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Filing Rules for a Three-Dimensional Catalog

JOHN DULKA
Assistant Director for Public Services
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Library
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

and

JOSEPH Z. NITECKI*
Assistant Director for Technical Services
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

In order to increase the efficiency of Public Catalogs, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Library divided its catalogs into three independent units. This report describes the simplified rules of filing developed for that arrangement.

THE PROBLEMS OF FILING and the consequent search for their solutions are the perennial headaches of practicing librarians. The complexity of the issue is directly proportional to the size of the card catalogs and the makeshift devices to resolve the crises vary with the type of library that is willing to experiment. As if this were not enough, the computer experts remind us that "the mechanization of filing rules is the next necessary milestone in the continuing application of computers by the library profession."

Although this paper is written with full awareness of the problems in filing, it does not address itself to them directly. We do not attempt to evaluate other filing systems nor do we recommend our own. We are merely reporting on a filing system which has been developed and successfully applied in our own library.

Background

"For years, librarians and their clerical assistants have been seen standing in front of banks of catalog drawers trying to figure out, guidebook in hand, just where to put a particular catalog card."\(^2\)

* Mr. Nitecki was Assistant Director for Technical Services, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Library, at the time he wrote the article.
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We do not concede the ignorance of filing rules by our staff, since we were always lucky to secure the help of at least one expert in these matters. We do, however, admit that the filing rules are black magic to some professionals, to many civil service personnel and to most student filers. The number of users, be they faculty or students, refusing to be bothered by any filing system was never estimated. Most people select the drawer and then patiently plow through all the cards. All attempts to educate the users of catalogs, together with numerous efforts to adapt the official rules to local filing needs, fell short of success.

It became obvious to us that the sophistication of well-developed and comprehensive LC or ALA Rules of Filing were not utilized in practice. We suspect from discussions with professional visitors and conference colleagues that we are not alone in this predicament.

At the same time, a close observation of the pattern of use of our Public Catalogs suggests that in an overwhelming number of cases, the catalogs are used as indexes to the collection rather than the sources of bibliographic information. The accessibility of various bibliographies, designed for the specific use, quite often fulfills the needs of the searcher much more efficiently than the card catalog.

This review of the purposes of the Public Catalogs was reinforced by our success in dividing the Public Catalogs three ways, into separate Author, Title, and Subject Catalogs. None of the arrangements in these catalogs is complicated, and the division itself automatically simplifies some of the rules of filing originally designed for the traditional concept of a dictionary catalog. In short, the complexity of the existing rules of filing, together with the changing character and composition of the Public Catalogs in the UWM Library, prompted us to experiment with simplified, homemade rules of filing.3

Introductory Remarks

Public Catalogs in the UWM Library are arranged in three completely separate units:

1. Title Catalog: entries for all publications by the exact title which appears on the title page.
2. Author Catalog: entries for all publications by the personal or corporate names associated with the work.
3. Subject Catalog: entries for publications by a subject heading assigned by a cataloger.

Title Catalog.—The Title Catalog contains at least one title card for each entry in the collection and for each volume on order. Added title entries are made whenever necessary. All title main entries and entries for series set up as titles are included in this catalog.4

3 The authors acknowledge the encouragement of Mark M. Gormley, Director of UWM Libraries, and the assistance of the library staff in developing the rules.
4 For full description of the Title Catalog in the UWM Library see: Joseph Z. Nitecki, "Title Catalog, a Third Dimension," College & Research Libraries, 29 September 1968, 431-36.
The filing arrangement is divided into three sections: signs, letters, and numerals. Each section contains cards with the corresponding first filing unit. The application of this arrangement in our Title Catalog is illustrated in the example at the end of this report.

**Author Catalog.**—The Author Catalog contains main and added entries for persons or corporate bodies associated with the work. The series main entries set up as author entries are also filed in this catalog. When a main entry consists of more than one card, a full set of cards is filed only in the Author Catalog and the Shelflist. For all other entries an adjusted “front card” is used.

In this arrangement personal names precede all other entries with exactly the same wording. Among the same personal names, names with no birth dates file in front of names with dates; names with complete dates (i.e., birth and death dates) interfile with the names having the same birth date only. In case of conflict, an additional search is made to complete the dates so that works of the same person are together.

All added entries are filed as “running entries,” that is, exactly as typed, up to the end of the raised heading. If the author entry is sub-arranged by title, the supplementary rules for filing in the Title Catalog are followed. The corporate entries with exactly the same filing words followed by geographical designations, such as “(State),” “(City),” are interfiled, with cross-references made from the omitted designation.

**Subject Catalog.**—The Subject Catalog contains conventional subject headings assigned in accordance with LC rules for subject headings. Subject entries are not typed on each card but instead, guide cards are made for each subject heading appearing in the tracing on each entry. This practice allows for interfiling old and new forms of headings behind the guide card made for the subject heading currently used by LC.

The catalog is arranged alphabetically by subject disregarding all punctuation, including dashes. However, if the heading contains dates or numerals, that subject is subarranged chronologically or numerically. For this purpose that part of the subject entry containing the dates is considered as a subdivision. The subdivision begins with the preceding dash and is arranged as if the date began the subdivision. As an illustration from our list of examples, the subject, “Great Britain—History—Hanoverian period, 1688–1722,” is filed as if printed “Great Britain—History—1688–1722, Hanoverian period.”

In formulating our filing rules we have abandoned the concept of readjusting the entry to fit the needs of filing arrangement. It is important for us to maintain a high level of compatibility between the arrangements in the card catalogs and the arrangements in published bibliographies, but without additional editing of LC entries. However, this principle does not apply to obvious inconsistencies in the format of the entry, such as variations in punctuation, incomplete personal
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dates, etc. If the inconsistency involves omission only, we assume that
the entries are the same and interfile, e.g.,

(a) Henry of Huntington, 1084?-1155
    Henry, of Huntington, 1084?-1155
(b) Churchill, Winston Leonard Spencer, 1874-

The principle of filing "word-by-word" retains some conceptual
aspect of the traditional filing systems. This decision was based on the
assumption that many users of the catalogs think in "words" rather
than "letters." This assumption is, of course, questioned by some ex-
erts, especially in commercial filing systems, who prefer "letter-by-
letter" arrangements or even first name entries instead of surnames.

Our own sentiment is also divided. One of us would not like to
interfile entries such as "New man" with "Newman"; the other would
prefer to interfile "Newsweek" with other entries starting with "New,"
instead of placing it at the end of that word sequence.

In formulating filing rules an attempt was also made to compromise
the filing arrangement with the requirements of computer filing. The
basic difficulty in this approach is created by a desire to print the
entries in book catalogs in one format, but to sort them by another.
Thus, for instance, we would like to have together, and in numerical
order, entries beginning with the word "first," "second," etc., without
changing the word "first" to numeral "1."

Sorting by selective parts of an entry involves an extensive pre-
punch editing. It seems, in effect, that what could be gained by fully
automated filing would be offset by time-consuming editing. Thus, a
complete adaptability of the filing rules to computer specifications poses
two distinct problems: (a) a simplification of the existing rules for
descriptive cataloging, or (b) a simplification of the rules for filing
adaptable to the mechanical, nonconceptual, arrangements.

In choosing the second approach we were forced to give up some of
the advantages of bibliographic distinctions provided by the first ap-
proach. In return, we have gained some semblance of uniformity by
filing cards in less meaningful but perhaps more obvious sequences.
A patron usually looks for retrieval of one author, title, or subject. He
wants to locate it as quickly as possible using a familiar approach.

Some Weaknesses of the System.—At the time of the writing of
this report the filing rules are already implemented. The following are
the first impressions gathered to date:

1. The new approach will disturb the unity of technical arrange-
ment developed by LC, ALA, and similar professional systems of
filing.
2. Users familiar with the existing rules will have to readjust their
pattern of search.
3. Filing "word-by-word" does interrupt the alphabetical "letter-by-
letter" arrangement.
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4. The filing is still not fully mechanical, inheriting perhaps all the disadvantages of a compromise.

**Conclusion.**—The rules described in this paper do work. They work well for the user and the staff of our library. Subject to verification in the future, the new rules save time in filing, in instructing filers and in retrieval of information from the catalogs. The number of errors in filing cards is down and the number of complaints from users is nil. This last “nonreaction” can, of course, indicate one of two things: either the user is satisfied with the new filing, or he is not aware of the changes made. We would “drink to” each of these effects with equal enthusiasm.

**FILING RULES: GENERAL**

A. The overall arrangement of the card catalog is by the type of the first unit in the entry and in the following order:

1. **Signs:**
   a. Signs (e.g., “?,” “*,” “$,” etc.) are filed before letters and are subfiled by the first letter that follows; signs without letters file before signs with letters.
   b. Signs or symbols within the filing entry will be disregarded and arranged by the word following the sign.

2. **Letters of the alphabet:**
   Entries are arranged letter by letter to the end of the word, word by word to the end of the entry. Entries in non-Roman alphabet are transliterated in tracing and filed as transliterated.

3. **Numbers:**
   Numbers follow letters and are arranged chronologically or numerically with the lowest number first, inclusive number in front of specific number (e.g., 20th Century before 1900–). When subarranging by numerals, use numerals in order of their appearance.

B. Nothing files before something.

C. **File as printed:**

1. Acronyms, prefixes, elisions, conjunctive marks, e.g., “etc.,” letters (e.g., “vv” as “vv” and not as “w”).
2. Words and names spelled in different ways.
3. Abbreviations are filed as word units (that is, abbreviations are not spelled out) and each word unit is filed as spelled (e.g., Mc is filed after Mac).
4. Single letters as initials or abbreviations:
   a. Initials in personal names are filed as printed, i.e., each letter is a separate filing unit. This rule also applies when personal names are used in corporate entries.
   b. Nonpersonal initials or abbreviations are always filed together as a word unit.

D. **Disregard for filing purposes:**

1. Initial articles in all languages in main and added entries.
2. Letters preceding personal dates (e.g., “d,” “b,” “fl,” “ca,” etc.).
3. Abbreviations for no date “[n.d.]” file at the end of the date sequence.
4. Letter prefixes and suffixes to the numbers (e.g., “no.,” “number,” 15th).
5. Letter modifications and diacritical marks.
6. All punctuation marks, except:
   a. Comma (when separating personal names in the author catalog).
   b. Apostrophe (file separated parts as one unit, unless used in initial article).
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c. Hyphen (file as two separate units).
d. Period when referred to in specific rules.

7. Cross-references are made for any arrangements departing from the above rules as needed for clarification of filing sequence (e.g., "U.S. see United States"). The words "see" and "see also" with the wording that follows are disregarded in filing. "See" entries file at the beginning of the sequence, "see also" at the end of the sequence.

FILING RULES: SUPPLEMENT I: TITLE CATALOG

A. The end of the title entry is indicated by a period. If there is no period, title entry ends before the connecting words such as "edited by," "translated by," "introduction by," etc. (Most of the title entries are underlined in the UWM title catalog).

B. Titles with the same entry are subarranged alphabetically by author, by publication date in reverse order (i.e., most recent publication first), then by publisher. Publications with no date or "n.d." file at the end of the date sequence.

C. "On order" slips are interfiled in the title catalog by title; slips for titles already in the collection (i.e., orders completing gaps) are arranged behind the entry.

FILING RULES: SUPPLEMENT II: AUTHOR CATALOG

A. The filing entry ends at:
   2. The last unit: in other cases.

B. Identical entries (in 1 or 2 above) are further subarranged in the following order:
   1. Letters, words, or numbers following commas or periods, up to the end of the author entry.
   2. Titles (All added entries are subarranged by title and not by the author entry.)
   3. Published date in reverse order (i.e., most recent date first).
   4. Publisher.

C. Designations such as rank, title, editor, etc., if not used as the initial filing unit, are disregarded in filing. When only the single name is given, file in front of all other similar names and subarrange by remainder of entry as printed, including designation. Written numbers indicating numerical arrangement are filed as numbers (e.g., "second series" filed as "2 series"). Dates of birth and death are disregarded except when needed in subarranging identical author entries.

FILING RULES: SUPPLEMENT III: SUBJECT CATALOG

A. The subject entry is the complete heading as typed on the guide card, disregarding all punctuation marks, except when dates or numerals are included in the subject heading.

B. Chronological and numerical arrangement:
   1. Subdivisions without dates are filed in front of the same subdivision with the date.
   2. Dates or numerals within a subdivision are filed as if printed in front of that subdivision. For this purpose, "subdivision" is defined as that part of the heading which follows a dash.
   3. All single dates are filed as beginning dates.

