those of the United States and
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Russia, was to increase her steel producing capacity. One solution hastily adopted was to build blast furnaces in backyards. Although the Chinese achieved considerable propaganda mileage from the program, the Chinese leaders apparently neglected to check the quality of the steel that could be produced by these backyard burners. The metal proved totally worthless, so it was not surprising that the backyard furnaces quickly faded into oblivion. The zealots forgot that Confucius said: “Garbage in, garbage out.” Although as a profession it may be true that we have been overly conservative in our approach to automation, it is equally true that a few zealots who shouted “Come on in, the water's fine,” before they had developed operational systems, equally impeded progress. Library automation, I believe has now passed through this formative stage; moreover, we are already reaping the benefits from solid research and engineering.

What impact will the computer have in solving the current manpower problem? I suspect the computer, at least initially, is not going to solve our manpower shortage. On the contrary, it is more likely to aggravate the situation. Even now we do not have a sufficient number of personnel able to perform detailed, analytical systems studies. Too often, a machine has been blamed for a failure when the real culprit was a faulty designed system. Librarians regrettably have been slow to adopt standardized work methods; that is, we have traditionally given priority to systems that are capable of handling all exceptions; (which automatically are cumbersome and expensive), in addition, we have placed undue importance on producing customized local products. Consequently, we have failed to reap the advantages of standardization. Further, we have not graduated enough librarians who are, at least, conversant with flow diagramming and computer programming techniques. These shortages can be wiped out, but it will take time. A question that needs to be asked today is: “What are library schools doing now to supply these specialized skills?”

A Short Range Solution

The new technologies may provide the long range solutions, but what about the next few years? With all that has been said about the manpower shortage in technical services, it is nearly impossible to say anything that is really new. The solutions that have been proposed have ranged from the drastic suggestion of Daniel Gore, one of the professions more vocal gadflies, that we turn libraries back to faculties (which might be fun and pregnant with possibilities)6 to the proposal that we lower our professional educational qualifications for beginning librarians.

During the past year, the quality of library education has come under close scrutiny from the profession. The drive to lower entrance standards, at least as we view them today, seems to be gaining momen-

tum. One of a series of recommendations, emitting from a special manpower conference held in Washington, D. C., in March, 1967, dealt with changes in library education. The conferees suggested a range of educational training programs. The proposed range included:

Five programs were listed under this spectrum: two-year technician programs; four-year undergraduate programs; master's programs; post-master's programs; and informal and short-term training programs (continuing professional education). Recommendations were made that the two-year technician programs in junior colleges be considered acceptable training if strong safeguards are built in to insure adequate facilities, planning, and faculty. As for the four-year undergraduate programs, it was recommended that these be recognized as leading to the first professional level (beginning librarian) if this education is liberal and not technical. It was further recommended that master's programs be upgraded and centered around intensified specialization—principles, theory, and research.7

To the extent that a technician or quasi-technician training program can clearly distinguish between professional and non-professional activities, these programs could prove valuable and beneficial. However, if clear distinctions cannot be outlined, the programs will tend to merge and lose their identity, and all we will have accomplished is further dilution of professional standards. Up to now, I do not think we have been notably successful as a profession in developing challenging master's and advanced degree programs, let alone technician programs.

Although I am not interested in becoming embroiled today in the current controversy over whether standards should be raised or lowered, I would observe that if the current shortage is anywhere near one hundred thousand—which is one commonly heard estimate—it is folly to believe that by lowering the standards we can close the gap. We could lower our standards to zero and not succeed. The demand for manpower from competing professions is just too great, and as it is, the profession does not command sufficient prestige to change significantly the balance of recruitment. Unfortunately, we have not completely shed our "clerical" image.

In my opinion, the most promising solution lies in improving the climate for job analysis. We take for granted that we routinely carry on programs to re-assess the duties performed by professional and non-professional personnel, and although this approach has been advocated for years by many of the professions' most articulate and influential spokesmen, too often their advice has fallen on deaf ears. Lest anyone doubt this, I would suggest we consider in how many libraries professional librarians still: file catalog cards, catalog books when LC copy is available, perform pre-order searching, type or revise orders, check-in periodicals, or shelf-list? The lamentable fact is that in too many libraries these activities are still performed by professional staff.

In this connection, I am reminded of a conversation I had recently
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with a library school graduate. He was bemoaning the fact that most of the positions for which he had been interviewed were clerical in nature; that is, clerical according to the definitions supplied by his library school professors. This complaint could possibly be only an isolated incident, but if it is not, we are likely to be hoisted with our own petard. In each graduating class we are sending forth a corps of anti-recruiters to warn away prospective professional candidates. Since we live in a society of "backlashes," we could term this phenomenon a "recruiting backlash."

To what extent the present personnel shortage could be alleviated with proper manpower utilization is moot, but I feel strongly that the results would be far more productive if the profession were to concentrate on educating systems analysts, rather than trying to recruit 100,000 additional librarians.

Therefore, I suggest that the most effective way of attacking the problem of mis-utilization and under-utilization of manpower is to increase our efforts to distinguish between professional and non-professional activities. I would urge governmental agencies, such as USOE, and foundations such as the Council on Library Resources and NSF to award grants to library schools to strengthen existing courses devoted to systems analysis and data processing, and to offer incentives to other library schools to inaugurate similar programs. Such courses should not preclude drawing from the talents and skills of specialists from other disciplines. These people will still be needed. But our just task should be to graduate librarians who are at least conversant in the new technologies.

To make progress, we will need to mobilize activity at both the state and national levels. Heretofore, most efforts have been confined to the local level, and while these have created oases in the desert, the desert persists. This does not mean we can pass the buck to A.L.A. However, our professional associations should play instrumental roles in creating a climate favorable to manpower conservation programs. Before we can begin to solve this problem, conservation must become a professional-wide concern and given equal priority with other important programs such as recruitment and education.

In summary, many large libraries have taken first steps to improve utilization of manpower in technical processing. To a great extent these programs have been spurred by computer technology. But there are no grounds to be content. Those of us here concerned with technical services, may, in fact, be suffering from a form of manpower schizophrenia. At national conventions in June and July, we are immersed in talk of exciting breakthroughs in such areas as automation, cooperation, and communications; but, by September after the flush of the conference has worn off, and we are swamped with work, I wonder how many of us will be as actively involved in seeking solutions to this problem. What is needed now is action not lip service.
How I Spend My Typical Day, Week, and Year: Technical Services*

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

HOW DO I SPEND MY TIME teaching cataloging, classification, technical services at Simmons College? Perhaps a brief profile of the graduate library school may properly set the stage. Our classes at Simmons are relatively small, with ordinarily no more than twenty-five students in each section of required or basic courses, or, for that matter, in elective or optional courses. The latter, indeed, may have fewer students. We teach three courses each semester, each meeting once a week on a varied pattern of morning, afternoon, or evening sessions. Our formal class, or “contact” teaching, hours consist of nine class periods each week; in other words, six and three-quarters clock hours. Occasionally, we have a one-semester tutorial research project for an individual student.

A further characteristic of the Simmons School of Library Science is that each faculty member teaches within his specialization. For that reason, we are expected neither to teach in an area where we may not be vitally interested, nor to teach in a field where we may be little qualified. We are expected, however, to assume authority and responsibility in our own field, not only on behalf of the students but also in the profession.

Teaching at Simmons is highly individualized and personalized, with opportunity for a creative approach. To that end, three or four sections of a course may be taught quite differently, rather than coordinately, depending upon the instructor. There is, consequently, considerable flexibility in course presentation and content. Decisions about courses are made informally and individually rather than collectively in long faculty sessions, for as the Director has expressed it, “We are not ‘meeting-happy!’” We do not spend undue time in faculty meetings. Simmons considers that time is the most valuable asset which the faculty has. Because of that, faculty members are expected to be self-generative in the optimum use of their time, showing mature self-discipline in evaluat-

* This paper was given at the Association of American Library Schools Midwinter 1966 meeting, Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago. Miss Colvin is currently Professor, School of Library and Information Science, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada.
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ing what is worth doing within certain time limits. We are expected to spend time in productive scholarship and in other contributive professional services.

With respect to our students at Simmons there are the usual classroom contacts, individual and/or group conferences, and social functions. Our student advisee system includes individual faculty preregistration conferences with some fifty students each semester. The Director of Students and the faculty are both involved in counselling. Placement, on the other hand, is handled centrally and, I may add, admirably, for the entire College. The students are privileged to invite two instructors to write recommendations for their dossiers in the Placement Office. In their turn, the students, about twice a year through an elected committee report to the Director on student or "consumer" reaction to all the courses in the curriculum. The feedback can be enlightening! Another contact with students includes interviews with prospective students who seek admission.

There are three courses in the area of technical services at Simmons. Each is a one-semester course, and each represents four credit points. There is the required basic introductory cataloging and classification course, with no supervised and, therefore, no scheduled "laboratory" periods. The two electives, "Comparative Cataloging and Classification" and "Technical Services," are advanced courses, usually with no final examinations. Generally, all three courses are given in the second semester, while one elective and several sections of the basic course are available in the autumn. During the summer session the basic course and one of the electives are offered.

How, then, do I spend my time in the role of teacher in fulfilling my obligations to the students and to the College? Preparation of courses for quality teaching requires constant appraisal and reorganization to meet changing goals and new concepts. The forces of change must be reflected and problems of the future anticipated. Conflicting questions continue to arise over course content—such questions as: What combination of intellectual aspects and vocational aspects will meet library goals, or, perhaps more important, will set library goals? What should be the philosophy for courses in cataloging, classification, technical services—the "materials" courses—that provide the knowledge background for decisions on controls for bibliographic and for subject access to library collections? In a basic cataloging course, how much substance and how much "know how" will provide the dimensions for value judgments? What will be the emphases—the traditional or the latest; the theoretical or the practical? I deal with basic principles, distinguishing between the fundamentals and the fads and gadgets, using "the book" as the original case study. I deal with both ideas and issues and encourage the critical approach in terms of the present and the future.

How do I replenish my supply of ammunition for class discussions, particularly for the elective courses? These courses provide opportunity
for comparative and evaluative studies on intellectual and pragmatic levels, and they range from local to international perspectives in the whole field of technical services. Each course is tailored to individual student needs and requires continuous preparation—there are no time limits!

New books and journals for perusal or study arrive daily. Visits to local library technical service departments provide visual demonstration of changes and developments; for example, in catalog card reproduction—the Copyflo process, the Dura Mach tape, and the Itek Cross-Filer—what are their values and limitations? Letters go out requesting sample copies of book catalogs produced from punched cards or by photographic methods, because classes are more lively when students may compare and evaluate the product.

Attending library association meetings, where there is time for talk with cataloging librarians, or lunching with teaching or professional colleagues, or with graduates in Greater Boston, become provocative means for interchange of ideas and for discovery of new information. Seeking “grass roots” experience—during vacation periods—when there is time to observe at first hand, in a county public school system, the regional processing center for school libraries—in a federal library, the divided catalog compiled from two separate dictionary catalogs—in a university library system, the new computerized divided book catalog compiled to serve several institutions—in a special library, an automated serials control system—in a technical library, an experimental acquisition and information system—yields “down-to-earth” material. Spending a day making a feasibility survey of the technical services problems of a small library, or several days surveying the technical processing department of a state library system, for instance, can prove a stimulating experience at the time and can later give impetus to class discussions.

For some years now, the ALA Catalog Code Revision Steering Committee meetings, held usually in two full-day session four times a year, at the Annual and Midwinter Conferences and in the spring and fall at the Library of Congress, have required both concentrated preparation beforehand and assimilation afterwards and have provided invaluable, albeit time-consuming, source material for teaching.

The inevitable assignments—how to vary them to insure interest and to lessen indigestion—need constant reassessment and imagination. What kinds of questions and problems assist students to make professional or administrative decisions based on sound understanding of principles and their application in differing situations? Since there are no syllabi with set bibliographies for the cataloging courses, each student, with a brief outline of the course and some guidelines from the instructor, is on his own to read selectively. Cataloging Sampler serves all three courses. Briefly, there are in the basic course weekly assignments with no term project, while in the electives there are a number
of problems and research projects in one, and individual projects along with a seminar paper in the other.

Within the context of problem assignments, there is a graphic records or “laboratory” collection—books, serials, and nonbook materials. Their selection, organization, maintenance, along with administration of appropriate records, is an exacting responsibility. When new publications appear, viz. DDC: 17 and Sears: 9 as in 1969, many records require updating. I shudder to think what the new Anglo-American Cataloging Rules in 1967 will require! A graduate student assistant is assigned part-time to the sections of the basic cataloging course for revision and for the supervised cataloging and clerical tasks involved in handling the “materials” collection.

Closely allied to preparation of subjects is presentation. Again, these responsibilities have inherent in them both stimulation and satisfaction, because I like to express in my planning the creative urge. Elective courses may be taught as seminars, either entirely or partially. I like to share, or alternate, leadership with the students, either individually or in groups, and thereby introduce variety. Since I like to experiment in course presentation designs and approaches, when our “evaluation session” is scheduled at the end or near the end of the course, I ask the students to make criticisms, evaluations, and suggestions, not only about the content but also about the presentation. At the same time, I pose questions: What are the psychological barriers to cataloging? When are the seeds sown? When do these barriers begin to emerge? What elements in teaching contribute to erecting barriers to cataloging? I must say that this particular two-way communication—the evaluation session—if sometimes prickly, has always proved an interesting learning experience.

Further obligations embrace student conferences concerned with course work when personal instruction and discussions become part of the teaching process. Graduates often write, telephone, or return for conferences or advice. How gratifying to see their progress and leadership! College-wide relationships may involve general faculty committee assignments. The total professional education process, it seems to me, involves threefold responsibility and interaction, that of the teacher, that of the student, and that of the administration.

How do I spend my time in the role of former cataloging librarian, now teacher, in fulfilling my obligations to the profession? I accept identification with librarianship as a whole, and with technical services in particular. On that ground, in addition to teaching as my first commitment, I accept professional responsibilities which over the years have included participating in a diversity of committee work, serving in offices of, as well as speaking to, library associations on the national, regional, state, and local levels, none of which can easily be measured. I select new publications in my field for the professional collection. There is always multiple correspondence for decision and dispatch.
There are books to review, articles to write, and perhaps Sampler to revise. Research for Cataloging Sampler and for catalog code revision has been a continuing responsibility.

After teaching twenty-odd years of cataloging and classification courses, technical services/processing/procedures—by whatever name they may be called—they still can be joyful. Why? Because I firmly believe that the organization of library collections for optimum use is crucial to effective librarianship and that the librarians concerned with these activities are essential to the profession. Although this area has been the most controversial, the “whipping boy” of the profession, as it has sometimes been called, still it is the most exciting. Can it justify its existence? Does it know where it is going? We all share this climate of concern. Eventually, whether regional processing centers or commercial services provide all card or book catalogs to public and school libraries, or whether an automated Library of Congress distributes tape to college and university computer centers for card or book catalogs, there is still the intellectual process to consider. This intellectual process—the recording and organizing of information either for translation on the machine level in centers, or for interpretation on the human level in libraries—causes knowledge and understanding of cataloging, classification, technical services to continue viable.

Professional life cannot be compartmentalized in teaching, for there is no one day, one week, or one year that seems typical; variety is always present with new challenges, new emphases, new students. Life is demanding and stimulating, strenuous and provocative, satisfying and frustrating, serious and comic, exacting and rewarding!

**BACK ISSUES OF LRTS NEEDED**

The RTSD Office at ALA Headquarters is still in need of any extra copies of *Library Resources & Technical Services*, as listed below. If you can spare them, please mail them to ALA-RTSD, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611. These numbers have been unusually popular and the original printing is now exhausted.

*Issues needed:*
- Vol. 9, no. 1 (Winter, 1965)
- Vol. 10, no. 1 (Winter, 1966)
- Vol. 10, no. 2 (Spring, 1966)
- Vol. 11, no. 1 (Winter, 1967)
- Vol. 11, no. 2 (Spring, 1967)
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**Library Resources & Technical Services**
Major Committee Activities

The American Book Publishers Council/RTSD Joint Committee (Carl Jackson, Chairman) presented a public program at San Francisco on “emerging problems in acquisitions,” thereby adding another dimension to the activities of the committee, which has already provided, in its closed meetings, a forum for discussion of matters of mutual interest to librarians and publishers.

The Book Catalogs Committee (Ian Thom, Chairman) presented a program at the San Francisco Conference, highlighted by an analysis of the forty questionnaires returned in connection with the committee’s project for studying on-going book catalogs.

The Bookbinding Committee (Stephen Ford, Chairman) gave formal endorsement to the provisional performance standards for binding used in libraries. These standards, upon recommendation of the Board of Directors of RTSD, were adopted as ALA standards by the ALA Council at the San Francisco meeting. The Bookbinding Committee has engaged in conversation with bookbinders regarding the new standards. It has also established a list of criteria for independent testing laboratories.

The Organization Committee (Paul Dunkin, Chairman) discussed and made recommendations to the Board of Directors on a number of organizational questions.

The Public Documents Interdivisional Committee (Joseph A. Rosenthal, Chairman) reports that as a result of the efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee on Depository Libraries and the Library of Congress, the Bureau of the Budget recently issued a directive to federal agencies requesting that four copies of each non-GPO publication issued by a federal agency be sent to the Library of Congress as required by law. It is understood that LC will then forward one copy of each such publication to the Government Printing Office for listing in the Monthly Catalog. It is hoped that this will be a start towards better bibliographic control of non-GPO publications, and perhaps an entering wedge for distribution of all non-GPO publications to depository libraries. The Committee also reports the issuance of the Directory of Documents Librarians in the United States, compiled by Thomas and Elizabeth Shaw.

The Regional Processing Committee (Peter Hiatt, Chairman) published the results of its survey of public library regional processing centers in the July issue of Library Trends. During the year, the com-
mittee was reorganized with two academic librarians added to the roster; it is anticipated that during the coming year a representative of school libraries will be added to the committee. The committee is presently receiving replies to its questionnaire on college library centralized processing.

The Resources Committee (Norman Stevens, Chairman) presented a program at the San Francisco conference on the national program for acquisitions and cataloging. The committee has also been concerned during the year with an evaluation of its activities, looking to an identification of appropriate areas for activity in the future.

The School Library Technical Services Committee (Milbrey Jones, Chairman) was dissolved by the Board of Directors of the Division at the San Francisco Conference, following a discussion during the year of the mutual interests of this committee and of the Regional Processing Committee. School library interests will, in the future, be represented on the Regional Processing Committee.

The survey of commercial services being conducted by Barbara Westby reports further progress. Approximately two-thirds of the processing centers are scheduled for visits by Miss Westby by mid-July and the others will be visited by other librarians. In all, fifty centers are being investigated, of which forty to forty-five are likely to be included in the final directory.

The Technical Services Costs Committee (Paul Kebabian, Chairman) served as a referral point for a number of requests relating to technical services costs.

The Technical Services Costs Ratio Committee (Helen Welch, Chairman) reports further progress toward the committee’s goal of defining the technical services cost ratio (the ratio made up of the total cost of technical service salaries divided by the amount spent for library materials during a given period of time) and in establishing it as a useful library concept. The committee will attempt to deal with two problems before requesting dismissal: (1) Explore possibilities of including the figures needed to compute TSCOR in the national annual statistical reports for libraries, and (2) develop a TSCOR form for easy use by interested librarians, including some testing of the form in an adequate sampling of libraries.

The RTSD/ISAD Interdivisional Committee on Universal Numbering System for Publications (C. Donald Cook, Chairman) was established following the mid-winter meeting to consider and to cooperate with other interested agencies in the development of a universal numbering system for the bibliographical control of books, serials, and other publications. The committee was appointed late in the spring and held its first meeting at the San Francisco Conference. Liaison has been established through Daniel Melcher of the R. R. Bowker Company with the publishing group working on the same matter and with Jerrold Orne of the United States of America Standards Institute.

The ISAD Relations Committee (Dale Bentz, Chairman) examined
the issues relating to the mutual interests of the two divisions and considered organizational methods for securing effective coordination of activities. The committee will continue to serve for at least one more year.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Groups (Joe Treyz, Chairman) recommended a number of changes in organization and activities designed to assist the groups to take greater advantage of the assistance that ALA and RTSD can offer and at the same time allow the profession to benefit more from the work of the groups. Some of these changes were instituted at the San Francisco Conference.

President's Remarks

Unfortunately, the year was marked by the untimely death of Esther J. Piercy. Her most visible contribution to the Division was Library Resources & Technical Services. The officers and other members of the Board of Directors over the years are familiar with the effectiveness of her less visible, but no less significant, activities in preserving and promoting the interests of the Division.

Evidence of the strength of the Division, which observed its tenth anniversary during the year, may be seen in the work of its committees, as reported above, and in the work of the sections, reported elsewhere. In addition to co-sponsorship with the Information Science and Automation Division of a preconference institute on library automation with several speakers drawn from the ranks of RTSD, the Division presented a total of nine programs at the San Francisco Conference.

Although expressions of personal feelings are doubtless inappropriate in an annual report, I cannot close this, my second annual report, without a statement of personal gratitude to the large number of individuals who have responded so graciously and effectively to my numerous appeals for counsel and guidance in conducting the affairs of the Division. It has been, for me, a gratifying and rewarding experience. The Division begins its second decade with a large and loyal membership, and with strong leaders who are well aware of the problems and challenges faced by the Division. It has been fortunate indeed in securing the services of Paul Dunkin as editor of LRTS. And, finally, it retains the services of Elizabeth Rodell, our loyal and effective Executive Secretary.
THIS REPORT is submitted on behalf of the Chairman, Carl Jackson. All the achievements of the report year therefore go to his credit and to the hard working committees appointed by him. Special and most sincere thanks are due Mrs. Elizabeth Rodell whose advice and help throughout the year were invaluable.

Policy and Research Committee

The Committee made three recommendations. The first of these concerned the advisability of producing a handbook on procedures and methods of acquiring books that would assist librarians in gaining the experience necessary for efficient and competent operation within the book trade; the second concerned the preparation of an annotated list of book dealers, probably arranged by country; and the third recommended the establishment of liaison with the Library of Congress by the invitation to that institution to have a representative either at the P & R level or on the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee was very much interested in the first recommendation. However, instead of a handbook other devices are under consideration.

Book Disposal Committee

The Committee postponed any action and recommendations till a report from the pre-conference meeting of the Rare Book Section could be studied.

Acquisitions Policy Committee

The Committee collected a total of 81 acquisitions policy statements. Broken down by type of library the sample contains:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Libraries</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Libraries</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Libraries</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No further action is at the moment under consideration, and the Committee has been disbanded. The policy statements have been deposited in the ALA Headquarters Library, from which they may be obtained on interlibrary loan.
Ad Hoc Committee on Training Acquisition Librarians

The Committee members were keenly aware of the importance of their tasks. However, after long, serious, and inconclusive discussion, the Committee reached the view that it would not be desirable to study further the matter of training acquisition librarians within the limited framework of acquisition work alone. The members feel strongly that there should be an overall functional view of acquisition work in library school instruction, stressing interrelationships with other technical services, and the progressive steps in bringing the book from the publishing source to the reader. The Committee recommended that its functions be taken over completely by the ARL Committee on training for research librarianship. The Committee was therefore disbanded.

Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee

The main activity was to sponsor the study of book purchasing arrangements, a joint project of the ALA and the National League of Cities. This study is being conducted by Evelyn Hensel of Pennsylvania State University, who gave an exhaustive report at the business meeting of the Section in San Francisco.

A federal court in Scranton, Pa., sentenced Richard F. Caverly, former librarian of the Scranton Public Library, and bookdealer James S. Rizik to a two-year federal prison term. The two defendants have appealed.

Sub-Committee on Disposal of Surplus

No action taken.

Sub-Committee on Unsolicited Material

The Committee feels that its task is already being handled by another committee.

Library Materials Price Index Committee

Publications connected with the Committee's work:


Manuscript on Mexican book price indexes by William Kurth, ready for publication.