C. In addition to General Rule D 2, the following words or letters in front of dates should be disregarded for filing purposes and interpreted as follows:
   to: (e.g., "to 449") (file as "O-,", e.g., "O - 449")
   B.C.: Before Christ The dates with B.C. abbreviations should be filed in
   A.D.: Anno Domini front of dates with A.D. abbreviations.
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British economy in 1975
British economy of the nineteenth century
British economy: problems and prospects
British economy, 1920–1957
British economy, 1945–1950
3 poems for Benedetta Barzini
4 artists of the Americas
13 cuentos y El diablo
100 American poems of the twentieth century
100% money
100 more story poems
La 628-E8.
1000 years of Greek vase painting
1877: year of violence
1930’s painting and sculpture in Americas
2300 steps to word power
338171 T. E. (Lawrence of Arabia)

Author Catalog: Example
Abbo, monk of St. Germain, ca. 850-ca. 923.
Abbo, John A 1911–
Abbot, George, Abp. of Canterbury, 1562–1633.
Abbot, George, 1603–1648.
Abbot, Robert, 1588?–1662?
Adam, of Cobsam.
Adam, of Eynsham, fl. 1196–1232.
Adam, Adolf, 1918–
Adam, Mme. Juliette, 1880–1922.
Adam, Julius C.
Adam de la Halle, ca. 1231-ca. 1288.
Adam international review.
Adam (Mystery)
Adam Smith, 1776–1926; lectures to commemorate . . .
Adams, Abigail (Smith) 1744–1818.
Adams, Mrs. Emma Hildreth.
Adams, Francis, 1796–1861, tr.
Adams, Sir Francis Ottiwell, 1825–1889.
Adams, George, pseud.
Adams, George Burton, 1851–1925.
Adams, Sir John, 1857–
Errors in school.
Adams, John, 1857–
The Herbartian psychology applied to education.
Adams, John, d. 1866.
Adams, John R 1900–
Adams, Samuel, 1722–1803.
Adams, St. Clair, 1883– joint comp.
Adams, Thomas, fl. 1612–1653.
Adams, Thomas, 1871–1940.
Adams family.
Adams Manuscript Trust, Boston.
The Adams papers. Series I: Diaries
Bible. English. Selections.
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Bible. English. 1535. Coverdale.
The Bible in art; miniatures, paintings, drawings and . . .
Bible. Manuscripts, Greek. Codex alexandrinus.
Bible. N.T. Hebrew. 1901.
Bible. N.T. Titus. English. Paraphrases. 1535?
The Bible of the world; edited by Robert O. Ballou . . .
Bible. O.T. Aramaic. 1959.
Bible. Syriac. N.T. Gospels. 1894-
Churchill, Winston Leonard Spencer, 1874-
Blood, sweat, and tears.
Churchill.
D., J.
D., T.
Daalder Hans.
DAVI conference proceedings.
David, Claude.
Day, Lillian, 1893-
Day-Lewis, Cecil, 1904-- ed.
Dayton, O William, 1914-
Dayton, William Adams, 1885-- ed.
D'Azzo, John Joachim.
D. C. libraries . . .
DCT news bulletin.
De, Sushil Kumar.
D'Humy, Fernand Emil.
Dia, Mamadou.
Dluska, Maria.
DM; the discount merchandiser.
Dmitriev, Ivan Ivanovich, 1760-1837.
Dschenzig, Theodor.
DSH abstracts.
D'Souza, Anthony Conrad.
Fulcher, Paul Milton, (ed.)
Foundations of English Style.
Fulcher, Paul Milton, (ed.)
Short narratives.
Fulcher, Paul Milton, 1895-- comp.
Descriptive passages.
Fulcher, Paul Milton, (1895- joint ed.)
Literary masters of England.
Fulcher, Paul Milton, (1895-- ed.)
Wuthering Heights.
Gregorius, Saint, Bp. of Nyssa, 538-594.
Gregorius, Saint, Bp. of Tours, fl. 379-394.
Gregorius Nazianzenus, Saint, Patriarch of Constantinople.
Gregorius I, The Great, Saint, Pope, 540 (ca.)-604.
Gregorius XV, Pope, 1554-1623.
Macadam, Miles Frederick Laming.
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MacAgy, Douglas, 1913-
Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.
MacAlister, Everilda, ed.
Macarthur, John Robertson.
M’Arthur, John, 1755–1840.
McAdam, Edward Lippincott, ed.
McArthur, Elmer D.
New York Academy of Medicine.
New York (City)
New York city housing authority.
New York. College of Forestry, Syracuse.
New York (Colony)
New York County Lawyers’ Association. Committee on, etc.
New York State Historical Association.
New York (State) University.
New York times.
The New-York weekly magazine; or, Miscellaneous repository:
Standard, Samuel.
Standard education almanac.
Standard periodical directory.
Standard & Poor’s corporation.
Standard Rate and Data Service, inc.
U. S. Administrative office of the United States courts.
The United States after war; the Cornell University
U. S. Agency for International Development.
U. S. Bureau of the Census.
The United States catalog; books in print January 1, 1928
U. S. Central Intelligence Agency.
United States code Congressional and Administrative news.
U. S. Navy. Aviation training division.
United States Navy gas engine school, New York.
U. S. President
U. S. see United States.
Uris, Leon M.
Usher, Dan
Van, Guillaume, de, ed.
Van Abbe, Derek Maurice.
Van Riper, Charles, 1905–
Vanbrugh, Sir John, 1664–1726.
Vance, Rupert Bayless, ed.
Vanity fair.
Vann, Gerald, 1906–
Webb, Beatrice (Potter) 1858–1943.
American diary, 1898.
A constitution for the socialist commonwealth of Great Britain.
Webb, Beatrice (Potter) 1858–1943, joint author.
English local government
The history of liquor licensing in England
Webb, Beatrice (Potter) 1858–1943, joint author.
The history of trade unionism.
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Webb, Beatrice (Potter) "Mrs. Sidney Webb," 1858–

*Industrial democracy.*

Webb, Beatrice (Potter) 1858–1943.

*My apprenticeship.*

Webb, Beatrice (Potter) 1858–1943.

*Our partnership.*

Webb, Beatrice (Potter) 1858–1943, joint author.

*The prevention of destitution.*

Webb, Beatrice (Potter) 1858–1943.

*The Webbs' Australian diary, 1898.*

Wilson, Thomas, advocate, tr.

Wilson, Thomas, (Ph.D.)

Wilson, Thomas, 1525–1581, supposed Author.

Wilson, Thomas, 1563–1622.

Wilson, Thomas, 1916– ed.

Wilson, Thomas George.

Subject Catalog: Example

---

**Example 1**

Great Britain—Administrative and Political Division.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Great Britain. Army.

Great Britain. Army. Australian and New Zealand Army Corps.

Great Britain. Army—Biography.

Great Britain. Army. Cameronians (Scottish Rifles) 2nd Battalion.


Great Britain. Army. Foot guards.

Great Britain. Army—History.

Great Britain. Army—Volunteers.

Great Britain. Army. 3d Dragoons (King’s Own Hussars).

Great Britain. Army. 73d Regiment of Foot. 2d Battalion.

Great Britain—Biography.

Great Britain—Church history.

Great Britain—Church history—Anglo-Saxon period.

Great Britain—Church history—Early period.

Great Britain—Church history—Medieval period.

Great Britain—Church history—Modern period.

Great Britain—Church history—Sources.

Great Britain—Church history—16th century.

Great Britain—Church history—17th century.

Great Britain—Foreign relations.

Great Britain—Foreign relations—Africa.

Great Britain—Foreign relations—Bibliography.

Great Britain—Foreign relations—Central America.

Great Britain—Foreign relations—U. S.

Great Britain—Foreign relations—16th century.

Great Britain—Foreign relations—1509–1547.

Great Britain—Foreign relations—18th century.

Great Britain—Foreign relations—1709–1721.

Great Britain—Foreign relations—1714–1837.

Great Britain—Foreign relations—1760–1789.

Great Britain—History.

Great Britain—History—Addresses, essays, lectures.

Great Britain—History—Biography.

Great Britain—History, Comic, Satirical.

Great Britain—History, Local.
Great Britain—History, Naval.
Great Britain—History, Naval—Tudors, 1485–1603.
Great Britain—History, Naval—Stuarts, 1603–1714.
Great Britain—History, Naval—1689–1714.
Great Britain—History, Naval—18th century.
Great Britain—History—Philosophy.
Great Britain—History—Sources.
Great Britain—History—To 449.
Great Britain—History—To 1066.
Great Britain—History—Roman period, B. C. 55–A.D. 449.
Great Britain—History—Anglo-Saxon period, 449–1066.
Great Britain—History—Edward the Confessor, 1042–1066.
Great Britain—History—William I, 1066–1087.
Great Britain—History—Norman period, 1066–1154.
Great Britain—History—1066–1216.
Great Britain—History—Medieval period, 1066–1485.
Great Britain—History—1066–1377.
Great Britain—History—13th century.
Great Britain—History—Henry III, 1216–1277.
Great Britain—History—James II, 1685–1688.
Great Britain—History—Revolution of 1688.
Great Britain—History—Hanoverian period, 1688–1722.
Great Britain in literature.
Great Britain. London Transport Executive.
Great Britain. Parliament. (The buildings)—Commons.
Great Britain.—Social life and customs.
Great Britain. Treasury.

Example 2

Alexander, James, 1691–1756.
Alexander Janneus, King of Judea, 126 (ca.)–76 B.C.
Alexander Nevski, Saint, Grand duke of Vladimir, 1219–1263.
Alexander the Great.
Alexander I, Emperor of Russia, 1777–1825.
Alexander II, Emperor of Russia, 1818–1881.
Alexander III, Pope, d. 1181.
Alexander VI, Pope, 1431, 1503.
Refiling by the Second

Lucy A. Poucher
Catalog-reference Librarian
and
Richard E. Moore
Technical Services Librarian
Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Oregon

In the refiling of a college library catalog by the second edition of the ALA Rules, some local clarification and interpretation of rules, 9, 18, 20, 26, 33, 34, 36 and 37 were required. Better examples and clearer prefatory remarks, especially in the application of the rules to a divided catalog, would have been helpful. The problems encountered in the refiling process are discussed in terms of LC cataloging practices, the AACR, and the new filing rules.

In applying the second edition of the ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards to the refiling of the card catalog (containing approximately 300,000 cards) at the Southern Oregon College Library, several difficulties were experienced which can, in part, be avoided by others. The following discussion is concerned with the policies and practices which were adopted as part of the refiling project and which have since been retained as permanent practice. Some of the problems arose because of difficulties with the old Library of Congress (LC) cards and the new cataloging rules in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR). Others can be attributed to lack of clear direction on the part of the new filing rules, especially in the filing for a divided catalog. The decisions made locally may prove to be inappropriate in the long run because of unforeseen circumstances, but it was the long-range projection that provided the basis of our justification.

By way of background, the decision to refile the local card catalog was based on several factors: first, it was decided that if the catalog were ever to be made uniform in its filing, this was the appropriate time to make the change. The catalog was still of manageable size but would not long remain so. The college had in recent years begun an expanded program of course offerings, the effects of which the library was just beginning to feel in the form of added book allocation. If the dual filing systems created by the new filing rules were to be eliminated, now was the time to begin. In studying the new rules, the more direct approach seemed to be easier for the library to maintain and would cause less confusion for the user. The long-range benefits would justify the immediate expenditure.
Second, the decision was made to divide the card catalog into three segments (author-title-subject as opposed to the previous catalog which was divided by author-title and separate subject), again for both ease of student use and ease of filing by library employees. This decision was in preparation for an expanded catalog with the consideration that in larger libraries the smaller catalog units are easier to use for both patrons and library personnel.

Third, the library collection was in the final stages of reclassification from Dewey to the LC scheme. In reclassification, new cards were added where needed; the cataloging was brought up to present standards used by the Library of Congress, and some effort was made to unify headings for a single person or body. The card catalog at the outset of the project was in good shape.

In an initial projection of time required to refile, based on a 1 percent sampling, the total refileing time was placed in the 400 hour range. The actual time involved came to about 1,000 hours. The projection failure was due to several factors.

One, the initial projection did not allow for distractions such as answering reference and directional questions presented to the filer by catalog users. While this time was not accurately clocked, it was estimated to be about 6 to 8 percent of the total time expended. A separate, private office near the card catalog was considered, to eliminate the interruptions, but was not carried out because of the distance factor. As filing problems came up that related to earlier problems, the filer could more easily check back with the catalog on hand. The strength of the project lay in the use of one filer who was able to recall decisions or earlier problems and tie these problem areas together by making up appropriate cross-references. In applying rule 18 (making cross-references for variant name spellings), for example, there were found in our small catalog over 1,100 personal names without cross-references, which were phonetically the same, but which had variant forms of spelling. Each of these 1,100 names had an average of three variations per name.* This meant an additional 3,300 cross-reference cards requiring inclusion in the catalog. While the time devoted to making up the extra cards was not included in the total project time, the filer had to make notations and check on similar names, then pencil a note for follow-up personnel. This factor alone added considerably to the refileing time and was not foreseen in the projection. In tying this to the distance factor, had the filer been working away from the catalog, the checking of name variations and other potential problems would have been more difficult. While the addition of cross-references did take more time, it resulted in a better catalog because that time was taken.

Two, the break-waste time, which most time and motion studies place at 15 percent of total work time, was not included in the projection.

* A list of the names and their variations are available to interested libraries from the Southern Oregon College Library at Ashland.
While this appears to be a large block of time, break time is included along with various distractions, including momentary rest from filing fatigue. Rigid adherence to a filing schedule which permitted frequent breaks from filing may have increased the efficiency of the filer. Two possibilities were opened; the second was loosely applied. First, disregarding user traffic around the catalog, patterns of one hour work slots would have been effective; that is, 8–9 A.M., 11–12 A.M., 1–2 P.M., 4–5 P.M. This would permit half-time filing, yet nicely break up the filing day with lengthy periods for work elsewhere. However, the alternating routine would have required a task needing little continuity in thought (such as washing dishes), or it would suffer along with the filing. We were unable to come up with an appropriate secondary routine; as a result, the second possible schedule that evolved was one which eliminated alternating filing with other work. A five- or ten-minute break at the end of each drawer or an hourly break proved to be effective. This would, of course, vary with the nature of the person doing the refiling. Some persons are able to withstand long periods of filing without their accuracy dropping off. The person carrying out this project was capable of doing this.