Reprinting Committee

The Committee expanded its work of “lending to reprinters” to include the loan of materials for microfilming. A special statement will be published shortly. The basic paper, “Lending to Reprinters,” was published in *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 11 (1967), 229-231. The Committee continues to give consideration to bibliographic citations used by reprinters in listing and advertising their materials. In connection with this problem, the Committee has been asked to review the Special Libraries Association’s statement of guidelines for the advertising of books and relate it to citations used in advertising reprints. Copies of the SLA statement have been distributed to the Committee for comments and suggestions.

RTSD-SS/AS Joint Committee to Revise List of International Subscription Agents

The manuscript of the list will be completed by the summer of 1968.

Bylaws Committee

The Committee submitted the following statement: The Executive Committee can increase the number of Members-at-large without conflict with the spirit of uniformity in the Bylaws of the several RTSD sections. It is recommended that exact representation of types of libraries not be specified in the Bylaws, but that the Nominating Committee be directed to make nominations which would assure the representation desired.

Nominating Committee

The Committee under the chairmanship of Helen Welch is preparing a list of candidates.

Intersectional Committee on U. S. Congresses and Conferences without Fixed Headquarters

The Committee was appointed to investigate improved means of acquiring publications of U. S. congresses and conferences without fixed headquarters and to recommend appropriate action to the Executive Committees of the Acquisitions and Serials Sections. Creation of the Committee followed a recommendation of the Serials Policy and Research Committee which on the basis of a questionnaire reported a need on the part of many libraries for easier ways to discover the existence of
such publications. The Chairman of the Serials Section appointed a chairman and two members, and two members were appointed by the Chairman of the Acquisitions Section. The committee has submitted a most useful selective bibliography. The Executive Committee of the Acquisitions Section voted the continuance of the Committee. The Serials Section agreed with the proposal.

**Interdivisional Committee on a Universal Numbering System for Publications**

The Committee was created at the New Orleans meeting and had its first formal meeting at the San Francisco Conference. The Committee decided to include serials in the numbering system. The Serials Section agreed to this proposal. The British system has been in operation since January 1967. About 60,000 titles are included. The number identifies the publisher and the edition and includes a check digit. If the publisher does not want to number his books, they are numbered for him. The British system avoids the use of letters. The United States is considering how and when its publications could be fed into this system; the boards of the American Book Publishers Council and the American Textbook Publishers Institute are interested in the system and plan to call a meeting of publishers, wholesalers, and booksellers to consider the subject in great detail.

**Assistant Editor for LRTS**

Richard Dougherty has accepted re-nomination as the Assistant Editor for the Acquisitions Section to LRTS.

---

**RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section Annual Report, 1966/67**

*Marian Sanner, Chairman*

**FOR OVER A DECADE**, the annual report of the Cataloging and Classification Section has included some mention of the Code, and this report continues that tradition. Catalogers have had the “red book” and the “green book”; since January of this year, we have had the “blue book”—the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*, which signal the beginning of a new era in cataloging.

*Volume 12, Number 1, Winter 1968*
There are two publications which can be anticipated for the coming year: (1) The ALA Filing Rules, which were prepared by a subcommittee of the ALA Editorial Committee and were approved by the Section’s Executive Committee at its Midwinter meeting. (2) The Proceedings of the 1966 Institute on the Use of the Library of Congress Classification, which have been edited and are awaiting publication.

The San Francisco program meetings of the Section were devoted to subject headings. Library of Congress staff members, Robert Holmes and Charles Bead, discussed the latest edition of the LC subject heading list and some aspects of LC subject heading practice. Miss Barbara Westby talked about the Sears List of Subject Headings. Our program concluded with a look at subject headings from the processing center viewpoint; these presentations were made by Mrs. Margaret Shreve and Mrs. Catherine Chadwick.

During the year 1966/67, the substantive work of the Section has been carried on by its numerous committees. It was not necessary to call on the services of the Bylaws Committee during the past year, but this Committee stands ready to go into action whenever a need arises. The Cataloging Policy and Research Committee continued its interest in Library of Congress progress under Title II of the Higher Education Act, and in the status of the Library’s MARC project. The Committee recommended to the Library of Congress that it issue a list of the classification numbers which will be cancelled as a result of the development of the “K” schedule; this can be done, but not until the class “K” schedule has been completed. In response to requests received at Headquarters, this Committee prepared a policy statement on the cataloging, or non-cataloging, of paperbacks. The members of CPRC have under consideration now a study of the use of non-professionals in cataloging.

As a follow-up to last year’s highly successful Institute on the Use of the Library of Congress Classification, our Classification Committee is seeking information concerning any workshops on classification or reclassification. It is hoped that the Committee will serve as a clearinghouse for this kind of information. The Section’s Executive Committee submitted to the Subject Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress several recommendations of the Classification Committee: (1) that explanations of classification decisions and policies, along with answers to questions of general interest, be included in Cataloging Service; (2) that the Library of Congress prepare a manual of practice for use with the LC classification; and (3) that the Library publish an index to its classification. The Committee continues to respond to requests for information on classification and reclassification.

It has been customary in the Cataloging and Classification Section to have the various geographic areas of the country represented in the membership of its committees. During the past year, we “went abroad” when the Chairman of the Descriptive Cataloging Committee moved to Oslo, Norway, to head the Library of Congress Overseas Office in that location. In spite of the distance separating the Chairman from her Com-
committee, business proceeded as usual. The Committee has approved the rewording of one rule in our new Anglo-American Cataloging Rules in order to clarify its application. It can be expected that the need will arise for other slight revisions in wording to clarify intent or define application. The Descriptive Cataloging Committee and the Library of Congress have agreed that revisions of a rule will include revision of the corresponding item in the index. This Committee continues to work with the Library of Congress on preparation of transliteration tables.

The Subject Headings Committee, through its Chairman, cooperated with the Program Committee in planning for the Section's San Francisco meetings. The Committee has under consideration at the present time a proposal for cooperation with the Library of Congress in formulating a questionnaire to solicit consumer opinion in regard to future patterns of frequency and cumulation for the LC subject heading list and its supplements. In response to a suggestion that the Classification and Subject Headings Committees consider closer cooperation, the chairman of each committee is attending the meetings of the other committee.

Our Section's representative on the Catalog Use Committee of the Reference Services Division reports that the Committee decided to follow up its study of catalog use in university libraries with a similar one for public libraries. Forms were mailed in January of this year and were to be returned by May 1st. Essentially the same form as that used for the previous study was adopted. One important change was that all items were keyed for computer analysis.

The controversy concerning the problems involved in the cataloging of juvenile books has not gone unnoticed by the Executive Committee of this Section. Acting on the Committee's instructions, the Chairman appointed an ad hoc committee, chaired by Mrs. Mary Seely Dodendorf, to meet at the San Francisco Conference for the purpose of defining the problems in this area of cataloging and submitting recommendations for appropriate action to bring about their solutions.

The Committee on the Award of the Margaret Mann Citation selected as the recipient of this year's award C. Sumner Spalding, editor of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. This award provided well-deserved recognition of the great contribution Mr. Spalding has made to the profession.

To the officers and to all of the Section's committee members, the Chairman takes this opportunity to express sincere appreciation for their devotion to duty, their cooperation, and their achievements. A special tribute should be paid to one person—one who is always there to guide, to help, and to listen—RTSD's Executive Secretary, Elizabeth Rodell.
THE SERIALS SECTION has, for some time, voiced the concern of serials people over the growing "serials gap" between control of pre-1950 and post-1949 serials, and the general lack of any national effort in serials control comparable to the Title II programs for monographic material. This year Donald Hammer and his committee specifically recommended that, for the time being, those pre-1950 serials inadvertently omitted from the third edition of the Union List of Serials be included in New Serial Titles, and that the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials be asked to reconsider its decision that the third edition of ULS is the final one. Two later developments, the decision to include serials in the publication of the pre-1956 National Union Catalog and the establishment of the Serials Data Program, make it unlikely that the J.C.U.L.S. will agree to this proposal.

Meanwhile, in another part of the forest, the Section's representative on the Joint Committee on the ULS, Kenneth Soderland, served on a sub-committee whose work led to the establishment of the national Serials Data Program at the Library of Congress. The Serials Data Program will be a computer-based bank of information about all serials, some of whose products might be the publication of general or special union lists of serials, or the provision of machine-readable data for local serials processing. The program might serve as a basis for cooperative acquisition of serials; for standardization of processing; for measuring abstracting and indexing coverage, etc. The first phase of this program will consist of an effort involving three tasks: (1) the development of a comprehensive set of data elements for serials, (2) the conduct of a market survey to determine consumer needs, and (3) the preparation of a detailed system design. Over $100,000 has been budgeted for this initial investigatory phase of the program.

Closer to home, the Section's programs and publication activities continued to serve the interests of serial librarians. Acquisitions people will be pleased to learn that the Joint Committee to Revise the List of International Subscription Agents (chaired by Mrs. Roma Gregory) expects to have the manuscript for the new edition completed by next summer. The Intersectoral Committee on U. S. Congresses and Conferences Without Fixed Headquarters (Mrs. Mary Kahler & company) has prepared a bibliography of sources on publications of congresses and conferences. The committee will continue to collect material to supplement this bibliography. William Huff, outgoing Assistant Editor for LRTS, crowned his efforts with the Summer 1966 issue which con-
tained nine articles on serials, including the report of the Section's ad
hoc Serials Holdings Information Committee, entitled "Serials Holdings
Information Service in Research Libraries." Before leaving the publish-
ing business, it must be noted the Policy and Research Committee has
also recommended that the Section sponsor an informal publication
dedicated to serials problems, activities, and news.

The year may have marked a turning point in the fortunes of the
Duplicate Exchange Union. The new DEU Committee under the chair-
manship of Mary Pound conducted a survey on the current state of
the Union. Replies to over 200 questionnaires were tabulated and ana-
lyzed. As a result, the Union's statement of function has been revised.
It is expected that that revised version will enable the DEU to improve
its service to members of the union, and help to attract new members.

Frank Hanlin and his Bylaws Committee drafted amendments to
bring the two newly formed Serials Discussion Groups (one for "large-
sized research libraries," the other for "medium-sized research libraries")
into the Serials Section's fold. The amendments were approved at the
Serials Section business meeting in San Francisco. During the year the
groups agreed on a statement of purpose and membership qualifications
to be presented to the RTSD Organization Committee, and procured
the necessary signed petitions for affiliation with the Section. The for-
mination and rapid development of the groups under their energetic
officers, particularly Chairman Barbara Gates and Chairman Maurice
Lapierre, has been the happiest "happening" of my tenure in office; it
must be even more satisfying to the group's "founding fathers," the
Elizabeths Norton and Rodell.

Two important serials bibliographies were the subject of the Section's
San Francisco program meeting. Mrs. Marietta Chicorel took a look at
*Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory* and the small library serials
collection from her vantage point as the directory's new editor. Dr. A.
Frederick Kuhlmann talked about the consumer survey of *New Serial
Titles*.

Correspondence has been very light, the most notable being an ex-
change of letters with D. Bayle, librarian of the Maison des Sciences
de l'Homme in Paris, concerning that organization's publication, *Period-
dicals and Serials Concerning the Social Sciences and Humanities; Current
List of Available Reproductions (Microforms and Reprints).* A review of
this important new bibliography was published in the Library of Con-
gress Information Bulletin.

This summary of the Section's activities suggests that the year 1966/67
was one of consolidation and development rather than of innovation;
not much was new, but quite a lot was done. As usual, the people who
did most of the doing were the members of the various Section com-
mittees, and Section representatives, prodded and abetted by the divi-
sion's Executive Secretary and her exemplary secretary. For all of them I
have only two further words: "Thank you."
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STEPHEN R. SALMON, Chairman

ON JUNE 26, the Copying Methods Section ceased to exist, having passed on to "RELMS" of glory; at the annual membership meeting on that date, the members of the section voted to change the section's name to "Reproduction of Library Materials Section (RELMS)," with the following new statement of function: To assist libraries by providing an organization for (1) the discussion of problems in and the dissemination of information about the production, storage, and use of reproductions of library materials; and (2) the fostering of studies and research and the promotion of uniform practices and policies in this field. This action was the culmination of work begun more than two years ago by a sectional Committee on Program which reviewed the scope, function and program activities of the section and recommended the new name and statement. The implied limitations of the old name, which had bothered members in the past, were thus removed, and the wider scope of the section's activities has now been officially recognized.