Three, even though the catalog was in good condition, some headings that varied were found. These were corrected to unify all headings for a single entry, which included adding the middle name where originally only an initial was given, or the addition of a birthdate where not always stated. The basic rule against mental insertion of missing information was interpreted locally to include all these factors as well as variant word spelling, acronyms, abbreviations, etc. This has proved to be a continuing problem since LC does not always give the full name and dates, or will vary slightly on the spelling of middle names, especially on added entries. Because added entries are not checked locally when taken from tracings, the filer was and is continually pulling variant spellings, etc., rechecking, correcting, and refiling the cards.

The inconsistencies from LC in variant spelling of the same name, the use of only initials at times and the inclusion of dates irregularly, is requiring more local checking. One of several policies will be required to handle these inconsistencies, for instance concerning the application of rule 20 (filing personal names) without regard to whether Smith, J. C., happens to be John C., John Charles, or John Charles, 1924. The possibility of finding one author in several places is not attractive, but perhaps is economically expedient. Also, the checking of all personal names on LC cards to ensure the continuity of entries requires “tampering” with the cards, all of which takes time and effort. Finally, the continuation of checking only inconsistencies which the filer happens to find, which is a policy of sorts, is not in keeping with acceptable cataloging practice.

Many of the problems encountered in the application of the second edition rules came about because of the divided catalog and some because of the three-way division. Rule 26C states that an author-title sub-
ject entry files in alphabetical place immediately after author entries for
the same title. In a dictionary catalog, this places author-title subject
entries in front of the subdivided subject entries, but in a divided cata-
log it seems more logical to interfile author-title and subject-with-sub-
division entries. In other words, disregard the exception listed in rule
26C1.1 for divided catalogs. Perhaps this is understood; it is not stated.

There were several local decisions that had to be made concerning
title entries; for example, rule 33D provides for arrangement of differ-
ent kinds of entries under title of the same periodical or newspaper in
four groups (omitting subject entries). All but group 2, the author en-
tries (main and added) were filed in the title catalog; the added entries
which were filed in the author catalog included those for reprints of
articles from the publication, while added entries for former titles were
filed in the title catalog. This, along with title main entries of motion
pictures and film strips (rule 37D) required some local explanation to
make the distinction clear to the filer, particularly concerning added
entries. It is very difficult for students and filers to distinguish between
a title added entry and a corporate author added entry. This is particu-
larly a problem where the author catalog is separate from the title catalog.
It does, however, remain a problem that could use some clarification or
direction.

Further guidance could have been given in the second edition dis-
cussion concerning what constitutes a subtitle. In checking, it appeared
that a colon does not indicate a division into title and subtitle in almost
every case; however, semicolons always preceded a subtitle. The comma
seemed to go either way. The prefatory remarks to rule 26 (especially
B5 and B9b) should have discussed the problem with general guidelines.
The filer is not certain unless the cataloger marks the cards having sub-
titles. In discussing the filing of authors’ names at the beginning of titles
(rule 26B6) it was suggested that angle brackets be utilized to indicate
that part of the title to be disregarded. This could be suggested for un-
necessary parts of a subtitle. Again, the examples at 26B6 were not ex-
tensive enough, and the implication from the general discussion at
26B6 is that the cataloger would make the decision for the filer. More
guidelines are needed for effective application of rule 26.

In the discussion of the numerical and chronological arrangement
(rules 9 and 36) there is not sufficient direction given generally as to
which applies. In 36B1 there is the warning: “Titles that can be ar-
ranged in a numerical sequence under author cannot always be so ar-
 ranged as title added entries because as added entries they must take
their place with other titles beginning with the same words. For an ex-
ample of titles like Europe since 1815 see p. 44.” The examples given,
while not obvious, were not very extensive. The discussion of when to
spell a number and when to file it by the number is inconclusive.

In this same area of numbers but in dealing with series, rule 34C
discusses briefly the partially numbered series, indicating that the un-
numbered volumes are to be arranged alphabetically before the num-
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bered. However, there are series that have annual numbers with lapses into volume numbers, or some years which are unnumbered with lapses into numbered issues at irregular intervals. Series come in a wide and a wondrous variety of form; more discussion could be given which would give direction and uniformity.

As a whole, the second edition is a welcome change. The approach is more direct, the exceptions are limited, and the examples for the most part, extensive. It would have been more effective had more recognition been given the libraries with divided catalogs. Divided catalogs are no longer that uncommon and they present unique problems that are not common to a dictionary catalog. The preface to the second edition states, “These filing rules are basically for a dictionary card catalog, but are also generally applicable to divided catalogs, book catalogs, indexes, etc.” This may indicate that the reader should not expect specific statements about application to a divided catalog. If so, there needs to be developed a body of literature which will clarify some of the rules, especially pertaining to filing in divided catalogs. The prefatory statements or footnotes to the rules should have carried more in the nature of guideline discussion. Since it does not, professional literature is needed that will.

It is difficult to ascertain the usefulness of the second edition from the students’ point of view. Once the user understands the three-way division of a card catalog, he appreciates it more and is able to find his way about effectively. However, whether placing the new edition behind the old edition is better or not is still a question. We were aware that our students were having problems with the old catalog, and being user oriented, we are trying to work up a “best” catalog. Our efforts have taken us this far. We do not relish the thought of putting all the cards back into one dictionary catalog, but the possibility has not been ruled out.
The significance of rigorous entry formatting for machine filing of computer-produced bibliographic tools, including book catalogs, has not received the attention it deserves in automation efforts. Too often a format is devised and a large body of data keyed, and only then is the problem of filing this data considered. The result is that the capabilities of the computer are not used to the fullest advantage. This paper reports a study of computer filing which utilizes the arranging possibilities of the computer and of careful format design to considerable advantage. Several book catalogs have been computer-filed using the procedures reported here; the usefulness and flexibility of the procedures have been shown by their continuing application in the experimental information handling programs written at the Columbia University School of Library Service. Through these programs the principles and procedures have been applied not only to book catalogs, but to thesauri, classification notations, book indexes, and concordances.

Introduction

In the process of automating library catalog procedures, especially for computer production of book catalogs, filing rules have frequently been left until last in system design. This tendency is unfortunate, to say the least. By the time the catalog data have been keyed into machine-readable form, it is too late to make the (mostly) minor modifications in spacing or form which make possible automatic filing in a sequence convenient and comprehensible to the catalog user.

It has often been pointed out, recently by Nugent,1 that present filing rules are not suitable for machine filing, and that the catalog data used for filing are not explicit; therefore, it is simply not possible to program present filing rules to operate on catalog data in its present format. For this reason, as Nugent has pointed out, "... modifications and simplifications have to be made to certain of the rules that will consequently change the filing location of associated items."2

* Financial and technical assistance and advice from the Bro-Dart Foundation contributed greatly to the research described in this report.
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Nugent has called for "one operating [filing] program of considerable complexity, along with documented computer running time and storage..."³

Computer Filing Rules

Aware of the vital need described above, the authors some time ago began development of a set of rules for computer filing. Between 1965 and 1967, these rules were programmed, and used in three published computer-produced book catalogs: those of East Bay Cooperative Library System (California), St. Louis Junior College District Library, and Oakland (Michigan) Community College Libraries.

These rules for computer filing were published in book form in mid-1966.⁴ The purpose of this report is to describe them briefly, and to indicate developments in our research program since the book was published.

The computer filing rules were developed around a few basic principles. Stated briefly, these are: (1) filing should be a mechanical procedure, whether performed by humans or by machines; (2) arrangement should be immediately evident to both filer and user; (3) as a corollary to (1) and (2), the filing position of an entry should be based only upon the characters actually appearing in the entry; (4) no task that can be performed adequately by the computer in a machine-based system should be assigned to humans.

Since we have always tended to view the computer as a labor-saving tool, our main goal was to keep human effort in all phases of the operation to a minimum, relying on the immense capabilities of the computer to perform the kind of repetitive operations of which library filing is largely composed. For this reason, the system requires a bare minimum of human annotation and special keying at input, but at output produces an arrangement of entries the basis of which is evident to the human user, even if he does not know the ALA or LC filing rules. The arrangement, with three optional exceptions, can be a simple character by character sort in which punctuation is ignored, and spaces precede other characters, being followed by the letters of the alphabet A–Z and the numerals 0–9; in other words, true word by word alphabetization.

It is important to make clear that the rigorous simplicity of filing under the code is due not so much to limitations of the computer as to one of the base principles of the code: arrangement should be immediately evident to the user.

Possible Alternatives to the Code Provisions

(1) Punctuation as a Filing Element.—Several alternative basic concepts were considered, but rejected. While at first glance punctuation may seem to provide a useful filing element, further consideration shows that its sorting significance is, to say the least, highly variable. For instance, the period may indicate an abbreviation in any kind of
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entry, in which case it is either ignored or acts as a signal to the filer mentally to spell out the word for arrangement (and, unfortunately, to the user to do the same for finding—one may wonder how many catalog users would expect to find Mrs. Dane's defense filed between Michigan . . . and Modern . . .). In addition, the period in author or subject entries may indicate organizational hierarchy or place entry—and these are conventionally filed separately.

Multiplied by the number of marks of punctuation used in catalog entries, it may be seen that many complexities arise. In addition, numerous marks of punctuation used in title entries are not under the cataloger's control. Furthermore, arrangement on punctuation requires some order of precedence and, while it may be assumed that nearly all library catalog users know the order of the alphabet and the numbers, they most certainly could not be expected to know the sequence of punctuation marks adopted by the library for its catalog. Much less is it reasonable to expect the user to recognize the different sequences of punctuation that would of necessity be required for different kinds of entries.

It is theoretically possible to set up different sequences of punctuation for an author-title-subject divided catalog, but any entry in the author or title catalog may also be a subject. Therefore, the problem remains the same, although smaller in magnitude.

While it might be reasonable to file on punctuation in a small catalog or a file which does not have complex entries where there are few different entries beginning with the same word, the large catalog with several drawers (or dozens of pages) of entries beginning with the same word requires a simple entry format and arrangement that will be as obvious as possible to the user.

(2) Annotation at Input.—While annotation at the time of input to the computer at first may seem to be an easy means of getting around the question of sequencing different kinds of entries (author-subject-title; person-place-thing; varying forms of modification of the same subject), it does not take full advantage of the capabilities of the computer. It is possible to key directly from unannotated LC unit cards entries with tracings which may then be reformatted and arranged by the computer under all the headings required for the title. Early in our work on the problem an experimental computer program was written by Brian Aveney, then a student at the Columbia University School of Library Service, to do just this. The entries for the published book catalogs cited earlier were keyed from LC cards without annotation other than the changes made in form of entry to conform to the computer filing code. In addition, all these changes were made by clerical personnel under the supervision of professional librarians.

Arranging Order under the Code

Arrangement under the code is from left to right, with the single exception of numerals. In the form of procedure outlined below, the
order of sorts (item 5) is mechanically sufficient to carry out arrangement. It should be noted that generation of a special sort key is not required (although this procedure is usually used), in keeping with our preference for maximal utilization of computer capability together with minimum human input. Filing is in the following order.

1) By entry unit.—An entry unit is a single complete catalog entry. Entry units may be separated from each other by any convenient device, including the use of more than four spaces between them.

2) By field or filing unit within the entry.—The filing units in the usual catalog entry would include the heading (in secondary entries), author, title, and imprint. Other filing units may be defined as needed. Fields may be separated by any convenient device, including the use of three spaces. Where one form of the entry unit is to be used as input for multiple entries under different headings, the parts of the entry which are to become headings may be designated by their order of appearance, or by characteristics of LC card type input. However, other means may be used if preferred.

3) By sub-field or subdivision.—Under the computer filing rules a subdivision is separated from other subdivisions in the same field by two spaces.

4) By word.—A word is defined as an element set off by a single space on either side.

5) By the following order of sorts:

(a) Blank (i.e., space).
(b) Letters of the English alphabet, A–Z. Capital letters are considered equal to lowercase letters; fonts are set equivalent; modified letters are set equal to their unmodified equivalents.
(c) The Arabic numbers. These are treated as numbers, not as isolated numerals. In effect, the program must file outward from the decimal point. B.C. dates, of course, are ordered in reverse and precede A.D. dates; one of the programs already written and tested includes a simple routine to produce this arrangement.
(d) Signs, symbols, punctuation, and letters not given as part of the sort sequence are to be disregarded. If a sign must be used in filing (e.g., the ampersand), it must be written out as a word or words in the language of the entry.

Entry Form under the Computer Filing Code

It must be emphasized that very few of the provisions for entry form under the code involve anything other than spacing. And rigorous control of spacing is vital in computer filing no matter what filing rules are used. For that matter, it is vital in the styling of any bibliography for publication. Witness the number of machine-produced book catalogs (including one of those arranged by our code) with two files under U.S.—one with and one without a space between the letters.
The few changes in entry form are minor, and only make explicit the implicit intent of the entry. These changes, together with spacing requirements, are described below.

Before the computer filing code was written, a study of the then current (1st) edition of the ALA filing rules was undertaken to determine the adaptability of these rules to computer filing. The published code includes a rule-by-rule comparison of the computer filing rules with the first edition of the ALA rules. This will not be repeated here. However, a brief description of those cases where arrangement differs from that in the LC filing rules (which are as complex as the ALA rules but offer fewer alternatives) will be given below.

The entry forms on which the computer filing rules are based are, of course, those of the A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries. The changes in entry under the new Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, insofar as they affect filing at all, reduce the problems somewhat. These changes do not make obsolete any of the requirements of the computer filing code.

In its original form, the computer filing code was recommended for up to 100,000 entries in a single file; this limitation was due solely to the fact that resources at the time were inadequate for the extensive study of subject headings that would have been required to file larger numbers of entries. This study has been completed; its findings (described near the end of this report) have made possible removal of the size limitation applied earlier.

While the computer filing code is intended for divided catalogs, it is highly adaptable to the dictionary form. In fact, the experimental program by Aveney, mentioned above, will arrange the same entries in either divided or dictionary form as preferred. The computer filing code was designed for the divided (author, title, subject) catalog form because what few data are available indicate that both filing and finding in the divided catalog are simpler. The literature certainly does indicate a trend to the divided form, as library catalogs grow larger and more complex. Very nearly all machine-produced book catalogs are divided.

While the code is designed for entries written in the Roman alphabet and in Arabic numerals, it is readily adaptable to such other alphabets as the Cyrillic and Scandinavian.

Optional Special Symbols.—Any combination of three optional special symbols may be applied under the code. These are used: (1) to indicate a space in the printout but not in the filing sequence (e.g., von Braun); (2) to indicate a space in the filing sequence but not in the printout (as in hyphenated compound words intended to arrange as two words); and, (3) to surround material which is to appear in printout but not to be filed on, such as ignored designations of royal privilege. (Designations of royal privilege, of course, do not appear in the new cataloging rules.) This symbol may, if desired, appear as brackets or parentheses in the entry:
No other special symbols have any place in the code. This does not mean that symbols for such things as uppercase and lowercase or for computer composition may not be used. On the contrary, it means they may be used without restriction, as they are simply ignored in filing.

Spacing Requirements.—Generalized uses of spacing to define entries and parts of entries are described above. This section describes specific requirements for various types of entries.

1) Modern surname entries. The full name, dates, and title or epithet are each treated as a subdivision, set off by two spaces.

2) Subject subdivisions using the dash. The number of hyphens used to indicate the dash is unimportant, but there must always be a space on either side of the dash. Since the dash, as a punctuation mark, is completely ignored in filing, this provision has the effect of creating a two-space subdivision.

U.S. — History

3) Corporate entries. In entries for the names of corporate bodies with parts of the organizational hierarchy indicated, two spaces must be left between the parts.

When institutions are entered under place, however, only one space is left after the place name.*

New York. Public Library

4) Holy books and anonymous classics. Parts and sections of these works are separated by two spaces from the preceding part of the entry. Likewise, indications of language are separated from the preceding part of the entry by two spaces.

Bible. O. T. Genesis. French
Charlemagne. Gesta Karoli Magni ad Carcassonam et Narbonam

5) Periodicals. Subtitles of periodicals are separated from the remainder of the title by two spaces.

Bookman: a review of books and life

6) Notes showing nature or form of work or author. The note (periodical, etc.) showing the form or nature of a work or author must be preceded by two spaces.

Life, periodical
Charlemagne (Drama)

* Further study and discussion have led us to question this provision. It might be preferable to interfile all these entries, the alternative used in the 2d edition of the ALA filing rules. Interfiling may be accomplished simply by leaving two spaces after the place name.
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(7) *Words and initials.* Some words and initials are now written sometimes with and sometimes without a space between them. For proper filing under the code, these entry elements must be written uniformly.

(a) Ellipses and other punctuation marks at the beginning of titles may remain, but there must be no spaces between or before them, or between them and the first word of the title.

```
---- and ships and sealing wax
```

```
- - - - and ships and sealing wax
```

(b) All initials intended to file as one-letter words must have a space after each period or letter.

```
A. L. A. NOT A.L.A.
A L A NOT ALA
```

(c) Personal names with separable prefixes, when prefix and surname are to be filed as one word, should be so written:

```
vonBraun NOT von Braun
```

unless it is preferred to use the optional symbol which prints out as a space, but is ignored for filing purposes.

(d) In *see* and *see also* references, four spaces separate the entry from the modifier.

```
Bookbinding. See also Book covers
```

*Changes in Entry Form.*—The actual changes in form of entry, as distinguished from spacing conventions, are few in number.

(1) *Name entries.* Titles, descriptive epithets, and the designation *pseudonym* follow forename and dates instead of preceding.

```
Smith, John Alan, 1868-1902, Sir
```

```
Smith, Sir John Alan, 1868-1902
```

It is interesting to note that this procedure has been adopted elsewhere without comment.

In forename entries the epithet (if any) follows the title.

```
Charles, duke of Burgundy, le Teméraire
```

```
Charles, le Teméraire, duke of Burgundy
```