The most notable events of the final year of CMS were the completions of three publication projects, two of which had concerned the section for several years. *Microfilm Norms*, a manual of recommended library microfilming practices developed by an ad hoc committee formed in January of 1961 under the chairmanship of Peter R. Scott, appeared in July of 1966. Specifications for quality of the image, reduction ratio, image orientation, and bibliographic identification are included. The second publication, the *Copying Methods Manual* by William R. Hawken, was published in October. An authoritative, up-to-date, comprehensive and comprehensible reference manual of the field of document copying, it discusses the principal characteristics of the reproduction processes currently used to produce both eye-legible and microfilm copies, and the physical characteristics and other factors which affect copying methods. The volume was produced with the assistance of the ALA Library Technology Program staff and an advisory committee from the Copying Methods Section; one of the members of the committee, Allen Veaner, also contributed an annotated bibliography. Grants from the Council on Library Resources supported both *Microfilm Norms* and the *Copying Methods Manual*.

The third publication to appear under the section's auspices during the year was a new edition (the third) of a work already familiar to
most of the section's members, Cosby Brinkley's *Directory of Library Photoduplication Services.*

Various committees have been active throughout the year. The Committee on Photocopying Costs in Libraries, chaired by Robert Sullivan, distributed questionnaires concerning cost estimates and pricing practices of 130 libraries, received an excellent response, and is now tabulating and analyzing the results. The Simplified Payments Committee, under its new chairman Allen Veenan, worked with two credit card firms in its continuing efforts to devise a feasible system of centralized billing and payments for photocopies.

A new Telefacsimile Committee, formed in January with David Heron as its chairman, met with representatives from various institutions now using telefacsimile equipment and is considering the possibility of presenting a program on the subject at the Kansas City Conference. Another new committee, under the chairmanship of David Nevin, studied the need for revision and republication of the section's leaflet on photocopying.

Revision of the copyright law has of course been a subject of special interest to members of the section for a long time, and with actual legislation now pending a full-scale program on the aspects of this legislation that are most vital to libraries seemed appropriate. The section accordingly presented five experts on the subject in a panel discussion during the San Francisco Conference; the attendance (and the duration) of the program exceeded all expectations.

The year was thus a busy but productive one, and with its glossy new name the section faces a bright future.

---

**RTSD Council of Regional Groups**

**Annual Report, 1966/67**

**Louis A. Schultheiss, Chairman**

*As in the past, the principal activities of the Council took place at the annual conference. The type of meeting was changed somewhat this year, in keeping with recommendations of the RTSD Ad Hoc Committee on the Regional Groups, which had met at the Midwinter meeting in New Orleans and presented its final report in San Francisco. The first conference meeting was an unstructured program meeting involving representatives from approximately 15 of the groups. The principal topics discussed were program ideas, ways in which the Council...*
could be strengthened, and the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee. The second meeting was a luncheon for Council members or their representatives, at which the recipient of the Margaret Mann Citation and the Executive Secretary and incoming President of RTSD were introduced to the members.

The third, and final meeting of the Conference was a discussion program at which C. Sumner Spaulding of the Library of Congress answered questions concerning the Library's policy of superimposition of the new *Anglo-American Cataloging Code* and its probable effect on other libraries using LC copy as a basis for their own cataloging.

**Remarks on the Program of RTSD, June 27, 1967**

By David C. Weber
President, 1967/68

The late 1960's are a turning point for RTSD. Its membership has produced the new *Union List of Serials* and the new *Anglo-American Cataloging Code*. We have received the BM catalog and the Berkeley and UCLA catalogs. Our members in such libraries as Chicago and Stanford Universities and Nassau and Suffolk Counties are embarked on large scale automation of basic processing operations in total integrated systems. With all of this going on, RTSD needs to approach the next decade with renewed insight, inventiveness, and energy.

RTSD therefore should reconsider its programs, rethink and revise as necessary its goals. It should restudy its attention to school libraries, to the newer academic libraries, to library systems, and to libraries in underdeveloped countries. It should pay more attention to the vast and increasingly important serial publications, technical reports, symposia, microtexts, and video and audio tapes. RTSD should make every effort to carry its full responsibility in computer applications and collaborate with the Information Science and Automation Division. It should work tirelessly with the Association of Research Libraries toward its goal of an integrated and nationalized organization of bibliographical effort. It should strive to clarify the economic and efficiency factors and thus determine whether the total national bibliographical data bank should be best accessed via a single central repository tapped by long-line communication, via regional depositories, or through the maintenance of the complete bibliographical record in the larger individual libraries.

These are among the present challenges to RTSD.
OUT OF RESPECT to our former editor and long-time Board member, Esther J. Piercy, I tried to write this report without mentioning her name. It was wasted effort. We have always said that LRTS was our division's most important work, but it is good to remember that at her last conference (New York, 1966) we told her so. She was genuinely surprised to hear President Wesley C. Simonton call her our elder statesman. At the RTSD office at ALA we had always proceeded on that assumption. Hardly a week went by that we did not ask her advice about something in the wide range of technical services. The folders are full of her replies, often dashed off on scraps of paper in moments of her busy days, but tireless, sparkling, full of vision and good sense.

We were in a Board meeting in New Orleans last winter when we learned of her death. A poor tribute to her it would have been to show ourselves incapable of carrying on. The directors and the Editorial Board rose to the challenge, and kept LRTS splendidly on course.

One of her chief concerns, after her daily work at Enoch Pratt and, of course, the content and style of LRTS, was to have public and school librarians (for whom she wrote Commonsense Cataloging) represented in RTSD. With her passing, not one public librarian remained on the Board of Directors. This condition changed in the spring, however, with the election of Margaret C. Brown of the Free Library of Philadelphia, who will be the first public librarian to become president since 1959. In the list of nominees for the 1968 elections, elsewhere in this issue, there appear an unusual number of public librarians, and for the first time in years two school librarians are candidates for the office of director-at-large.

The so-called "internship" plan, which originated in the Association of College and Research Libraries, if adopted by RTSD will give experience on substantive committees to some young members of ALA, realizing another of Esther's long-frustrated ambitions. In 1964 she encouraged the formation of a discussion group for technical service administrators of large public libraries. She would be glad to know that in San Francisco they held their best-attended meeting so far, with every one of the twenty-three members present (surely a record).

How useful at the ALA office we found her manuscript later published...
as the chapter on "Organization and Control of Materials," in the volume *Local Public Library Administration* which was produced by the International City Managers Association! It was the best source we had for helping inexperienced librarians in their many difficulties in buying books. Since that time, the joint committee with the American Book Publishers Council's conference programs addressed to the general librarian, and the ALA/National League of Cities' study to provide guidelines for librarians in dealing with book jobbers, are evidences that our Acquisitions Section has been increasingly aware of its responsibilities in this area.

A woman of extraordinary common sense, she was no easy optimist; indeed, I think she would have agreed that in the technical services (as in life) the basic questions seem never to be answered, just gradually give way to new ones that seem more disturbing (like automation). She would have read with wry appreciation the report of an ad hoc committee on cataloging children's books, which met in San Francisco, that no special list of subject headings is needed for children's books, but that we do need guidelines to evaluate commercial and centralized services, and standards for organizing non-book materials.

The long-awaited issue of *Library Trends* on "Cooperative and Centralized Cataloging," which she planned and was to have edited, appeared in July 1967 with a warm tribute to her by Robert L. Talmadge, who completed the task. She would have been the first to agree with Maurice Tauber, who wrote in the introduction that "we have not yet reached a solution to the problem we are trying to solve."

She was opposed to the formation of an automation division by ALA, on the logical grounds that automation was just another means of performing technical services in libraries; but once the new division was established, she entered into friendly and generous arrangements with its president about the distribution of papers between *LRTS* and the forthcoming journal of automation.

Others have written about the breadth of her interest in librarianship. At ALA we had a ringside seat when she was on the Executive Board, and especially on the Headquarters Visiting Committee from 1963 to 1965, to see how her professional zeal remained keen after hours of meetings and argument about the Association's complicated structure and activities—in fact, she said that of all her professional committee assignments, this was the one she most enjoyed.

About RTSD, she cared enough to criticize us sharply; it was best to avoid her after a dull, inconclusive board meeting; and yet underneath there was the steady assurance that what we were about was worth doing. Apropos of our annual reports last year, she wrote, in one of her last letters to this office: "One thing which strikes me . . . is that, although great things are going on in processing areas, RTSD is seldom the leader—or so remotely so, that they look as though others run with the balls. . . . Perhaps this is the way it has to be with changing officers and
committees. . . . Perhaps RTSD (indeed, all ALA units) must ask the questions and let Headquarters carry the load. . . . What ALA needs is more help at Headquarters."

It is both poignant and endearing to think that this generous woman, who carried so great a load of professional duties, set out for the sole purpose (so she told a fellow-worker) of obtaining more help for the RTSD office when she left for Midwinter on that day in January.

DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION EDITORIAL
POLICY COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT, 1966/67

During the current year the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee has held two meetings, both at the Library of Congress in Washington. The first meeting in October, 1966 was the stipulated annual meeting of the Committee; the second meeting was held in February, 1967. Minutes of both meetings have been distributed to the Lake Placid Club Education Foundation and to the American Library Association setting forth in detail the business transacted at each. At the annual meeting in October new officers were elected in accordance with Committee regulations to replace those whose terms had expired. Mr. Carlyle J. Frarey was elected chairman to succeed Wyllis E. Wright, and Mrs. Marietta Daniels Shepard was elected vice-chairman succeeding Mr. Frarey. Mr. Wright's term on the Committee was concluded during the past year and he has been succeeded as one of the Forest Press nominees by Miss Frances Hinton of the Free Library of Philadelphia.

The Committee was shocked and saddened by the sudden and untimely death in January, 1967, of Esther J. Piercy, one of its most valuable and helpful members. The Committee has expressed its deep respect and admiration for Esther Piercy's contribution to the Decimal Classification and to the library profession as a whole in a Memorial Minute adopted at its February meeting and incorporated in the minutes of that meeting.

Although Miss Piercy's term as an ALA nominee was to have expired at the end of the current year, it seemed imperative that a successor be named at once to carry on her work and to finish out her unexpired term. The Cataloging and Classification Section of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division nominated Miss Mary Louise Mann of the Indianapolis, Indiana, public schools to fill out Miss Piercy's unexpired term, and Miss Mann's nomination was confirmed in time for her to attend the Committee meetings in February.

In its deliberations this year the Committee has continued its attention to the preparation of a revised index to Edition 17, to reviewing, reaffirming, and establishing criteria and rules for the schedules and index of Edition 18, and to reviewing draft schedules for revised tables in Edition 18. It has also continued its discussions of the need for more surveys of the use of the Decimal Classification, hopefully to enable the Committee and the Forest Press to develop sound guidelines for the future development of the classification.

In March, 1966, at its 54th meeting, and as a result of expressed user dissatisfaction with the original index to Edition 17, DCEPC recommended to
Forest Press that a revised index be prepared along the lines of the index to
Edition 16, and that this revision be done as quickly as possible. The Directors
of Forest Press approved the recommendation and authorized the Library of
Congress to begin the preparation of such an index in August 1966 in the
expectation that the revised index could be published in the spring or summer
of 1967. At its October meeting, DECPC recommended certain changes in the
specifications for the revised index and these were subsequently incorporated
in the Forest Press work authorization. The manuscript for the revised index
is now at the printer and publication during the fall of 1967 seems assured.

In this connection the Committee deliberated thoroughly the need for a
concomitant revision of the index to Abridged 9 since that index derives from
the original index to Edition 17. The Committee concluded, however, after
consultation with a major user, that revision of the Abridged index was less
necessary than revision of the full index, and if it were to be done, would
delay unduly the publication of Edition 18 and Abridged 10. It has therefore
recommended to Forest Press that no revision of Abridged 9 be undertaken
but that all editorial effort be given to the preparation of Edition 18 and
Abridged 10.