(2) *Numerals intended to file as numbers.* All numbers intended to file serially must be written as Arabic cardinal or ordinal numerals. This includes numbered forenames, books of the Bible, congresses, military units, and reports.

```
Louis 18, King of France
```

```
Louis XVIII, King of France
```

```
1st report NOT First report
```

```
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For further examples see (g) below.

(g) Numbered items intended to file serially. All elements which are composed of a number and a word, and conventionally filed first on the word and then numerically by the number, must be inverted. This applies to books of the Bible, congresses, military units, etc. Similarly, such elements as d. 1868, fl. 1500 are inverted.

Bible. N. T. Corinthians 2

Bible. N. T. II Corinthians

U. S. Congress, 1st

U. S. 1st Congress

(4) Numbers and abbreviations filed in spelled-out form. In keeping with the requirement that the intended filing position be made explicit in the entry, all numerals* and abbreviations which it is desirable to file as though they were spelled out must be so written as full words in the language of the entry. Certain exceptions are written and filed as abbreviations for reasons of space. These are U. S., U. N., and Gt. Brit.; and N. T. and O. T. in Bible entries. In addition, Mrs. is so written and filed, on the ground that few if any readers would visualize the word as Mistress.

(5) Non-filing elements.

(a) Initial articles in the nominative case in title entries (or subject entries) are omitted from the entry, or inverted where they affect meaning. It is possible to make these words non-filing elements, but not advised.

(b) Designations of a person’s relationship to a work (e.g., ed., tr., illus.) are either omitted or made non-filing elements.

(6) Blanks left for later fill-in. No blanks may be left for later fill-in under the code. This is certainly no hardship, as the practice has a point only in the card catalog where cards may be removed and additional information typed on them.

(7) Subject headings subdivided by period. In these headings dates must be used consistently, and precede the name of the period.

U. S. - History - 1861-1865, Civil War

U. S. - History - Civil War

This provision is perhaps one of the most important in the code, although it does not affect a very great number of entries. It makes the

* Since publication of the computer filing code, we have received several suggestions that all numbers be written as numerals, and where they happen to be the first entry element in titles, be allowed to file in their normal position at the end of the alphabet. This idea has real possibilities.
arrangement of these headings immediately evident and saves considerable guesswork. Of course, it also requires the professional cataloger to define once and for all the scope of a heading rather than leaving this chore to the filer and user, but this is hardly a disadvantage.

(8) Place entries. Where two or more places have the same name, the computer filing rules require that each be followed by a geographical designation.

|--------------|--------|

*Arrangement under the LC Rules and the Computer Filing Code Compared*

This discussion, due to space limitations, will ignore numerous minor arrangement differences which would appear only in very large catalogs—and, there, would not significantly affect finding. Besides, most if not all of these differences could be reconciled, if necessary, by application of the principles of the computer filing code. For convenience, this discussion is arranged in the order of the LC filing rules, using the alternate rules where they exist.

*Abbreviations.*—Arrangement is identical except for those elements both spelled and filed as abbreviations under the computer filing code (U. S., U. N., Gt. Brit., N. T., O. T., Mrs.). This result is secured by the simple method of writing everything out.

*Anonymous Classics.*—The name of a historical person, if followed by dates or designation, will follow anonymous classics beginning with the same word(s) under the computer filing code. Conventional titles of anonymous classics will interfile with other titles; the complex subarrangement of the LC rules does not appear.

*Author Arrangement.*—Arrangement under author in the computer filing code is identical to that in the LC rules in all but a few minor points of sub-subarrangements. This result is accomplished without special annotation, lengthened sort times, or additions to the basic program.

*Bible.*—The LC filing rules arrange Bible headings in a number of groups, dividing each group except the first into two subgroups; language and subject.

1. Bible manuscripts
2. Complete Bible
3. Parts of the Bible in alphabetical order
   a. Complete New Testament
   b. Individual New Testament books or collections
   c. Complete Old Testament
   d. Individual Old Testament books or collections

The subarrangement under these groups is based closely on elements...
appearing in the entry, except that Polyglot precedes single language.

Since the computer filing code arranges on the entry itself, not on the basis of annotation at input, there are some variations from LC arrangement; however, these are rather minor. Language and subjects will interfile; Polyglot will appear in its normal alphabetical position. Bible. Manuscripts will appear in a single group interfiled with subdivisions of the complete Bible. N. T. and O. T. will be similar. Since, beyond this part of the entry, filing has in the past been strictly on the entry elements, the computer filing code, aside from interfiling subjects and languages, will produce exactly the same arrangement.

This arrangement does not produce the classification of entries found in the LC rules, but our attitude (and that followed in many existing catalogs of considerable size and complexity) is that classification has no place in the dictionary catalog unless it is explicit in the entry. The results may be less intellectually satisfying, but they should be easier to search.

**Corporate Authors.**—The LC rules arrange corporate authors (not places) in a number of groups.

1. Institution as corporate author, without official subheading.
2. Institution as added entry, without official subheading.
3. Institution as general subject.
4. Institution as general subject, with subject subheadings.
5. Subdivisions of the institution in the same subgroups as above.
6. Titles beginning with the name of the institution.

It seems inexplicable that added entries are filed separately under corporate authors, but not under personal authors. Aside from this problem, there is very little difference in filing under the computer filing code. It would arrange the above groups as follows:

(A) 1 and 2, interfiled.
(B) 3.
(C) 4 and 5, interfiled.
(D) 6.

**Elisions.**—Under the LC filing rules, elisions are filed as spelled, as one word, except for certain foreign language elisions, which are treated as separate words. Under the computer filing code, all elisions are treated as single words; however, use of the optional space-in-filing symbol can produce results identical to those of the LC rules.

**Firm Names.**—The LC rules treat firm names followed by forenames or initials as personal names; other firm names are interfiled with titles. The arrangement under the computer filing code is somewhat different. A firm name consisting of a single word, followed by a descriptive term (e.g., Scribner, firm, publishers, New York) will arrange ahead of other uses of the word. Other entries will all interfile.

**Forenames.**—LC files forenames before surnames in a strict alphabetical sequence, except that numerals are disregarded unless required
to differentiate forenames with identical designations. Arrangement under the computer filing rules is alphabetical straight through the entry, including numerals, and forenames interfile with surnames. Forenames could be made to precede surnames by the simple expedient of setting off everything following the first word of the forename as a subdivision preceded by two spaces.

Hyphenated and Compound Words.—The LC filing rules in general arrange hyphenated words as separate words. Compound words printed as one are so filed. Compound words which appear in more than one form are to be interfiled under one form with references from the others. Words with hyphenated prefixes are treated as single words, as are hyphenated American Indian names and German words. A special warning is given to distinguish the dash in a subdivided subject from the hyphen.

This last caution is not required under the computer filing code since it files on the spaces surrounding the dash, not the dash itself. The code will file compound words printed separately as two words; all uses of the hyphen will automatically file as one word. Where it is required to file hyphenated words as two, the nonprinting space-in-filing symbol may be inserted. Where words are sometimes hyphenated, sometimes not, they will arrange as they are input.

Initial Article, Humorous Spellings, Words in Dialect.—The computer filing code advises omission of initial articles in the nominative case in most instances. However, it would be possible either to invert them or to use the optional symbol which deletes material included within it from the filing sequence.

Humorous spellings, words in dialect, and phonetically spelled words are arranged as written by both the LC rules and the computer filing code.

Initials.—The computer filing code arranges initials exactly as in the LC rules, except that inverted initials are interfiled with uninverted ones.

Modified Letters.—The computer filing code treats all modified letters as their unmodified equivalents. For ü to file as ue it must be so written.

Names Compounded of Two Words.—Arrangement by LC is identical with that of the computer filing code.

Names of Family, Clan, Dynasty, House, etc.—All entries of this type are interfiled under the computer filing code.

Names Spelled Differently.—These names are arranged as spelled under both sets of rules.

Names with a Prefix.—Names with prefixes may be arranged as a single word under the computer filing code either by so writing them or by using the symbol that indicates a space in printing but not in filing. M', Mc, and Mac are arranged as spelled by the computer filing code—just as in the telephone book.

Nobleman's Title and Bishop's See.—These entries interfile with other entries under the computer filing rules.
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Numbers.—The computer filing code requires that numerals in titles be written out in the words under which they are to file.

Numerical and Chronological Arrangement.—The computer filing code arranges these items in the same way as the LC rules by means of the changes in form described earlier.

Order of Entries.—When the divided catalog is used, the order of entries problem is alleviated, though not solved. This discussion assumes the dictionary form, as it is here that the majority of difficulties arise.

Rather than the sequence of "person, place, thing, title" as in the LC rules, the computer filing code can provide "author, subject, title." Other parts of this section are treated elsewhere in this report.

Oriental Names.—By use of the provisions already given (inversion, omission, or nonfiling symbol for Arabic articles; space-in-filing symbol for Oriental names) the same results can be achieved under the computer filing code as in the LC rules.

Place Arrangement.—The computer filing code requires that if more than one place of the same name appears in the catalog, all places of the name be followed by a designation. The chief place of the name will thus appear in its normal sequence. Aside from this, official subheadings will interfile with subdivisions of the place as a subject. All other headings will interfile in a separate group.

Punctuation Marks, Possessive Case.—All punctuation marks are disregarded in the computer filing code; therefore, arrangement is the same as in the LC rules. However, since the subtitle of a periodical is a subdivision, a periodical having the same main title as the full title of a book will follow the book rather than precede it as in the LC rules.

References, Authority Cards, Form Cards, etc.—References will precede other entries with the identical heading. Authority, history, information, scope, and form cards will also precede.

Signs and Symbols.—Since all signs and symbols are totally disregarded by the computer filing code, arrangement under the code is identical to that in the LC rules, with the following provisos:

1) The ampersand must be written out in the language of the entry, as described earlier.

2) In the case of signs used without letters instead of the author's name, which the LC rules require to be filed ahead of entries beginning with A, an informal survey was made of the LC printed catalog and the printed NUC. The result showed thirty-one entries of this sort in the 1942 catalog, of which all but three were "see" references. In the supplements through 1962, sixty-one more entries were found, all of them cross-references. For this reason the computer filing code prescribes title main entry or author entry with title added entry for all books which use signs instead of the author's name.

Subject Arrangement.—The computer filing code can arrange a subject after an author and before a title when the entries are otherwise identical. Within subjects, all dashed subdivisions are interfiled.
and precede all other subdivisions, likewise interfiled with each other and with phrase headings and titles.*

_Surnames._—Arrangement under the two sets of rules is the same except that unhyphenated compound surnames will interfile as though the second surname were a forename. Hyphenated surnames will file the same or as single words depending on whether or not the space-in-filing symbol is used.

_Title Arrangement._—Title arrangement is the same.

_Words Spelled in Two Ways._—Arrangement is the same.

**Storage and Sorting Time**

Complete figures are not available for storage requirements and sorting time for the book catalogs filed according to the computer filing code. They were produced by Bro-Dart Industries on an IBM 360/30 computer. Sorting on this computer takes two to three minutes per 1,000 titles (not entries) on a sort field over 100 characters long.

**Applicability of the Code**

As its name indicates, the computer filing code is not intended solely for library catalogs. The same principles are applicable to indexes and bibliographies. Symbols may be added for computer composition without conflict with the code. Under “Further Research” (below), a number of recent applications are described.

**Response to the Code**

The response to the code was not at all what we had hoped it might be. Our reason for undertaking the research described and for publishing the results was a firm conviction that the sorting of bibliographic entries by computer was a highly significant problem, with ramifications extending into areas usually treated separately from filing. As we believed that it was important to utilize the computer as effectively as possible, and knew that sizable amounts of bibliographic information were being keyed into machine-readable form without real consideration of the filing problem, we hoped to spark some real discussion and study before major commitments were undertaken. We had no delusions then or since that our suggestions might be considered final.

To judge from the response of reviewers, we did not make our position entirely clear at that time; but much more importantly, very little real notice was taken of filing as a significant problem from the time our work was originally published until the recent publication of the first volume of a new series, which includes an entire chapter on filing. Despite the many published book catalogs and indexes which have made very clear the problems of computer filing when entry format is inconsistent, and of other published tools which resorted to numerical coding of entries (the equivalent of hand-filing them), it is

* See below for a discussion of findings of further research on subject heading form.
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still often said that the system we have devised does not make full use of computer capabilities and/or that it requires human beings to perform tasks better relegated to the machine.

Certainly precise entry formatting requires that humans perform a certain amount of drudge-like work of the type we would prefer to relegate entirely to computers. We have found, however, in a variety of situations that these responses quickly become automatic and nearly error-free. We have not seen evidence that any other system requiring less of this sort of formatting has actually been made operational without the keying of explicit tags, or the like, which are quite complex. Furthermore, anyone who has ever had to type cards for a conventional card catalog knows that the styling conventions for such typing are both complex and rigid, and we do not see that our conventions are any more difficult. We do hope that Cartwright's discussion is indicative of real interest in the problem on the part of other workers and that we may now progress to the point where some really useful alternatives are proposed on the basis of actual attempts to use them on universes of significant size. Filing should be a minor problem; our goal in this area is to contribute to making it that.

Further Research

Work on filing problems has continued at Columbia, both directly and indirectly. One of us (Harris) has performed a study which extended the entry formatting procedures of the code to include subject headings. This study used a 10 percent sample of the Library of Congress subject heading list, 7th ed., selected in such a way that numerous complex groups of headings were included. A formatting procedure was devised, and shown to be applicable as a clerical operation with professional editing. Some of the arrangements under complex terms are not entirely satisfactory; a major conclusion of the study was that these terms are precisely those which will be difficult to search in any case, and that extensive study of subject heading structure must be carried out to permit better, more usable formatting either in the conventional arrangement or in that given by the code.

Indirectly, we have shown the applicability of the base principles of the code in a number of products of various types. Several years ago—out of necessity, not advisability—we learned to do our own programming. Since then we have included a filing routine based on the code in every program. The usual procedure is for the preliminary segment of each program to build a rough sort key for each access point desired in the final product. The filing routine removes punctuation and pads all numbers except B. C. dates with zeroes to the left to a predetermined maximum length. For B. C. dates the reciprocal is calculated and filing is on the basis of that. We had in the beginning hoped that use of a sort key would be unnecessary, but we found that a key that would permit us to take advantage of the speed of the utility sort could be generated without human intervention.
One of us (Hines) has published an article describing filing of classification notations. The filing routine was used in production of the index to volume 20 of American Documentation, published in its October 1969 issue, and an article describing production of the index has been submitted for publication. A description (with Charlotte Levy) of a computer-produced concordance to Goethe's Faust has been published, and we anticipate publication of the concordance itself in the near future. In addition, we are using the filing routine in three thesauri, an experimental incunabula listing, a small book catalog, and several book indexes. In all these applications we have not found it necessary or desirable to make any limitation on field length, punctuation, etc. We have found it to be viable and flexible in all these uses. It has, in fact, become a standardized routine which we use with all kinds of bibliographic data as needed.

Conclusion

We still regard the routine described here as preliminary, despite its success in a number of different situations. We hope that others will carry this work forward and produce new insights from actual research.
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More on DC Numbers on LC Cards: Quantity and Quality

The percentage of LC cards with DC numbers was the subject of a vigorous debate in 1965. The discussion and the figures are brought up to date. Then the value and limitations of DC numbers on LC cards is considered. Possible reasons for the rejection of numbers is examined, both theoretically and with examples, under the categories of local policy, typographical errors, optional locations, optional extensions, misclassification, inconsistency, and policy decisions. Some suggestions for the improvement of LC's DC service are made.

With the growth in pressures on library services and personnel, libraries are making increasing use of central cataloging services. The extent of coverage and the value of these services are thus a matter of considerable importance.

In 1965 there was a lively debate in the pages of Library Resources & Technical Services on the relations between the Library of Congress and the Dewey Decimal Classification, and in particular on the percentage of DC numbers on LC cards. I would like to summarize this discussion, to bring it up to date, and to offer some thoughts on the equally important subject, but one largely unconsidered in the literature, of the value and limitations of DC numbers on LC cards.

The 1965 debate was begun by the report of the Classification Committee, RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section, on types of classification available to new academic libraries. The report stated that DC numbers appeared on LC cards for only about 35 percent of titles, and that this figure was liable to decrease. In replying to the report, Benjamin Custer, Chief of the Library of Congress Decimal Classification Division, and Editor of the Dewey Decimal Classification, reported that although the figure of 35 percent was substantially correct, in fact, about 80 percent of the cards sold by the Library of Congress had DC numbers, and that instead of the percentage of titles with DC numbers decreasing, it was expected to increase.

In a follow-up article, Verner Clapp expressed the opinion that the Classification Committee report was alarming to all users of DC, and he examined the historical relations between the Library of Congress and DC. He demonstrated that the percentage of LC cards with DC num-
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bers had been steadily decreasing since the 1930s and had reached a figure of only 26 percent in fiscal year 1964. He concluded that LC had "... inadvertently become entangled in a painful conflict-of-interest situation..." and that "... it is difficult to perceive an exit from the situation other than that LC should resume giving 'equal time' to DC and LC on its cards..." L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, replied at considerable length to Clapp's article. Among his points were that LC had never advocated the use of its own classification to other libraries, and that it had given much service to DC by housing the DC Editorial Office and editing DC16 and later editions under contract.

But in spite of Custer's assurances, things were to get worse before they started to get better. DC numbers on LC cards reached all-time lows of 25 percent in 1964/65, and 24 percent in 1965/66. But it could be announced in 1967 that "... on June 5, the DC Office [as it was then named] surpassed its all-time high of 42,914 titles classified in a single year..." That earlier high, incidentally, had been in 1934 and represented 99 percent of all LC cards. The 1967 figure represented a more modest 42 percent. It was further added that the DC Division was classifying all current nonfiction published in the U.S. in any language, all current nonfiction in English published abroad and catalogued by the Library, and all current titles (other than belles lettres) in French, German, Spanish, and Portuguese which were received by the Library through the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging.

The use of the word "all" may have been debatable but the report was encouraging. Even better was to come, however. In 1968 it was reported:

The Division broke all records by classifying 71,641 titles in fiscal year 1968, an increase of 55 percent over fiscal 1967, and even a small increase over the total classified in the three fiscal years 1964-66. This increase constitutes a major improvement in the Library's bibliographic services to other libraries.

The percentage coverage was now 49 percent, and the policy statement was amended to state that the Division was assigning Dewey numbers to "nearly all current non-fiction titles catalogued by the Library in English, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish."

Finally, in 1969, the Division reported further advances:

During fiscal 1969 the division classified 74,966 titles, an increase of 3.8 percent over 1968. Coverage included all current titles in English being cataloged by the Library (except some juvenile works), and a limited number of titles, chiefly in the fields of natural, physical, applied, and social sciences in French, German, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish. In midyear the division began to assign class numbers to adult fiction for the benefit of libraries that classify fiction. Dewey numbers were assigned to all titles in the MARC program except juvenile fiction.

Thus, the critics on quantity of DC numbers on LC cards are gradually being answered. The increase, from 24 percent in 1965/66 to 49
percent in 1967/68, is praiseworthy, and enthusiasm is only tempered by the realization that this is in fact only a return to the general level of coverage of the 1950s, far below the coverage offered in the 1930s and 1940s, and far short of total coverage.

In summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1931-39</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-49</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-59</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963/64</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964/65</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965/66</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966/67</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967/68</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The administrative history of the Decimal Classification Division deserves some comment at this point. From 1933 to 1958 it was named the Decimal Classification Section and was successively part of the Card Division (1933/34), Cooperative Cataloging and Classification Service (1934/40), and finally the Subject Cataloging Division (1940/58). In 1958 the Section was merged with the DC Editorial Office, which had been operated by LC since 1934 under contract with Forest Press, to form the Decimal Classification Office. "The objectives of the merger...were to increase the number of Library of Congress printed cards carrying Dewey numbers and to produce future editions of the Classification firmly based on daily experience in applying it to books."8 The significance of this merger was reflected in DC17, and is important in relation to the next section of this study. Finally, when the LC Processing Department was reorganized in 1968, the Decimal Classification Office became the Decimal Classification Division, one of the five divisions under the supervision of the Assistant Director for Cataloging.9

The Library of Congress has always maintained that libraries are free to make as much or as little use of the information on LC cards as they wish. This point is made firmly in an important article by William Welsh.10 This is unquestionably true, but the value of central cataloguing services can only be assessed in terms of the extent to which the information they provide is useful and usable.

Virtually no library accepts all information on LC cards without alteration, and it could not be expected that any library would be able to accept all DC numbers provided, even if they had been assigned by the DC Division from the particular edition of DC used by the library. Having discussed the percentage of LC cards carrying DC numbers, it is natural to consider next what percentage of these numbers are acceptable.

Various figures have been given in the literature. Naturally, the percentages will vary with particular libraries. I offer some more figures, for comparison, from a series of checks taken at La Trobe University Library, Victoria, Australia.
Taking cards of any date into account:

Sample 1 (717 titles) 56% acceptable

The sample was broken down by DC edition. (La Trobe University Library uses DC17.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC17</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC16</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC14</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages for DC16 and earlier editions are as much a reflection of the fact that certain sections of DC have not changed over the years as they are a measure of the degree of acceptability of DC Division numbers. To get a less ambiguous result, a second sample of DC17 numbers only was taken.

Sample 2 (427 titles) 73% acceptable

There is some material in the literature on classification on the problems of accepting Library of Congress Classification numbers on LC cards (the article by Welsh gives a useful summary of the subject). But the numbers, at least, are designed for and totally acceptable to one particular library, and so serve a purpose. There is very little discussion, however, of the usefulness of the DC numbers. The figure for rejected numbers will obviously vary from library to library, but the problems of use, in general terms, are clearly of some importance. Although I am discussing the DC Division and DC numbers, much the same comments could be made on the classification work of any central cataloguing agency.

Over a period of several months (in 1969) I collected samples of DC numbers assigned by the DC Division from DC17 which were rejected by La Trobe University Library, and attempted to categorise them. The cases I have selected to quote as examples form only a small percentage of those that I collected, but they seem to illustrate the basic problems. I shall refer to the examples by LC card number for brevity.

The reasons for rejections were found to fall into the following categories: (1) Local policy; (2) Typographical errors; (3) Optional locations; (4) Optional extensions; (5) DC Division practices, (a) misclassification, (b) inconsistency, (c) policy decisions.

Local Policy

All libraries, perhaps unfortunately, make variations from the classification scheme which they use, either by way of special expansions or by alterations to suit special and continuing local needs. There is no way for a central cataloguing agency of the LC type to allow for this, and so certain DC numbers are automatically of no use in the library using the central service. No examples are necessary.
Typographical Errors

The DC Division can hardly be blamed for typographical errors on LC cards and entries. But the Library of Congress can be. Numbers are very ready sources of proofreading error, and errors are common in the DC numbers on LC cards. Thus, no number can be accepted without careful checking.

One example will suffice here, although there were many.

332.109763 instead of 322.109763
(Church and state in French colonial Louisiana, 66-21529)

Optional Locations

The Classification Committee report stated that DC is "too permissive" for central cataloguing. Certainly, there are fifty-four alternative locations indicated in DC17, with the editors preferring one of the placings in each case; a number of these alternatives are in major areas, such as biography, geography, bibliography, and belles lettres. The DC Division takes a reasonable course and follows the editor's preference in all cases, and gives only that number. Works that are considered to be primarily biographical, however, are identified by a "(B)" following the classification number to alert libraries which wish to use the optional alternative number, but it is not given. Libraries, then, who use any of the options are left to do their own classification, and in general are not warned of the situation on LC cards. Once again, no examples are necessary.

Optional Extensions

There are many places in DC17 where an optional extension of the class number is provided for libraries which wish to classify in depth. These instructions are usually in the form, "If desired..." Although the DC Division wisely follows a general policy of providing the fullest DC number possible, which individual libraries may modify if they wish with the guidance of the segmentation of numbers that is provided, they do not use any of these optional extensions. Libraries are hence in the situation of extending the numbers for close classification. The implications of the extensions are rather wider than this, however.

In most cases the DC number that the DC Division gives is merely shorter than it could be. For example, all works and criticisms of Shakespeare are given 822.33 instead of 822.33A to 822.33Z. But in other cases the number as a whole is affected by the option, and the DC Division, in order to give a number that is wholly acceptable to all libraries as far as it goes has to give a considerably reduced number.

For example, the major literatures have an instruction that, if desired, literatures of specific countries may be distinguished by an initial letter. If this is done, however, special period divisions are to be used. Thus a Colombian novel can only be classed at 863 (67-102123) or a criticism of Patrick White at 823 (66-70759), or a collection of contemporary
Australian children's poetry at 821 (67-102927). It is only that part of the number up to the form of literature which does not change, and the resulting number is so broad as to be totally useless.

**DC Division Practices**

Theoretically, at least, the DC Division has no "policies" other than the kinds described above. But in practice this is not so for two major reasons. Firstly, classifiers are, at best, human, and human beings are certain to interpret within the limitations of their understanding, knowledge and experience, even with precise tools, and even more so with imprecise tools such as Classification schedules. Secondly, as mentioned earlier, the DC "editorial" and "practice" sections are combined, and cards may reflect policy matters not in DC, not yet incorporated in it, or inadequately explained in it.

**Misclassification**

Classifiers, as intimated above, are not perfect, and LC cards show many misclassifications in DC numbers. Some are very difficult to distinguish from typographical errors, but I have tried to give only indisputable examples.

016.8203 instead of 016.8209003 (or 016.8208003)
(Elizabethan bibliographies, 67-19738)

320.95608 instead of, probably, 320.956008
(A collection on politics in the contemporary Middle East, 67-20484)
[There are two unusual features about this number. The 08 is in the place reserved for optional period divisions (there is no period 08, though) and should be 008 if "collections" is intended. However, both types of extension are of the optional type not usually used by the DC Division.]

354.54053 instead of 354.5405
(Cabinet government in India, 67-83073)
[There is no -3 division.]

631.49954 instead of 631.4954
(Land and soil in India, SA66-7432)
[A direction at 631.4 instructs you to use 631.49 and not 631.409.]

915.1 instead of 913.3103
(Chinese civilization to 221 B.C., 66-70138)
[914.3149 is for the modern world only.]

581.90982
(Pacific area plants, 66-2101)
[581.909 can only be divided like areas -11 to -15, and not area -18.]
882.0093 instead of 882.01093
("Time" in classical Greek tragedy, 68-16380)

[The assigned number refers to Greek drama of all periods.]

199.52
(Japanese philosophy, 67-17604)

[The index to DC17 gives 181.12 as the number for Japanese philosophy.]

709.4
(Gothic art, 67-97913)

[The index gives 709.02 as the number for Gothic art.]

709.4
(Renaissance art, 68-100935)

[The index gives 709.024 as the number for Renaissance art.]

951.90430924 instead of 951.050924
(Mao Tse-tung, 66-15302)

[Chairman Mao among the Koreans, a bizarre effect achieved by skipping over the page!]

270.60943 instead of 274.3(03)
(Reformation in Germany, 68-75762 and 68-74086)

[Although it is not specifically stated, the period divisions of 270 must have their usual meaning of not being limited geographically. The numbers 274-279 are designed for treatment by continent, country, locality.]

These examples, I think, serve to show that the DC Division is capable of seriously misleading classification of a kind from which central services should be completely free.

Inconsistency

Individual libraries take various precautions to ensure consistency in their classification. The same standard can be expected of a central agency. The DC Division falls short of the ideal. This has been revealingly demonstrated since the introduction of the shared cataloguing program, where more than one copy of a book, varying only in imprint, have been classified.

Here are three examples:

020.1 (68-501)
020.8 (68-79875)
(Simsona: Lenin, Krupskaia and libraries)

914.203810922 (68-16292)
920.042 (68-20294)
(Drew: Acton, Gladstone, and others)
These admittedly are glaring examples and possibly exceptional cases, but the problem can also be illustrated in other ways.

New subject fields are problems for all classifiers, in spite of the instructions in the introduction to DC17. The DC Division does not always manage to overcome the problem.

e.g., Political sociology
301.01 (68-90044)
301.5 (67-10672)
320 (66-72798)
[LC classes all of these books at JA76.]

Certain ambiguities in the placing of subjects in DC17 also lead to inconsistency. Criticism of children’s literature is a typical case.

e.g., 028.5 (68-79060)
(A critical guide to Canadian children’s literature in English)
809.89282 (67-5971)
(A critical approach to children’s literature)

The provision of a number .33, for the novel as a “scope” of fiction, provides many opportunities for classification.

e.g., 833.03 (67-25327)
(The contemporary novel in German)
[By all principles this should be classed at 833.9109.]
843.03 (67-107875)
(The French novel before the Revolution)
843.009 (67-9795)
(A companion volume to the above on the French novel after the Revolution)

But probably the awkward provisions for the political parties of the U.S. provide the best (or worst) case of inconsistency. Specific parties are enumerated at 329.1 to 329.8, with a centred heading. Parties of other countries are classed in 329.9. The centred heading leads to 329 as the place for comprehensive works, except that political parties have a general number at 329.02.

The DC Division has tried all possible variations for comprehensive works on U.S. political parties.

e.g. 329 (67-17409)
329.00973 (68-16183)
329.02 (66-24247)
329.020973 (67-28029)
329.973 (67-12797)
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It is thus essential for libraries to compare each DC number with their own previous practice to ensure any kind of consistency, remembering in addition that a previous decision may have been influenced by a DC Division choice and not chosen from strictly logical considerations.

*Policy Decisions*