Criteria and editorial rules for the tables of Edition 18 were recommended
by the Committee and approved by Forest Press prior to the beginning of the
current year. Consideration of criteria for the index of Edition 18 was deferred
until the Committee had had the opportunity thoroughly to study the Editor's
recommendations, especially in the light of unfavorable reaction to the index
to Edition 17. In the light of committee reaction, the Editor proposed a new
set of criteria for the index at the February meeting which seemed to the
Committee to meet fully its hope that the index to Edition 18 can be the best
relative index to the schedules yet produced. The new criteria which were
approved by the Committee and recommended to Forest Press provide for
many more direct entries together with a reference structure which it is hoped
will facilitate use of the index and maintain it at a manageable size.

The Committee has also approved and recommended to Forest Press drafts
of revised schedules for the social sciences, sociology, and customs and folklore
(300-309; 390-399) which the editor proposed for adoption in Edition 18. It
has also recommended approval of drafts for three new floating tables which
can be applied as needed through the classification. The development of these
three tables, (a) persons, (b) languages, and (c) racial, ethnic, and national
groups, follows the philosophy reflected in the inauguration of the area table
and the introduction of a revised table of standard subdivisions in Edition 17
whereby orderly provision is made for greater specificity in classification by
those libraries which need or wish to use it without leading to cumbersome
and overly-detailed development of the main schedules in a way which might
be confusing to those libraries that neither need nor choose the degree of
specificity which can be achieved through the use of these tables.

In this same connection, in order to make the application of existing and
proposed tables easier, the Committee approved by mail vote and passed to
Forest Press for implementation a recommendation of the Editor to substitute
“add to” directions for “divide like” notes throughout the whole classification.
In the opinion of the Committee, “add to” instructions can be phrased more
clearly and explicitly, and their use should reduce considerably the confusion
which many classifiers have experienced in attempting to follow “divide like”
directions.
The Library of Congress and Forest Press sought the advice of the Committee on a proposal to show segmentation of Decimal Classification numbers on Library of Congress cards so that classifiers can readily distinguish base numbers in the classification notation from subdivisions which a library might or might not wish to use. The outline of this proposal was presented to the Committee during 1965/66 but was not complete in its details until the October meeting of DCEPC. The Committee concurred with the proposal and the Library of Congress inaugurated the practice in February, 1967. At the time this report is written, the Committee has heard no reaction to the practice although it seems likely that the segmentation of these numbers will prove to be helpful. The Committee has also recommended to Forest Press a scheme for the segmentation of classification notation to be printed in the tables and the index of Edition 18 in order that the user may be able to read the notation more easily.

Forest Press and the Library of Congress have also sought the advice of DCEPC concerning the contents of DCk, the supplementary publication to the classification which appears periodically between editions. The Committee has expressed its concern that the appearance of the first number was delayed longer than original plans contemplated, but the Forest Press edition has now appeared, and the mass printing is now underway at the Library of Congress. Hopefully successive numbers can appear in accordance with the regular schedule which Forest Press and the Committee are agreed is most desirable.

During the year the Committee recommended to Forest Press that a study in depth of use and user satisfaction with the Decimal Classification be undertaken among United States and Canadian libraries to complement the findings of a similar study made in England and published under the title, Classification Practice in Great Britain. At the time of this report the Directors of Forest Press have not reported their reaction. The Committee has also recommended that a glossary of terms used by the editorial office in the schedules and introduction to the classification be prepared and distributed as widely as possible to all users of the classification. No action on this recommendation has yet been reported to the Committee.

At its meeting in October, the Committee was pleased to have as its guest Mr. A. J. Wells, Editor of British National Bibliography, whose comments and observations were useful to the Committee in its discussions. In February, the Committee had as its guest Mr. Richard O. Pautzsch, newly-appointed Professional Counsel to the Directors of the Forest Press. It is contemplated that Mr. Pautzsch will be invited to sit as a guest at all meetings of DCEPC for so long as he is employed by the Press as its Professional Counsel.

Members of the Committee at the end of the year are Edwin B. Colburn, Virginia Drewry, Carlyle J. Frarey, Frances E. Hinton, John A. Humphry, Mary Louise Mann, Pauline A. Seely, Marietta Daniels Shepard, and William J. Welsh. Deo B. Colburn continues to serve as the appointed secretary.—Carlyle J. Frarey, Chairman
RTSD INTERSECTIONAL COMMITTEE ON
U. S. CONGRESSES AND CONFERENCES
WITHOUT FIXED HEADQUARTERS

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES THROUGH JUNE 1967

This is an ad hoc committee appointed "to investigate improved means of acquisitions of the publications of U. S. congresses and conferences without fixed headquarters and to recommend appropriate action to the Executive Committees of the Acquisitions and Serials Sections." Creation of the committee followed a recommendation of the Serials Policy and Research Committee which on the basis of a questionnaire reported a need on the part of many libraries for easier ways to discover the existence of and to acquire such publications. The chairman of the Serials Section appointed a chairman and two members, and two members were appointed by the chairman of the Acquisitions Section. The committee held its first formal meeting at the 1964 conference in St. Louis although the members had begun to exchange ideas by mail before then.

Attempted Solutions

An attempt was made to interest a library school in making the compilation of information about the publications in question a student project, preferably a continuing one. The response was negative largely because of the scattered subject fields involved and the time-consuming checking that would go into such a project.

The chairman then inquired of the Special Libraries Association concerning the possibility of broadening the scope of Scientific Meetings but again received a negative reply.

Correspondence was carried on with Publishers' Weekly which was urged to list as many of the publications in question as possible. Publishers' Weekly was favorably inclined but nothing came of this partly because little in the way of concrete examples was found. The committee's attempts to identify specific examples of these fugitive publications were continuously unsuccessful, a fact that made it difficult to clarify exact needs.

The Committee's Bibliography

A selective bibliography of sources of information about U. S. congresses and conferences and their publications was prepared and circulated within the committee. This bibliography is divided into four parts, viz., "Sources of Information on U. S. Congresses and Conferences," "Sources of Information on Publications of U. S. Congresses and Conferences," "Projected Publications," and "Dealers That Advertise Congress and Conference Publications." This bibliography (Appendix II) is herewith published in LRTS. Provision could be made for future upkeep and expansion of the bibliography.

Two Helpful Trends

Meanwhile, two important trends seemed to be reducing the dimensions of the problem. First, there is a growing tendency on the part of organizations of all kinds to institutionalize themselves and to set up permanent secretariats.
or headquarters. This is particularly true of bodies that expect to hold future meetings and to issue publications. In other words, "congresses and conferences without fixed headquarters" seem to be becoming fewer. This trend was borne out by the study of directories of national organizations.

Secondly, a few dealers have become keenly aware of the problem and see an opportunity to serve libraries in this respect. Such dealers include Richard Abel, Alfred Phiebig, who advertises conference proceedings as one of his "stocks in trade," and the InterDok Corporation which publishes a monthly and cumulative listing entitled Directory of Published Proceedings, and which provides an acquisitions service for the listed items.

Most of the above coverage, however, is limited to science and technology, this being particularly true of InterDok. Wherever possible the committee has urged publishers of relevant directories and dealers in material of this type to expand their coverage to include the social sciences and the humanities.

**Conclusion**

Further help in solving this problem appears to lie chiefly in the expansion of existing service and activity. One example is the International Organizations Section of LC's General Reference and Bibliography Division, which already gathers and organizes a considerable amount of information on national as well as international groups and their meetings; there is a possibility that this effort may be intensified. Secondly, commercial coverage such as InterDok's (mentioned above) which does so well for the publications of scientific bodies could be expanded by InterDok itself or by some other firm to cover other fields. At any rate, the needs and problems do not seem acute enough to warrant setting up a formal project, supported by grants or carried on by voluntary work by hard-pressed librarians.

In submitting this report the committee is at the same time seeking instructions from its two parent Sections as to its future. Should it consider its mission accomplished and disband? Should it continue in being as a sort of "watchdog" and attempt to push for further coverage? Or should it remain in being to carry out a related mission assigned by the parent Sections?—Mary A. Crozer; Ian W. Thom; John G. Veenstra; Samuel T. Waters; Mary Ellis Kahler, Chairman.

**APPENDIX I**

*Library Journal Exchange of Letters*

In the August 1966 and the October 1, 1966 issues of the *Library Journal* there is an interesting interchange of letters relating to the subject matter of this committee. Charles H. Shain of the University of California, Berkeley, in an effort to break part of the conference publications "logjam" suggested that University Microfilms under an appropriate schedule of fees provide microfilm (positive) copies of conference proceedings to libraries and other interested purchasers. Under his proposal, at the conclusion of a conference a "participating" conference official would send a copy of all conference papers to University Microfilms paying for the production of a negative microfilm. University Microfilms would then sell positive microfilms at a price that would be commercially feasible and at the same time carry on some kind of listing service. All this would provide for a much more prompt coverage. Mr. Shain was concerned not only by the "buried" aspect of some conference papers, but also by the tardiness of publication of those which eventually appear in the open market.

In the October 1st issue Walter L. Necker of the Wood Library-Museum of Anesthesiology, Parkridge, Illinois, took issue with the idea of a non-profit conference un-
derwriting the costs of a commercial organization. Instead he suggested the taping of such conferences and the making available of the tapes. In the same issue Albert James Diaz of "Microcard Editions, Inc." asked "why this affinity for the Xerox Corporation when there are any number of firms capable of providing the service described?" In the same issue Mr. Shain replied that he had no objection to other firms doing the job but had made his "original proposal to University Microfilms . . . on the simple grounds that they have adequate facilities to do the job at a reasonable price." He was not opposed to the taping of conferences but felt that such a technique would satisfy a too limited audience.

APPENDIX II

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON U. S. CONGRESSES AND CONFERENCES

Directory of National Trade and Professional Associations in the U. S. 1966- Washington, D. C., Potomac Press. (Takes the place of some of the directories formerly issued by the U. S. Dept. of Commerce)

  v. 1: National Organizations of the United States.
  v. 2: Geographic and Executive Index.
  v. 3: New Associations.


International Atomic Energy Agency. Conferences, Meetings, Training Courses in Atomic Energy. No. 1, April 1959- Vienna. (Six issues a year)


Pan American Union, Division of Conferences and Organizations. Futuras Conferencias y Reuniones Interamericanas. Forthcoming Inter-American Conferences and Meetings. 1948- Washington, D. C. (Quarterly)

Scientific Meetings. No. 1, spring 1957- New York, Special Libraries Association (3 times a year)

U. S. Atomic Energy Commission. Nuclear Science Abstracts. v. 1, July 15, 1948- Oak Ridge, Tenn., Technical Information Service Extension. (Semimonthly) Subject indexes include the heading "conference"; term covers only complete proceedings or discussions of conferences as a whole.


World Convention Dates. 1916- Hempstead, N. Y. (Monthly, with cumulative issues in January and July) Shows locations of meetings, arranged by state.


World Meetings, United States and Canada. v. 1, 1963- New Hartford, N. Y., Technical Meetings Information Service. (Quarterly) Formerly Technical Meetings Index; Appendix lists published proceedings.

UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

U. S. Atomic Energy Commission. Division of Technical Information Extension (Maintains a file of information on conferences in field of nuclear sciences)

U. S. Library of Congress. International Organizations Section. (Reference files of the Section contain much information on conferences, including some of national scope. There is more information on meetings than on publications)

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON PUBLICATIONS OF U. S. CONGRESSES AND CONFERENCES

Directory of Published Proceedings. v. 1, Sept. 1965- White Plains, New York, InterDok. (Monthly with annual cumulations)
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Library Resources & Technical Services
The National Union Catalog; a Cumulative Author List Representing Library of Congress Printed Cards and Titles Reported by Other American Libraries. 1956- Washington, D. C., Library of Congress. (Monthly with quarterly, annual, and larger cumulations) Lists only conferences cataloged as monographs or for which a printed card is prepared by the Library of Congress. Excludes entries for serials.

New Serial Titles; a Union List of Serials Commencing Publication after Dec. 31, 1949. January 1953- Washington, D. C., Library of Congress. (Monthly with annual or larger cumulations) Lists only conferences whose publications are considered to be serials.