There is no guide to the use of DC17. Much of the information of a general nature given in the Guide to DC16 is incorporated in the very detailed introduction to DC17, but more informal guidance on particular numbers is not. One could perhaps assume that where a direction in the Guide is not specifically contradicted in the introduction to DC17 by way of general principles, or by a note at the class number itself, it will continue to be true and continue to be practised by the DC Division (on whose practise the Guide was constructed). Such, however, does not appear to be the case. I will comment on two discrepancies.

The Guide suggests for the 8os, that "... in determining the period number for an individual author, use the period of the author's earliest known bellettristic publication." But consider the following examples:

848.912 (68-11419)
(Montesquieu, who published 1892 onwards)

848.91208 (68-92878)
(Genet, who published 1942 onwards)

844.914 (67-96766)
(Camus, who published 1938 onwards)

It can be seen that the principle in the Guide is not being followed, and it is difficult to see what principle is being used in its place.

The second instance is more important. DC, because of its basic concept of "discipline," is not designed to cope with books that cover several disciplines. A striking example is the "subject" usually referred to as "government," which covers topics scattered by DC in 320, 324, 328, 329, 342, 353-354, and other places. Finding a logical place to class books which cover government comprehensively obviously presents problems. The Guide suggested that 342 be used for "... the application of the provisions of a constitution to all three branches of a government—legislative, executive, judicial ..." and the DC Division at one time used 342 for works on government. Now, without explanation, it is most common to find such works classed at 320.09.
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It is not necessary here to consider the relative merits of the various numbers. The point being made here is simply that the DC Division is establishing practises that have no basis in DC17, and are often in contradiction to the last published guide to their practise. Many other instances could be detailed, such as DC Division policy on 320.9 versus 930-990, or 309.1 versus 913-919.

Conclusions

The foregoing discussion is not intended to belittle the work of the DC Division. It seems to be self-evident that DC numbers should continue to be given on LC cards, and that they should appear, if possible, on 100 percent of the cards. But quality is at least as important as quantity, and it is essential that the DC Division work in such a way that they offer the maximum benefit to users. It follows from this that the fullest possible DC number should be given, which libraries may then have the option of cutting if they wish. This leaves the choice of the degree of closeness of classification where it properly belongs, to the individual library (a point not appreciated by the editors of DC15). Where DC provides alternative locations, both numbers should be given and the preferred number indicated. Typographical errors should not occur. The classification should be consistent, based on sound and stated principles. Misclassifications should not be allowed to occur (libraries can manage enough of these without assistance). DC will obviously change and develop as literature is published, and DC needs a close and continuing contact with it. But the DC numbers on LC cards should not preempt the interpretation that properly belongs in the schedules.

Whether it planned it that way or not, or even wants it that way, LC is an arbiter of cataloguing practise. Its special relations with DC make the point critical, in spite of the various policy committees on DC. Libraries should be able to rely on DC numbers on LC cards, within reasonable limitations, as a basis of good classification practise. Perhaps the relative merits of DC and LC can be argued on a more rational level than is now current in the United States if DC and LC have “equal time” on LC cards.
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Reply to John McKinlay

We congratulate Mr. McKinlay for spotlighting the continuing interest of the profession in the Dewey Decimal Classification. Now that it is 1970, it appears that the "bandwagon of the '60's," as switching from DC has been called, is losing some of its momentum.

Quantity

It is the Decimal Classification Division’s wish, to the degree that financial support can be obtained, to continue to increase its coverage, and it would like to be able to assign DDC numbers to all titles currently cataloged by the Library of Congress in all European languages—including Russian—but not in Oriental or African languages. This is probably not a realistic aim. Although Dewey assignments increased dramatically in total numbers between fiscal 1965 and the present, there is still much new ground to be taken, and, in fact, as a percentage of total LC cataloging production, the trend is again downward. At present—May 1970—the Division finds itself not quite able to keep up with LC cataloging in English, much less with cataloging in even French and German. This is so because since the 1930s the DC service, being in the strict sense a national-library type of service, has not been able to obtain the appropriations it needs to give full coverage on all titles. At present...
a staff of nine, including supervisors, trainers, and trainees, is handling about 75,000 titles per year, which in my view is phenomenal. It is doubtful whether support for more staff will become available in the foreseeable future.

Quality

There is no doubt that the pressures upon the staff to class as many titles as possible have a certain detrimental effect on quality. Library of Congress cataloging as a whole is less error-free than it was in 1932 when I was a beginner in another library, buying LC cards; this is the price that must be paid if LC service is to cope with vast increases in publishing and acquisitions. In the old days, every cataloger's work was revised, and every reviser's work was reviewed; now new catalogers and classifiers are encouraged to work independently as soon as they possibly can. Errors of typography, of fact, and of judgment result.

Optional Extensions

The Decimal Classification Division plans to study the problem of literatures written in languages native to countries other than that of origin with a view to establishing a method for giving period numbers for Irish, Colombian, Australian, Anglo-Indian, Anglo-Canadian, French-Canadian, and similar authors.

Misclassification

We have investigated all of Mr. McKinlay's examples, and find that in most cases his criticisms are justified (nostra culpa!), and we have set the correction machinery in motion. Some of the errors had already been detected by ourselves or others. Comments follow on a few items.

Gothic and Renaissance art both in 709.4: Observance of the rule for citation order giving precedence to non-o notation before notation with o brings Gothic and/or Renaissance art of a specific place to the number for art in that place; in other words, place precedes period in virtually all uses of standard subdivisions 091-0994 and 091.099. For this reason, comprehensive works on Gothic art as a whole are classed in 709.02, but Gothic art in France in 709.44.

Political sociology: New subject fields are indeed problems for all classifiers. In this case DC17 does not supply a specific number. In Edition 18 there will be provision for this subject at 301.592, in anticipation of which books are now being classed in the broad 301.5. Until this number was developed the classifiers used 301.01, 320, and 320.01. There is little point in revising these cards until after Edition 18 is published with its specific provision.

The French or German novel of a specific period: Inasmuch as the DDC traditionally arranges literature by form, e.g., fiction, before period, e.g., 20th century, it has seemed to the editors that logically kinds of fiction, e.g., novels, science fiction, should also take precedence in citation order over period, even though this controverts the usual rule of
non-o before o. Edition 18 will provide direct instructions to class histories and collections of such kinds (but not works by and about individual authors) in 833.01-08 and similar numbers regardless of period. Meantime, unfortunately, some unwarranted anticipation of this change has taken place.

Political parties of the United States: The correct comprehensive number is 329.02. Works classed in 329 and 329.00973 were found by the classifiers to be broader in their coverage than parties alone; we all know how misleading titles can be. The last four digits of 329.020973 are redundant, because parties of all other countries are classed in 329.9; 329.02 serves for both U.S. parties and parties in general, and this will be clearly stated in Edition 18. 329.973 is just plain wrong.

Dates of individual authors of belles lettres: Mr. McKinlay has not quoted the entire statement from the Guide: “In determining the period number for an individual author, use the period of the author’s earliest known bellettistic publication. As a rule of thumb to determine this, use the copyright date of the earliest work in the library. When in doubt, follow the copyright date of the work in hand.” Once a period has been established, the classifier does not change it even if an earlier work comes to light.

Government: The general principles of Edition 17 emphasize discipline. Only works on government from a strictly constitutional point of view can be properly classed in 342. There has been inconsistency in the use of 320.09 and 320.9, which will be cleared up in Edition 18. 329 is used for practical politics (which is sometimes the true subject of a book called “government”).

It should be clear from these notes that Edition 18, due in 1971, will, with its greater precision, reduce the amount of error and inconsistency for which classifiers, even the best ones, are responsible.

Options: The editors do not agree that all alternative provisions should be shown on LC cards. Inclusion of every official option would clutter up cards and MARC records. Consider geography of France in 944 as well as 914.4, biography of Lincoln in 923.173 as well as 973.70924, economic geography of British Columbia in 910.1330711 as well as 330.9711, Hamlet in 828.3 as well as 822.33. Libraries wishing to take full advantage of centralized services should be prepared to use preferred arrangements only.
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Searching MARC/DPS Records for Area Studies: Comparative Results Using Keywords, LC and DC Class Numbers
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A computer-based file of approximately 8000 MARC Pilot Project records was searched in four different ways to find all the relevant references for two areas of the world, Latin America and the Middle East. Access to every word or number in each field of the MARC record was possible. Keyword searches in title statement and subject headings retrieved more relevant references than search by LC or Dewey class numbers or by scanning the Dewey class numbers for area codes. An analysis of false drops was made to determine how the search strategy could be improved.

The School of Library Science at Syracuse University has developed a computer-based laboratory where students can approach problems in cataloging, reference, and other courses by using computer processing and mechanized retrieval procedures. The computer-based laboratory is called LEEP (Library Education Experimental Project). “It consists of both complete and sample files of the MARC Pilot Project [MARC I] tapes in various formats usable with our own library of programs. . . . Special project materials, user manuals, and technical assistance are provided by the LEEP staff.”

One of the responsibilities of the LEEP staff is to work with the faculty in developing assignments which make use of LEEP facilities. Last summer, while working up an assignment on area studies for a course in “Bibliography of the Social Sciences,” a series of searches were made for MARC records on the Middle East. This group of searches led to the question, “Which is the most efficient way to retrieve relevant document references on the Middle East?” The following paper is a report on our work to answer this question.

The objectives of this study were:
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1. To discover the optimum search strategy to retrieve at least 95 percent of the relevant literature on an area of the world.

2. To discover what other methods to use, in what order, to retrieve the rest of the literature of that area.

3. To determine why non-relevant document references were retrieved.

4. To recommend search strategies which will minimize the number of "false drops" and maximize the number of relevant "hits."²

**Factors Likely to Influence the Results of the Study**

A. The document collection: The MARC Pilot Project tapes consist of cataloging information about approximately 48,000 English language monographs. From these tapes, LEEP selected about 8,000 MARC I records. The distribution of these records among the various subject areas is shown in Table 1. These records are accessible only through the computer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number in MARCS/DPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generalia (A)</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography &amp; Library Science (Z)</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (L)</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology &amp; Religion (B)</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology &amp; Geography (G)</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Economics (H)</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science (J)</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History: General &amp; World (C, D)</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Hemisphere (E, F)</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (M)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts (N)</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Literature (P)</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>7516</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. The MARC I record: Each MARC I record transmits the same information as does a Library of Congress unit card—descriptive and subject cataloging, LC and Dewey classification numbers and the LC card number. The record also makes certain information explicit—original language of the book, language of translation, juvenile titles, presence or absence or bibliographies, etc. Each major element of the cataloging copy (main entry, DC number, title, etc.) is given a MARC I tag to facilitate identification of the element.³

² "False drops" are document references which are retrieved by a search, but are judged not relevant by the user. "Hits" are references which are retrieved by a search and are judged relevant or questionable by the user.

C. Document Processing System: The Document Processing System (DPS) is an IBM information retrieval program package designed to facilitate the storage and retrieval of free text information.

In order to use the MARC I records with DPS, it was necessary to reformat the records. The MARCS/DPS records are divided into two sections (Figure 1): the Bibliographic Reference Data and the Text Data.

**MARC PROJECT CATALOG RECORD**
**IN DPS OUTPUT FORMAT (WITH FIELD NAMES AND TAGS)**

**BIBLIO:**
**CONF:**
**CONT:**
DATE1: 1967
DATE2: 1965
DDCNO: 595.7/06
DOCNO: 0000000121
EDITION:
FORM: M
ILLUS: X
IMPRINT: GARDEN CITY, N. Y., #PUBLISHED FOR THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY BY THE NATURAL HISTORY PRESS#1967, C1965#

**JUV:**
**LANG1:** ENG
**LANG2:**
**LCCALL:** SB931.N4 1967
**LCCARD:** 65017947
**MAENT:** NEWMAN, LEONARD HUGH.
**SERIES:**
**SUBJECTS:** INSECTS, INJURIOUS AND BENEFICIAL.
**SUCALL:**
**TITST:** MAN AND INSECTS # INSECT ALLIES AND ENEMIES# BY L. H. NEWMAN.
**TYPEME:** PAU
**UDCNO:**

**TEXT DATA IN DPS RECORD**

65017947 NYGC NHP CM27 LO537
T90 SB931.N4 1967. T92 595.7/06.
T10 NEWMAN, LEONARD HUGH.
T20 MAN AND INSECTS # INSECT ALLIES AND ENEMIES# BY L. H. NEWMAN.
T30 GARDEN CITY N. Y., #PUBLISHED FOR THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY BY THE NATURAL HISTORY PRESS# 1967, C1965#
T40 252 P. ILLUS. (PART COL.) MAPS (PART COL.) 27 CM. T51 NATURE AND SCIENCE LIBRARY
T70 INSECTS, INJURIOUS AND BENEFICIAL.
T72C AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK. T74 T. ALLDROP

* T90, T92, T10, etc. are the original MARC 1 field tag numbers.

Figure 1
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The various fields in the Bibliographic Reference Data portion (called the Record) have been given mnemonic names. In the Text Data portion (called the Text), the tag numbers have been preceded by the letter T (e.g., T10, T20, etc.).

DPS enables the user to request MARCS/DPS records by any word anywhere in the Text, including title words, words in notes, words in the collation, etc., and by any number—class, page, date, etc. Any single word, number or combination of letters and numbers may be searched (these are called keywords). The user can specify which portion of the Text he wants searched, or he can have the entire Text searched. A different type of search statement is available to work on the Record portion. This type of command does not look for keywords, but tests for conditions which describe the document (e.g., If ILLUS equals X).

The language of DPS consists of simple English words or numbers and Boolean operators to handle combinations of keywords (AND, OR, NOT). Word order and the simultaneous appearance of keywords in the same element of the record can be specified. Truncated words can be searched as well.⁴

**Methods of Constructing the Searches**

**A. Term Definition:** The first step in constructing the searches was to begin defining terms and geographic areas. Area studies or area research are considered to be "the interdisciplinary study of a given geographic region, country or group of countries (considered as a unit), which takes account of the socially significant data about the area, including the history of the people, their economic and political development and their use of natural resources.”⁵ “Area studies ... may treat the topography, ethnography, natural resources, religion, sociology, economy, law, government, history, culture (or any combination of these) for an area, large or small.”⁶

The area to be studied was the Middle East. Later in the study, it was decided to examine another area as a check on the results of the Middle East study. Latin America was chosen.

It was decided that "the Arab countries, inclusive of North Africa, together with Israel, Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan—often called collectively the Near East or Middle East ... constitute a regional unit.”⁷ Latin America was defined as "that part of the Western hemisphere that lies south of the border of the United States and of the Florida Strait. It

---

⁴ For more information about the DPS system as used by the LEEP project, see: Judith A. Tessier, Searching MARC/DPS; A User's Manual (LEEP Report 69-3; Syracuse: Syracuse University School of Library Science, 1969).


includes Middle America (Mexico, Central America, and the West Indies) and South America."\(^8\)

B. **Search Strategy:** In order to retrieve all the relevant MARC records from the file, four different types of searches were written:

1. Searches for **keywords**—English language words and phrases, e.g., Middle East, Palestine, etc.

2. Searches for **Library of Congress (LC) Classification** numbers on the area—e.g., DS36, F1869, etc.

3. Searches for **Dewey Classification** numbers on the area—e.g., 956, 972, etc.

4. "**If-scan**" searches—The "If-scan" function enables the user to scan a specified field of the Record portion of the MARC/DPS record for a given character or character string. In this case, we specified that the computer scan the field called DDCNO, which is the Dewey classification number, for an area code. Such a search for the area code 56 (Middle East) would yield such Dewey numbers as 560, 956, 321.00956, etc.