Union of International Associations. Bibliography of Proceedings of International Meetings. 1957- Brussels. (Annual)
Wayne State University, Detroit. Medical Library. Symposia and Conferences Published in Serials, Received at Wayne State University Medical Library; Preliminary Listing for the Period Oct. 15, 1965-June 30, 1966. Detroit, 1966.

PROJECTED PUBLICATIONS
American Chemical Society. List of Periodicals Abstracted by Chemical Abstracts. Projected new edition is to contain a part III which is to cover congress proceedings.

OTHER SOURCES
Many reviews, journals, or bulletins of professional organizations note conferences and conference publications. Examples are JAMA (Journal of the A.M.A.; first issue of month lists meetings), the Journal of Engineering Education, the American Archivist, Latin American Research Review, and Scientific Information Notes, issued by the National Science Foundation. Another typical source is the Calendar of Meetings and Regional Educational Associations, published by the National Catholic Educational Association.

DEALERS THAT ADVERTISE CONGRESS AND CONFERENCE PUBLICATIONS
Richard Abel & Co., Inc.
P. O. Box 4245
Portland, Oregon 97208
(Interested in seeking out this type of material. Has prepared several catalog listings.)
InterDok Corporation
6 Kenneth Road
White Plains, N. Y. 10605
(Issues Directory of Published Proceedings.)
Walter J. Johnson
111 5th Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10003
H. P. Kraus (also Kraus Periodicals, Inc.)
16 East 46th Street
New York, N. Y. 10017

Volume 12, Number 1, Winter 1968
Maxwell Scientific International, Inc.
44-01 21st Street
Long Island City, N. Y. 11101
(Provides free bibliographic information on new and forthcoming books.)

Pergamon Press
44-01 21st Street
Long Island City, N. Y. 11101
(Now has a Symposium Publications Division.)

Albert Phiebig
Box 352
White Plains, N. Y. 10602

Stechert-Hafner, Inc.
31 East 10th Street
New York, N. Y. 10003
(Its Book News, issued monthly September through May, lists some conference publications but they are usually foreign and easily identified and acquired.)

Western Periodicals Co.
13000 Raymer Street
North Hollywood, Calif., 91605
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Library Resources & Technical Services
NOMINEES FOR 1968/69

Resources and Technical Services Division

For Vice-president (President-elect):
  Mrs. Jeanne M. Holmes, National Agricultural Library, Washington, D. C.
  Carol H. Raney, Smithsonian Institution Libraries, Washington, D. C.

For Director-at-large—three-year term:
  Gladys M. Lively, Madison Public Schools, Madison, Wisconsin.
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FOR TEN YEARS I was Esther Piercy's Assistant Editor for Cataloging and Classification. They were good years. I had served on Marie Louise Prevost's committee which worked to establish the Journal of Cataloging and Classification; and later I had watched with pride while Esther Piercy built that Journal into a stimulating and sturdy voice for the profession. When I was invited to be one of Esther's assistant editors I felt that, in a sense, I was invited to carry on JCC for her in Library Resources & Technical Services; and I was sure that she had a special interest in what I was doing.

It was one of Esther's gifts that to many who knew her she was a friend but more than just a friend, a special friend. We talked and we wrote to each other about LRTS and cataloging. Best of all, we argued. Glorious, long-winded arguments. Arguments about ALA, arguments about RTSD, arguments about the world and all that was in it, what was wrong, what we could do to change it. Arguments about what she wrote and how she wrote it, arguments about what I wrote and how I wrote it. Arguments by letter, arguments in a bar at ALA meetings, arguments never ended.

Esther was gentle and persistent, thoughtful and imaginative, sensitive and tough. Always she sought excellence. In the crowded last weeks of her life she took time to read a book-long manuscript of mine and then to write a carefully detailed criticism of it. Her letter came when I was terribly busy. I thought I could not take time to reply, to thank her—and to debate a point or two. Never mind; I should see her at Mid-winter....

Now I undertake a new assignment for Esther Piercy.

To serve as Editor LRTS is not to conduct a holding operation. Just take a look at Esther's first issue (Winter 1957) and her last (Winter 1967). "Great days are ahead," she wrote in 1957, "and Library Resources and Technical Services anticipates being a part of them!" LRTS was, indeed, "a part of them" because the Editor of LRTS kept the journal abreast of, and sometimes ahead of, change.

It is not a modern discovery that we live in a world of change—although our hysterical pronouncements might have us think it so. Nor is resistance to change a modern reaction. Did all people welcome Martin Luther more easily than all people welcome Martin Luther King?

The problem with change is also old: How do we go about it?

Like all librarians, technical services people talk of standards and guidelines for this and that. But how do we get standards and guidelines?
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Do our standards and guidelines come from research which shows precisely what we really need and why? Or do a batch of us sit around a table and agree on what to demand within the framework of the status quo?

Like other librarians, we ask for more personnel; and we may get really upset with the library schools because they do not give us at once the people we want. But what will we do with more technical services librarians? Do we really need the people we say we need? Or do we need first to use more efficiently what is at our disposal? For instance, in cataloging, the various kinds of centralized processing and the greater use of the machine suggest that we may no longer need a lot of catalogers in a lot of little libraries cataloging the same books again and again. Instead, perhaps we need quality catalogers in processing centers and quality knowledge of cataloging in library administrators so that they will select or organize their processing centers with care. In one library (LC) it is a different story. The Shared Cataloging Program to which John Cronin and other LC staff are giving so much time and energy can be a great breakthrough—if LC can get from ARL libraries or elsewhere the necessary catalogers to do the job. Personnel: Is it a blanket problem with a blanket solution to preserve the status quo? Or is it a different kind of problem in different kinds of libraries?

We shout from the rooftops the advantages of automation. But do we really mean it? Are we prepared to allow automation to play a major role in every corner of our work where it can do the job more efficiently? Or do we want only enough automation to do the same old jobs we have always done in the same old way we have always done them—but more quickly? Is a stupid and unnecessary process less stupid and unnecessary if we can get a machine to do it?

We want research, we say. But are we prepared to use the results of research if it means changing something we have been doing for years? For instance, would we adopt a new and better approach to subject headings if it meant changing all those cards we already have in the file? We talk about recruitment and we put out folders. But are we truly willing to turn over RTSD to younger members and to plan an RTSD program in which every one of the several thousand members will find fulfillment?

I hope LRTS will continue to reflect change and to lead in trying to find out what to do about change.

P. S. D.
REVIEWS


The title is somewhat misleading. This is not the year's work or progress in librarianship, but a collection of articles or essays, some very good, on the general subject, but not limited to the year 1966. It is almost entirely about British librarianship and is written almost entirely by British people. The Chronology, five pages in the preliminary section, is quite insular, giving almost no attention to any happening outside Britain, but containing such items as, under date December 17, 1965: "The President of the National Book League, The Duke of Edinburgh, opens the League's exhibition of a specimen school library, comprising more than 2,000 works of non-fiction suitable for the age group 7 to 15." On August 11, 1966: "The Leader of the House states that at the last check in 1965, 2,380 books were missing from the House of Commons Library."

The foreword to the 1965 issue of this yearbook stated that the scope was not to be universal for each year, but that in perhaps four or five years, almost all subjects would be covered. The plan has been adhered to in this second issue. But the Chronology seems not to have been broadened, as was intended, according to the 1965 foreword. With these cavils now out of the way there are many good pieces to be noted.

In any yearbook with seventeen articles, one would find a variation between them in quality, and such is the case here. But the lesser pieces are not really poor. There are several really fine articles: A. J. Walford on bibliographies, B. A. Custer on the Dewey Decimal Classification, M. G. de St. V. Atkins on revising an encyclopaedia stand out.

To take the last of these first, the revision of the encyclopaedia, is written by the editor of the new Chambers's Encyclopaedia. We in America who are so "sold" on the idea that continuous revision is the best method of updating an encyclopaedia can learn much from this article. Perhaps the real reason for continuous revision is economic rather than in the interest of accuracy. The arguments for complete revision by this editor are quite strong. On the other hand, he does not slight the problems faced by the publisher who goes in for complete, periodic revisions.

A. J. Walford's contribution is a bibliographic essay on one hundred bibliographies in English, mainly, and to point out some criteria for compilation. So it is a critical essay, and a very interesting one. It also serves well as a selective bibliography of bibliographies.

Our own Benjamin A. Custer, editor of the Dewey Decimal Classification, takes up the defense of his system against the attacks of some of its detractors. Of course, the problem of this now nearly 100 year old scheme is how to maintain the integrity of numbers while allowing for new knowledge. The system is a closed, pure notation scheme with only ten possible main classes unless the integrity of numbers is given up completely. Mr. Custer's statistics of relocations, i.e., change in the meaning of the notation, shows that, while not discarded, integrity has had to be very frequently ignored. Dewey himself made 100 relocations between the 1876 and 1885 editions. By the 15th edition of 1951...
there were 1,015 relocations from the previous edition. Mr. Custer expects relocations to continue to be necessary in subsequent editions as new knowledge appears. The only way to avoid this would be to use completely impractical very long numbers.

The defense of Dewey rests, for Mr. Custer, in six virtues: stability, versatility, pragmatism, notational expressiveness, notational ingenuity, and application to specific titles by central bibliographic services, such as BNB and the Library of Congress Card Division. The strongest case is made on the basis of this wide use and availability of classification numbers already determined by central cataloging services.

There are several other good articles and none is really poor. Just the title of one, "Why Not National Book Week?", by J. Mac Gibbon is provocative. In Britain, as here, the main push behind National Library Week is the book industry. Why not give them their due?

Progress in Library Science, 1966, is a suitable acquisition for a library with a considerable collection in this area. It is certainly necessary for all library schools.—Richard H. Shoemaker, Professor, Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers—The State University, New Brunswick, N. J.


Three decades and three manuals. How important they were, those two earlier ones. Few today remember the first one—R. C. Binkley's Manual on Methods of Reproducing Research Materials, published in 1936. More will remember the 3 large, green, loose leaf binders which represent the Manual on Document Reproduction and Selection of the International Federation for Documentation in 1953. All who consider themselves professionally alert must take note of Hawk- en's Manual and many will agree that at last we've got the fine job some of us knew would come from this author.

A few moments of lucubration might not be out of place. I recall that the British Library Association Record never got around to a review of Binkley—no British library journal did. I like to believe the almost apocryphal story of Binkley's conversion to the need for a great expansion of methods of document reproduction. As a professor of history at a New York university he had been in the habit of sending his students to New York Public Library to study records of the United States at first hand—with the originals. After some time and a lot of wear on the originals, the Library authorities told him this had got to stop. They would make copies and he and his students would have to be content with them.

At first very annoyed, Binkley soon came to see the justice of their attitude and was persuaded to become the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Materials for Research and later, Chairman of the ALA Committee on Photographic Reproduction. It's a nice story to tell to students.

Binkley's Manual received enthusiastic reviews, "a long step forward . . . no other one book to which one may turn for this type of comparative information . . . is an excellent example of the photo-offset method."1 And yet 4 years later the ALA were announcing that they had bought the remaining copies of the Manual and could sell it at the reduced price of $1.75 (from $3.50). In the next breath they said "it is almost certain that the volume will soon become a bibliographic rarity." Maybe this was sales technique,

1 Ralph Carruthers, review in Library Journal, April 1, 1937, pp. 288-89.
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but I remembered it, when, 12 years later, I had to pay $28 for a Duopage copy.

The F.I.D. Manual of 1953 was, I believe, too ambitious a project. The editors hoped to include a manufacturer’s leaflet for every piece of equipment available, to describe in separate articles every method and process used, and to provide extensive bibliographies. It was almost ignored by the professional press judging by Library Literature. This shows that it only got seven reviews (and 2 of them were mine!). “It demonstrates in concise form” said Chester Lewis in the Library Journal “the interrelationships of various types of equipment and methods on an international basis.” The third volume, on selection, came in 1957. Supplements were issued for a year or two more, and then we learnt that H. R. Verry would make regular contributions to FID’s Revue de la Documentation which could be considered as a sort of continuation of their Manual.

Mr. W. R. Hawken has, I guess, lived with the two earlier Manuals for some years. His Manual was made possible by a grant from the Council on Library Resources and he had help from an advising committee which they set up. Allen Veaner of Stanford University Library prepared an annotated bibliography and C. F. Gosnell of New York University wrote an 8 page note on copyright.

Eight and a half by eleven inches in size, nearly 400 pages long, with 27 tables and 195 illustrations, the Manual is a handsome volume. Apart from a few of the illustrations, which are badly reproduced, it is a fine piece of book production.

The work is in four sections: Factors affecting the characteristics of copies, Physical characteristics of research materials, Processes, and Methods and techniques. This is certainly the logical way to approach the problem. It is important to know the details of contrast, resolving power, exposure latitude and color sensitivity of the materials to be used in making copies. This is technical in part, but the work would not deserve the title Manual if these facts were ignored or played down.

In his second section Mr. Hawken studies the characteristics of the materials, printed and non-printed, which are to be copied. There are eleven types, beginning with Books and serials and Newspapers, and ending with Microforms and Copies of originals. Naturally the make up of printed images receives much attention and many illustrations help point the moral. “Type design and size are important characteristics which are intimately related but no system of measurement exists which would be helpful in determining their reproducibility.” The point system does not help with line width and space width. One is immediately reminded of the author’s forceful article, “Microfiche, Microfilm, and Hard Copy Problems and Prospects for the Research Worker,” the essential point of which we were pleased to be able to reproduce in Microdoc: “When one considers the fact that most serial literature in virtually all fields of scholarly endeavor is designed to end up as microform, it is high time that steps were taken to make such publications more photogenic.” In the first place, the use of very small typefaces, especially typefaces having very fine line widths, should be eschewed. Secondly, sensible ratios should be established between overall size, letter height and line width for drawings, and thirdly, choice of colors and combinations of colors used in graphs and maps should take into account the limitations of black and white recording media.”

When will U.S.A.S.I. and B.S.I. prescribe certain type faces?

The illustrations to this section are fascinating as well as apt. A type face in 36-point size is shown which has a smaller "x" height than has a 24-point size of a different face. And the line of 26 different face "a"s in 36-point type shows that the "x" height of the largest face is 70% greater than that of the smallest face. Again in Ultra Bodoni, the "a" has a broad stroke fifteen times wider than the fine stroke!

Colored paper, foxing, offset, show-through, discoloration and other faults are all dealt with before the author deals with physical problems, size and shape, thickness and weight, and here one may be allowed a mild murmur—was it really necessary to have 6 illustrations showing sizes of books? In this section too, there is some overlap with the methods and techniques part. Oversewn binding, causing, in some cases loss of text at the inner margin, appears on page 67 and again on page 269. On the latter page I like to think Mr. Hawken was having a little joke as the bad example of lost text is open at an article on Bookbinding Methods for Libraries by one of Britain's experts on binding. Flat opening of full sewn binding is shown in both places too.

The last part of the section deals with characteristics of microforms and here we have succinct descriptions of all types extant. More than a brief mention is made of the growing use of 16mm roll film for libraries as against business use, with examples given of Chemical Abstracts, 1907 to 1965, and the U. S. Patent Office offer of copies of each year's patents on this size of film. A few weeks ago I saw samples of business documents on 8mm unperforated film. And planetary cameras are being developed for both sizes to give better definition.

Microfiche, micro-opaques and a new (sic) form of opaque called Mini-print are shortly described. There is nothing new about the Mini-print idea, reducing text by between 3 and 6 diameters; it was being done in the 1930's by Fiske, Van Iterson and Bendikson. Sometimes it is humbling to look back—"finally Dr. Sayce is on the right track when he settles on high reduction as his immediate study, for film rolls in readers' hands must be regarded as temporary. We shall surely come to flat photography on cards, as Dr. Bendikson has insisted—cards probably both opaque and translucent"—this was written in 1958 by that grand pioneer, Dr. Raney.

Mr. Hawken describes Microcards as having on the average, from 24 to 48 pages, depending on the size of the original and the reproduction ratio used. My experience suggests that these figures are very low, particularly with double sided Microcards. One characteristic which is worth a mention, I think, is the robustness of the opaques over film and the fact that fiche are usually kept in no-flap envelopes or translucent jackets.

Section 3—Processes, is by far the largest of the work. It has details of 25 "one-off" processes and five which are titled "edition processes." "Nineteen fifty" says Hawken, "marked the beginning of a revolution in the photocopying field." (He is writing of macro-copying)—"in that one year diffusion-transfer-reversal, Thermofax and Xerography all became commercially available... photocopying was suddenly taken out of the dark room... and placed in well lighted offices where clerical personnel were soon making copies in seconds at costs measured in pennies instead of dollars! Today, in the United States, the dollar volume of the office copy industry is near the $1 billion mark."

The method used by the author in
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the many parts of this section, is to describe the particular process under the headings Materials, Contrast, Resolving power, Exposure latitude, Speed, Color sensitivity, Keeping quantities (i.e. shelf life), Permanence, Suitability, and Manufacturers and Equipment. A table showing the principal characteristics of the process is given for each. These are quickly revealing and one can compare the good and bad points of different processes very easily. Mr. Hawken pulls no punches—in xerography, the potential waste factor is "low," but the quality of continuous tone images is "poor,"

whilst in the silver halide process, the waste factor is "moderate" and the continuous tone "excellent." Other headings in these tables are, Permanence of Copies, Reproduction of fine details, Contrast, Tendency to curl, Time required to make a $8\frac{1}{2} \times 11$ inch copy, Cost per copy, and Price range of equipment.

At the end of the section the author allows himself a few words on processes "under development": Imagic process (with a diagram from a 1961 textbook!), Photo- and copy-chromic processes, Xerographic frost imaging, and the General Electric Company's Thermoplastic recording. This too, we've known from about 1961.

An earlier statement which I would have put in this "under development" part concerns the Midex camera for microxerography. Mr. Hawken says it is undergoing field testing at John Crerar Library. Surely that was being done in 1964. What has happened since then? CLR seems to be keeping quiet about it.

Just under 90 pages are devoted to the Methods and techniques section with just over half, going to micro-copying. Contact copying gets 20 pages and every physical action used in exposing the copy has a large illustration. This is a noticeable feature of the work—the lavish size of most of the nearly 200 illustrations—some are unnecessarily large.

In the micro part, one early statement has long puzzled me and I have never received a satisfactory answer from the experts. "Reversal processing is little used in the document reproduction field," says the author. But he does not tell us why it is not. As one would expect the microfiche is given much attention and stress is laid on standardization. Line drawings, to scale, of nine variant forms are shown, and we are told that in Europe there can be 42 different formats. The French, we understand, have been fighting a last-ditch battle to get agreement on varying the frame size if necessary within the same fiche.

An interesting closed-system microfiche project where standards do not obtain because no one else uses the product is that of the Dutch Land Office. Here hand written large sheets of land registry are copied, 92 pages on to $148 \times 210$ mm fiche. Special adapted reader-printers are provided to supply copies to enquirers. (It is a pity this sub-entry in the index under "Microfiche" is "out of column"). Many pages are devoted to the preparation for, and the making of microfilm and one could devote a lot of space to commenting on the author's suggestions. It is far too late I suppose, to expect any change from the word "target," but some of us in Britain wonder why this incorrect meaning is put on the word. After all it is only a sign put in an important place on a roll of microfilm or on a microfiche. We aim at targets; we see signals clearly, or should do. (I am aware that one minor definition of target is American railway signal).

Mr. Hawken has a hundred and one hints and tips for the microfilmer. He gives much attention to retakes and suggests that adequate labor and materials cost studies must be maintained.
so that one can determine when complete refilming would be cheaper than many retakes and splicing in. A very useful chart shows filming position of originals to give optimum success with Copyflo enlarging and subsequent binding. At this point the British Caps-Jeffree enlarger (on to diazo paper) gets a mention. This machine was a real break-through because the inexpensive paper used gave it a great advantage over silver halide papers. The section ends with a look at hard copy from reader-printers, and as we now expect, some useful illustrations and tables add point to the text.

There are five appendices and a glossary. As mentioned at the beginning of this notice, Allen Veaner prepared the bibliography, and C. F. Gosnall a note on copyright. These are two of the appendices. The others are on Document reproduction services in libraries, Acquisition of reproductions of research materials, and Standards (international, domestic, and other national).

"Presumably it should be possible to codify the experiences of the many institutions which have operated such services over many years and to establish a firm corpus of recommended policies and practices. Such, however is not the case . . . it becomes increasingly difficult to make valid generalizations about the nature and operation of document reproduction services in libraries" says Mr. Hawken.

This is unfortunate but true. So much so that the Microfilm Association of Great Britain hopes to run in 1967 a conference on the administration and organization of photocopying services in large libraries so that better order can be brought about. Mr. Hawken makes many points, particularly on costing, which are going to be of great use to us. The only recent long look so far, S. M. Boone’s "Current Administrative Practice in Photographic Services" (Univ. of North Carolina M. A. thesis, 1964) only begins to set the scene of the problem. (Why couldn't Mr. Hawken and Mr. Veaner tell us that this thesis is available in the ACRL Microcard Series, no. 151?)

The chapter on Acquisition prompts the point that Kodak in London offers the Times Ed. and Lit. Supplements on microfilm as well as the daily Times, and a question about Bell and Howell's "Duopage Out of Print Books"—why is nobody in Britain using this technique? Another question, why did Bowker have to reprint the TLS when it has been long available on film?

Mr. Veaner's bibliography runs to 102 titles and is sectionalised under headings such as Reference books, Periodicals, Conference proceedings, Equipment, Microfilming, Storage and preservation, etc. It is good to see one section on some user viewpoints, including Verner Clapp's still valid article with the hard-hitting title, "Are Your Microfilms Deteriorating Acceptably?" A comment or two may be made—Microdoc issued microfiche as well as microopaque cards—the subscriber could choose which type he wanted. In future the form is to be 4 X 6 inch microfiche. Because Revue Internationale de la Documentation died in 1965, Verry's quarterly summary had to be issued in the FID News Bulletin. George Davison (not Davidson) did the British Review of Equipment for Microtext. Fixed reduction ratios in library microfilming ought not to be a "definite novelty" as the ISO standard on this has been with us since 1961. Mr. Veaner is too modest about his earlier bibliography, The Literature of Document Reproduction, which appeared (in 2nd edition) in an Illinois Graduate School of Library Science Occasional Paper in 1963. It still remains the best bibliography we have had and the present work is distilled from it.
This Manual brings to a small, though complicated and important section of library techniques, a conspectus of considered fact and thought which has not been equalled before. Nor is it likely to be for a long time to come. The book is a yardstick for all our present work in photographic laboratories and it will be a base against which future progress may be measured. It is good to know that Mr. Hawken will go on with his work for the Library Technology Program with the support of the Council on Library Resources. He has the moral support of the Old World too.—L. L. Ardern, Associate Editor of Microdoc, and Deputy Librarian, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland.


The 1954 Guide to Microfilming Practices may be considered to be the precursor of these two guides. The Library of Congress one was conceived because “numerous enquiries concerning Library of Congress practices and recommendations” were made. The Specifications are now sent out with orders for microfilm placed by LC.

We have been waiting some time for the work of Mr. Scott's Committee. It had been promised for 1964 and in 1965 it was to be “imminently published.” But it was well worth waiting for.

Both guides set out to bring some sort of order to the chaos of obsolete and indifferent practice. There is now no excuse for any more “hit and miss microfilming.” Both insist that their recommendations are based on existing standards. Where standards do not exist, Norms gives those procedures which are, in the opinion of the Committee, the best. In the absence of an American standard for reduction ratio it leans a little on the ISO one—14X reduction for “normal” sized material and 20X for the rest. The Specifications go no further than suggest that one should use 14X for small type and 20X reduction if the type size is 9-10 pt and 30X for 12-14 pt size. Both works show adequate diagrams for image placement on the film, though why Norms depicts two strips of presumably 35mm film in Figure 8 in two different widths, I would not know.

Glossaries of about 30 terms are given in both works though only half are common to both. As with the Chinese, who say that the beginning of all wisdom is to call things by their right names, I prefer the definitions to come at the front of the work—as in the Norms. Its language, too, is more precise, it punches home the recommended practice with almost total brevity and this, in my opinion, is a psychological factor of importance.

There would be little purpose gained in trying to give a detailed comparison, one with the other. I would guess that Peter Scott's Committee has gained much from the 1964 LC Specifications. I would like to think that that work would not now need to be reprinted and that the expertise which went into it could be transferred to Scott's team and so help enable Norms to receive “periodic revision and extension in the future.”

—L. L. Ardern, Associate Editor of Microdoc, and Deputy Librarian, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland.
OAS ISSUES TECHNICAL AID TO
LATIN AMERICAN LIBRARIES

A basic tool for the organization of libraries in Latin America has just been
made available by the General Secretariat of the Organization of American
States (OAS). The three volume Lista de encabezamientos de materia para
bibliotecas is a Spanish language list of subject headings for the subject analysis
of library books.

The work is expected to be an invaluable aid to Latin American libraries,
which will be able, through its usage, to achieve greater uniformity of heading
terms than it has been possible in the past. It contains over 10,000 different
terms in all fields of knowledge, with many subdivisions, and indicates related
subjects, for the guidance of both librarians and library users. The Lista will be
particularly useful to those hemisphere libraries utilizing either an alphabetical
subject catalogue or a dictionary catalogue. As a result of the adoption of these
standard listings, closer cooperation among libraries will ensue, since it will
lead to an easier transmission of information and the use of Latin American
libraries by researchers, students and the general reading public.

Two 450-page volumes compose the Spanish list, a third volume including
an English-Spanish index to the Spanish terms, to assist libraries which have up
to now used similar lists in English and have translated on their own each of
the terms. The Spanish list is based primarily on the Library of Congress list
as adopted in most large libraries in the United States and in many other
countries.

Prepared on the initiative of Marietta Daniels Shepard, Chief of the OAS
Library Development Program, the Lista was compiled by Carmen Rovira and
Jorge Aguayo, with the assistance of a grant from the Council on Library
Resources, Inc.

Some ten years have passed since the project was launched. The last five
years were devoted to the obtaining the terms used in some of the leading
libraries of Latin America, and to interfiling, revision, unification of terminology
and style, and the consolidated compilation proper. The compilers were aided
by an advisory committee of Latin American and U.S. subject heading specialists
who met in Washington in 1965 to review the progress of the work, determine
the general principles, and formulate specific recommendations concerning the
final preparation of the book.

Total cost of the compilation and publication has been estimated at more
than $75,000, including salaries of the OAS staff assigned to the task, fees of
professional and auxiliary personnel under contract, etc. The $25,000 grant
from the Council on Library Resources, Inc. enabled the OAS to contract full-
time additional professionals, convene the meeting of the advisory committee,
purchase the tape-punching typewriter for the setting up of the final text, and to
publish the Lista.
It is hoped that the total cost of the project will be more than compensated by the savings to the Latin American list users, not only in terms of time saved that was previously devoted to the translation and adaptation of English headings, but also in making possible new plans for cooperative or centralized cataloguing based on the list. These savings could easily amount to $200,000 a year if an estimated 2,000 libraries spent as little as $100 a year on establishing headings. If 100 of the larger libraries have one cataloguer on this job, at a minimum annual salary of $3,000, and additional economy of $300,000 per year may be achieved. Furthermore, the use of perforated tape will facilitate future list revisions.

As is customary, the OAS Library Development Program has distributed free copies to approximately 2,000 of the most important libraries in Latin America and to library schools in the United States. Additional copies at $12.50 for the 3 volumes, may be purchased from Sales and Promotion, Pan American Union, Washington, D. C., 20006, or from the OAS Offices in the member states.

ANNOUNCING

A computer compatible filing code
FOR: DOCUMENTALISTS • CATALOGERS • LIBRARIANS
PUBLISHERS • COMPUTER PERSONNEL

An important book for those using or contemplating use of computer information storage and retrieval systems. A workable filing code that makes it possible to deal with all catalog entries, even the most complex.

Written by Dr. Theodore C. Hines and Jessica L. Harris and sponsored by The Bro-Dart Foundation, this new filing code suggests actual steps for implementing filing rules for all bibliographic material dealt with on the computer. The code, wherever reasonable, makes the mechanical filing abilities of a computer compatible with accepted library procedures.

"COMPUTER FILING" includes a set of manual filing rules recommended for achieving the same arrangement with or without adoption of the computer code so that later conversion to computer based catalogs will be easier. Included, too, is an extensive filing example showing comparison of rules of the code with A.L.A. rules.

Address orders for Computer Filing of Index Bibliographic and Catalog Entries to:

The Bro-Dart Foundation
Dept. LRT-4, 113 Frelinghuysen Avenue, Newark, N.J. 07101

PRICE: $5.95
CUSHING-MALLOY, INC.
1350 North Main Street
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

LITHOPRINTERS
known for

QUALITY—ECONOMY—SERVICE

Let us quote on your next printing

THE
BAKER
&TAYLOR
CO.
OLDEST AND LARGEST BOOK
WHOLESALER IN THE U.S.

• Most complete first-shipment service
• 1 1/2 million books in each division stock
• More than 100,000 different titles
• Biggest stocks of University Press books
• Discounts competitive... bidding welcomed
• Complete reports on shorts

Order from nearest warehouse:
DIVISION ADDRESSES: Hillside, N.J. 07205 • Momence, III. 60954 • Reno, Nev. 89502 • School Center, 50 Kirby Ave., Somerville, N.J. 08876 • Interstate Library Service (subsidiary) 4600 N. Cooper, Okla. City, 73118

Expert Service on
MAGAZINE SUBSCRIPTIONS
for
ALL LIBRARIES

Faxon’s Librarians Guide
Available on request

For the very best library subscription service—ask about our Till Forbidden Automatic Renewal plan.

F. W. FAXON CO., INC.
515-525 Hyde Park Ave.
Boston, Mass. 02131

Continuous Service to Libraries
Since 1886

Chiang’s New Model
Catalog Card Duplicator
Price $54.50

Important improvements achieved from wide experience, assure to produce high quality catalog cards, with enlarged space good also for printing post-card, book card, book pocket, address, etc. Pus new features in stencil and new ink to dry in 10 minutes. Patented • Performance Guaranteed
Order “On Approval” Invited
Order now directly from the Inventor:
Chiang Small Duplicators
53100 Juniper Road
South Bend, Indiana 46637
**JUST PUBLISHED!**

**ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ASSOCIATIONS**

**A NEW EDITION OF THE FOREMOST GUIDE TO VITAL INFORMATION ON OVER 10,000 SUBJECTS—FIFTH EDITION, 1968, THREE VOLUMES**

- 13,600 Timely, Detailed Entries
- Over 1,800 New Entries
- 1,330 Pages
- Three new categories included
- 30,000-entry alphabetical/keyword index

**VOLUME 1: NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE U.S.** is the only major source of detailed information on nonprofit American organizations of national scope. As such, it has become indispensable to librarians, executives, teachers, students, and others who have learned that an association is often the only reliable source for essential up-to-date facts and figures and the logical first contact for statistical data, market research, background information, specialized publications, guest speakers, publicity, or doing many other jobs in specialized areas.

**1,800 NEW ENTRIES ADDED, PRIOR ENTRIES REVISED**

Every entry carried over from the previous edition has been reviewed—usually by an official of the organization listed—and changes have been made as required in all the fifteen key items of information supplied for all organizations. Users will find current information on: 1. Organization. 2. Acronym or abbreviation. 3. Address. 4. Chief official. 5. Founding date. 6. Members. 7. Paid staff. 8. State and local chapters. 9. Description of activities. 10. Special committees. 11. Sections and divisions. 12. Publications. 13. Affiliated organizations. 14. Mergers and changes of name. 15. Coming conventions and annual meetings.

**COVERAGE IS BROADENED**

Three kinds of organizations are included in Volume 1 for the first time:

1. **TWO TYPES OF NON-MEMBERSHIP GROUPS:** (A) Organizations, such as operating foundations, which have primarily a research or social function. An example is the Thomas A. Dooley Foundation, which brings medical care to people in the developing nations. (B) Commercial organizations such as the Research Institute of America whose names erroneously suggest voluntary membership groups.

2. **FOREIGN GROUPS:** Groups without counterparts in America whose purpose has interest for Americans. These include Britain’s Heraldry Society and Tennyson Society.

3. **SOME TYPES OF LOCAL AND REGIONAL GROUPS:** Groups organized around a geographically restricted skill, industry, or interest whose objectives have interest outside their immediate vicinities. Typical of these is the Los Angeles Copyright Society—attorneys practicing copyright law in the entertainment world.

**BREAKDOWN OF GROUPS LISTED IN THE NINETEEN SUBJECT-INTEREST CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject-Interest Categories</th>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Organizations, Commodity Exchanges</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic and Sports Organizations</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers of Commerce (Bi-national)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and Cultural Organizations</td>
<td>1,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal, Foreign Interest, Ethnic Organizations</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations Not Elsewhere Classified</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental, Military and Legal Organizations</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Letter Societies</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Medical Organizations</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby and Avocational Organizations</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticultural Organizations</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Unions</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs Organizations</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Organizations</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific and Technical Organizations</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare Organizations</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Business and Commercial Organizations</td>
<td>2,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans, Hereditary and Patriotic Organizations</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations which are Inactive, Defunct, or have Changed Their Names</td>
<td>3,305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TWO SUPPLEMENTAL VOLUMES CONTINUED**

**VOLUME II: GEOGRAPHIC-EXECUTIVE INDEX**

This volume is arranged in two sections: (1) GEOGRAPHIC—names and addresses of all organizations carried in Volume 1, listed alphabetically by state and city. (2) EXECUTIVE—each chief official’s name is listed alphabetically, followed by title, organization, city, and state. 392 pages.

**VOLUME III: NEW ASSOCIATIONS**

A periodic updating service issued to keep subscribers informed about new associations that will come to the editors’ attention during the three-year period between publication of the fifth and sixth editions of Volume 1. Covers up to twelve 32-page supplements containing information on 2,000 organizations.

**VOLUME I: NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE U.S.** $29.50
**VOLUME II: GEOGRAPHIC-EXECUTIVE INDEX** $17.50
**VOLUME III: NEW ASSOCIATIONS** $25.00

1400 Book Tower

**GALE RESEARCH COMPANY** Detroit—48226
New

LAROUSSE TROIS VOLUMES

A handy, easy to consult medium sized working tool for libraries. The entire French language, human knowledge including the most recent technological advances, a clear and direct approach to all definitions have been recast by specialized editors.

Paris 1965-66 3300 pages 3 volumes cloth $116.50

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

“CONFIDENCE”

In Our Complete Periodicals Service

—American or foreign. All periodicals, handled with a degree of accuracy, second to none! Write for our Brochure—then ASK FOR REFERENCES from any one of the hundreds of Librarians taking advantage of our outstanding and accepted procedures—Specialists in the Special Library field. Send your list and ask for a quotation and recommendations.

“PROMPTNESS IS A TRADITION WITH McGREGOR”


OUR 35TH YEAR

SUBSCRIBE TO
McGREGOR
PERIODICALS
BULLETIN

MCXGEROR
Magazine Agency

MOUNT MORRIS ILLINOIS 61054
YOU CAN HAVE A WELL ROUNDED PRINTING, STORAGE and FILING PROGRAM when you use PERMALIFE, a Thorographic paper by Standard of Richmond. PERMALIFE is acid-free and absolutely dependable. A life of several hundred to a thousand and more years is assured.* Use PERMALIFE with confidence for

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

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

*According to tests made of PERMALIFE by the W. J. Barrow Research Laboratory. Details upon request.

STANDARD PAPER MANUFACTURING CO.
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA
For Libraries That Want Quality Bookbinding

GLICK BOOKBINDING CORP.

Specialists in the Binding and Rebinding of Books and Periodicals

Serving Institutional, Public And Research Libraries Since 1905

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

In Nassau and Suffolk
Area Code 516 483-9534

In New Jersey
Area Code 201 642-5374