The first step in preparing the keyword searches was to compile a list of words and phrases which would yield records relevant to an area study. We examined the Dewey and LC classification schedules for the two areas and listed all of the relevant words and phrases we could find. To this list were added such words as geographic names, names of religions, and famous people representative of the area, etc. Each word and phrase was checked in our "index list of keywords in MARCS/DPS"\(^9\) to see if the word appeared in the file of 8,000 MARC records. If a word was not listed in this index, it was discarded.

The words which remained formed the keyword searches. They were combined according to DPS vocabulary and syntax rules in such a way as to retrieve every MARC record which contained any one or more of the specified words or phrases regardless of where it might appear in the Text portion.

The LC and Dewey Classification searches were prepared by examining the LC and Dewey schedules to determine the appropriate class numbers on the area. These class numbers were checked in the "index list." If they appeared in this index, the DPS search was written to retrieve every MARC record which contained the specified LC or Dewey classification numbers.

The "If-Scan" search was prepared for the applicable area notations from the Dewey Classification Area Table.\(^10\) All MARC records having a Dewey class number built with these area notations were to be retrieved.

The thirteen searches run on MARCS/DPS are listed in the Appendix. Each was assigned a number from 206–220.

---


\(^9\) This list is available from LEEP at a nominal cost.

Methods of Recording the Information Gathered in the Searches

Once run, each of the searches resulted in a printout, with statistics and document references which met search criteria. Each MARC record in the MARC/DPS file has a unique number (see DOCNO in the Record, Figure 1) and that document number was used for identification of individual MARC records.

Each MARC record was examined and the following information was recorded (see Figure 2):

Side 1: Document number
   Is it relevant (R), questionable (Q) or not relevant (NR)?
   Search number
   Kind of search
   Keyword(s) which caused the record to be retrieved

Side 2: Document number
   Keyword(s)—excluding LC or Dewey numbers
   Location (by MARC tag number) where the keyword appeared

Relevance Judgments

The MARC record was judged to be relevant if it fell within the boundaries of the definition of area studies quoted earlier in this paper. One person judged the relevance of all of the MARC records. In order to test her judgment, another member of the LEEP staff judged a group of ninety-five MARC records which had been retrieved by the area searches. The two evaluations agreed for eighty-three MARC records. In the case of nine MARC records, one of the judgments was in the questionable area (Q — R or Q — NR). In only three of the ninety-five MARC records was there complete disagreement (R — NR, or vice versa).

Analysis of Data

The different types of searches (KW, LC, DC, IFSc, and combinations of these) which caused MARC records to be retrieved for the Middle East and Latin America searches are shown in diagram form in Figures 3 and 4, respectively. This information is also shown in tabular form in Table 2.

The precision of each type of search was measured. The precision ratio (number of relevant MARC records retrieved to total retrieved) is shown in Table 3.

The estimated recall of each type of search was measured. The recall ratio (number of relevant MARC records retrieved by a given strategy to the total relevant retrieved by all strategies) is shown in Table 3.

To estimate the total number of relevant documents in the file, for each area study, a group of 100 MARC records was selected randomly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc. No. 4469</th>
<th>Search No.</th>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>KW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>DS 80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>956.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>IFSc</td>
<td>956.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>KW</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Side 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc. No. 4469</th>
<th>KW</th>
<th>T10</th>
<th>T20</th>
<th>T60</th>
<th>T70</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Side 2**

Figure 2
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### TABLE 2
SEARCH CRITERIA WHICH RETRIEVED MARC RECORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Strategy</th>
<th>Middle East Searches</th>
<th>Latin America Searches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyword</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW/DC/LC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW/LC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW/IF SC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW/DC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW/LC/IF SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/DC/IF SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF SC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/DC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Strategy</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precision Ratio</td>
<td>Recall Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF SC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW &amp; LC</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW &amp; DC</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW &amp; IF SC</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW &amp; LC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total R is 104 (Middle East), 145 (Latin America).
T Retrieved for any single strategy is the sum of documents retrieved using it alone or in combination with other strategies (see Table 2 for details).

Analysis of Failures

In studying the non-relevant MARC records which were retrieved, certain patterns became evident:

1. Those retrieved by the use of keywords resulted from homonyms, i.e., certain keywords have more than one meaning. Most of these false drops would be unavoidable.

In the Latin America study, a system error was the sole cause of twenty-eight false drops. A group of words (South, Central, Latin, Spanish and Pan) were linked with the root word AMERICA. The intent was to restrict the search to documents which contained phrases such as South America, Latin America, Pan American, etc.11 These instructions were ignored in error and MARC records with either word were retrieved.

Human error in preparing the list of keywords for the searches caused a few false drops. Careless truncation of words yielded such false drop keywords as Jewelry (from JEW-) and Arabesque (from ARAB-). A little

---

11 See Search 220 in Appendix.
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### TABLE 4

table hits by MARC data field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords in Data Field</th>
<th>Middle East</th>
<th></th>
<th>Latin America</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>Non-relevant</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single field hits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10 (author)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20 (title)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T30 (imprint)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T60 (notes)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T70 (subject heading)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hits in more than one field:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20/T70 (title and subject heading)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20/T60/T70 (title, notes and subject heading)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. More attention to the compiling of the keyword list can eliminate some non-relevant hits.

2. The “IF-Scan” type of search yielded many false drops—twenty-eight out of a total of fifty-two in the Middle East search and 204 out of 247 in the Latin America search. In no case did the “IF-Scan” type of search supply a relevant record which would not have been retrieved by a keyword, LC, or DC search.

3. The analysis of false drops uncovered the fact that false drops occurred more often in certain fields of the MARC records. The fields for author and imprint often yielded false drops. These same fields were never the only reason for the retrieval of a relevant MARC record. The fields for corporate tracings yielded the same results. It appeared that keyword searches restricted to fields for the title, series statements, notes, and subject headings eliminated many false drops without sacrificing the retrieval of any relevant records.

Table 4 records the data fields with more than five keyword hits (alone and in combination). This clearly shows that the fields for title and subject heading (T20 and T70 respectively) are the most effective for retrieving relevant MARC records. Author, imprint, and title fields (T10, T30, and T20 respectively) account for most of the non-relevant keyword hits. Keywords in the title field are sometimes useful and other times misleading.

Using this evidence, the search strategy for the area studies could be adjusted and many false drops might be avoided. This would raise the

---

12 See Searches 210 and 213 in Appendix.
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precision ratio considerably. If, in the Latin America search, for example, the “IF-Scan” search were discarded and keyword searches restricted to title, series, notes, and subject heading fields, there would be a reduction of 237 false drops and four questionable hits. This would raise the precision ratio for keyword searches from 38.4 percent to 76.8 percent. The change for the Middle East would be smaller—a reduction of forty-nine false drops and one questionable hit, changing the precision of the keyword search from 40.6 percent to 50.8 percent. In both cases, there would be no change in the number of relevant MARC records retrieved.

Conclusions

1. Our findings lead us to recommend the keyword search as the optimum search strategy to obtain 95 percent of the relevant literature on an area of the world. (In the Middle East searches, the keyword search retrieved over 97 percent of the relevant MARC records, while 98 percent were retrieved by the Latin America keyword searches.)
2. To retrieve the rest of the literature on an area, we recommend the use of LC numbers and then Dewey numbers, in that order. The Middle East searches required the use of both LC and Dewey to retrieve the three remaining relevant MARC records. The LC search yielded two new records and the Dewey search supplied the last one. The Latin America searches required only the use of the LC search to retrieve the remaining two relevant records.

3. Our examination of the non-relevant records retrieved leads us to conclude that although some false drops are unavoidable because of the homonym problem, the search strategy can be refined to minimize the number of false drops without affecting the number of relevant hits. The system and human errors described could be avoided if greater attention were paid to details of the programming system and truncation of keywords.
Recommendations

Our study has led to the following recommendations concerning the searching of MARC Pilot Project tapes for area studies:

1. If only one search is contemplated, do a keyword search of the following fields: filing or conventional title (T15), title statement (T20), series, traced (T50), series, not traced (T51), notes (T60), and subject headings (T70).

2. In preparing the list of keywords, use as many as you can discover that will describe the area. Watch out for homonyms, e.g., Israel (country), Israel (surname).

3. Be careful when truncating.

4. If more than one strategy is used to retrieve more material on the area, use the relevant LC class numbers.

5. Use the relevant Dewey classification numbers if the remaining relevant material is to be found.

6. An “IF-Scan” search by area code in DC is not recommended.

The fact that keyword searches were better than searches using a classification system was not surprising. Material on a given geographic area is not easily found on the shelf in any library. It is scattered because other aspects of the material are highlighted and used for primary subject access. The subdivisions of subject headings, more than the geographic codes in DC, appear to provide access to some of this material. To access the subdivisions, however, a catalog record must be in machine-readable form and the programming system used for searching the records must allow access to any word in the subject heading field, not just the first word. MARC/DPS is such a system. Our results show that two MARC I fields (title and subject) provide access to the relevant documents for an area study search. Neither is sufficient alone.

We are not certain that our findings hold true for other kinds of subject searches (e.g., biographical, political, historical, literary). Much more work along the lines described here will have to be done before the class numbers (either LC or DC) on MARC records should be discarded as subject access points in a mechanized retrieval system. Before we can say that the title and subject heading fields should be considered the primary routes of subject access to library materials, someone will have to test the entire system more rigorously than we have done here.
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APPENDIX

MIDDLE EAST SEARCHES

KEYWORD SEARCHES

Search Number 206
L1 DEAD & SEA(+1);
L2 MOUNT & CARMEL(+1);
L3 TEL & AVIV(+1);
L4 IBN & SAUD(+1);
L5 BENI & KURT(+1);
L6 PALESTINE,ISRAEL,JORDAN,ARAB($);
L7 ANTIQUITY,PALMYRA,SMYRNA,SUMERIANS,TYRE,UR;
L8 JEW($),JERUSALEM,BETHLEHEM,EMMAUS,MEGIDDO,NAZARETH;
L9 NEGEV,NEGEV,CAPPADOCIA,HEROD,HUSSEIN,JUDEA,
AFGHANISTAN;
L10 L6 & T10(NOT SEN);
L11 PERGAMON & T30(NOT SEN);
L12 MEDINA,DARUSSULAM,BAHRAMPOUR,ISMAIL,MAHMUD;
L13 L1,L2,L3,L4,L5,L7,L8,L9,L10,L11,L12;
LIST OFFLINE,TEXT,SUBJECTS;

Search Number 207
L1 MIDDLE & EAST(+1);
L2 NEAR & EAST(+1);
L3 UNITED & ARAB(+1) & REPUBLIC(+1);
L4 TURKEY,TURKS,CYPRUS,SYRIA,LEBANON;
L5 IRAQ,IRAN,PERSIAN,MESOPOTAMIA,Egypt($);
L6 ASIA & MINOR(+1);
L7 MOROCCO,ALGERIA($),TUNIS($),LIBYA,SUDAN;
L8 ARMENIA,ISLAM($),BEDUINO;
L9 EUPHRATES,ANATOLIA,ANKARA,ARARAT,ADEN,MOSQUE,
MUSLIM($);
L10 BABYLON($),KURDISH,KISH,BEIRUT,LEVANT;
L11 L1,L2,L3,L4,L5,L6,L7,L8,L9,L10;
LIST OFFLINE,TEXT,SUBJECTS;

L.C. SEARCHES

Search Number 208
L1 DS1($),DS2($),DS313($),DS326($),DS38($),DS43.S5,DS44($),DS48.F53,
DS49($);
L2 DS53($),DS62($),DS63($),DS70.6($),DS71.07($),DS80.9($),DS84($),DS89.T($);
L3 DS99($);
L4 L1,L2,L3;
LIST OFFLINE,TEXT,LCCALL;

DEWEY SEARCHES

Search Number 209
L1 915.6($),955($),956($);
L2 L1 & T2(SEN);
LIST OFFLINE,TEXT,DDCNO;

"IF-SCAN" SEARCHES

Search Number 210
ALLDROP;
LIST OFFLINE,TEXT,DDCNO;
IF DDCNO SC '56';
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LATIN AMERICA SEARCHES

"IF-SCAN" SEARCHES

Search Number 213
ALLDROP;
LIST OFFLINE, TEXT, DDCNO;
IF DDCNO SC '72';

L.C. SEARCH

Search Number 214
L1 F2066($),F2131($),F2161($),F2171($),F2263($),F2270($),F2384($),F2508($);
L2 F2510($),F2520($),F2621($),F2668($),F3094($),F3320($),F3429($),F2926($);
L3 L1,L2;
LIST OFFLINE, TEXT, DDCNO;

DEWEY SEARCH

Search Number 215
L1 917.2($),918($),972($),98($);
L2 L1 & T92(SEN);
LIST OFFLINE, TEXT, DDCNO;

L.C. SEARCH

Search Number 216
L1 F120($),F121($),F1232($),F1233($),F1234($),F124($),F1276($),F140($),
    F141($);
L2 F142($),F143($),F1446($),F1463($),F1526($),F1608($),F1621($),F1631($);
L3 F17($),F1869($),F1872($),F1924($),F1928($),F1958($),F1965($),F2041($);
L4 L1,L2,L3;
LIST OFFLINE, TEXT, LCCALL;

KEYWORD SEARCHES

Search Number 217
L1 BOLIV($),GUIANA,GUYANA,BRAZIL,BRASIL,TRINIDAD,VENEZUELA,
    HONDURAS,PANAMA;
L2 GUATEMALA($),SALVADOR,NICARAGUA,BERMUDA($),BARBADOS,
    MARTINIQUE,LUCAYAN;
L3 PARAGUAY,AZTECS,MAYA($),HIDALGO MORELOS, ITURBIDE,
    JUAREZ, DIAZ, MADERO;
L4 GUEVARA, YUCATAN, PANAMERICANO, DARIEN;
L5 L1,L2,L3,L4;
LIST OFFLINE, TEXT, SUBJECTS;

Search Number 218
L1 CUSCO,LIMA,ECUADOR,MONTEZUMA,BAHIA($), PARA,JANEIRO;
L2 PARAGUAY,MONTEVIDEO,CHACO,ARGENTIN($),URUGUAY,
    CORDOVA, CORRIENTES;
L3 PAMPAS,CHILE($),PERU,INCA,INCAS, NASSAU,CUBA($), HAITI,
    HAVANA($),CASTRO;
L4 SANTIAGO,JAMAICA,HISPAN($),CARIBBEAN, GUADELOUPE,
    REDONDA, REDONDA, ANDES, COLOMBIA($);
L5 L1,L2,L3,L4;
LIST OFFLINE, TEXT, SUBJECTS;

Search Number 219
L1 WEST & INDIES(+1);
L2 SPANISH & MAIN(+1);
L3 PUERTO & RICO(+1);
L4 SANTO & DOMINGO(+1);

Library Resources & Technical Services
The Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem has started indexing its classified catalog for more effective use. The classified catalog brings together material from five different alphabetic catalogs, none of which includes subject headings. Discussed are two indexes in the social sciences. An area index contains listings of all class numbers containing publications dealing with the area. A subject index includes the subjects of the books in the collection as well as the subjects listed in the schedules. Both indexes were begun on the basis of a review of existing class cards and undergo continual revision and expansion.

FOllowing Accepted European Practice, the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem has had a classified catalog for some forty years. Only in the past five years, however, have any attempts been made to provide indexes for this catalog.

By way of introduction, we may point out that the JNUL serves two functions, as its name implies. It is, first, the national library, not only of Israel but of the Jewish people; and second, the central library of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, the first and largest university in Israel.

Implementing its first function, the library classes its extensive Judaica collection under its own special scheme which is equipped with a detailed index. Based as it is on the library's own collection, with additions made regularly as new class numbers are required, this scheme and its index have proved to be quite effective bibliographic tools.

Difficulties have arisen mainly in connection with the library's second function. With the rapid growth of the Hebrew University and the great expansion in the scope of its book collection, librarians, as well as students, faculty, and the public, have found the problems of retrieval in its unindexed classed catalog increasingly formidable.

Function of the Classed Catalog

Before describing the indexes, some brief explanation may be useful about the function and the structure of the JNUL classed catalog, especially in view of the unfamiliarity with this type of catalog in the United States. The main points to be understood are: first, class numbers are assigned solely for the purpose of identification of subjects—they have no connection with call numbers; and second, the classed catalog
is the only (catalog) source for material by subject—there are no subject headings in the alphabetic catalogs.

Since 1936 books at JNUL have been shelved by accession number under a closed stacks regime. Moreover, a large proportion of the newer books are located in departmental libraries and are generally shelved there in a departmentally devised order. Discussion of the pros and cons of this arrangement is outside the scope of this paper, but for our purposes we may note that the separation of class and call number allows the classifier to assign as many class numbers as he believes relevant and as lengthy class numbers as he deems appropriate.

Thus the classified catalog performs the task usually assigned to subject headings in American libraries. Because of this, the alphabetic catalogs at JNUL do not include subject headings.

Suggestions have been made from time to time to abandon the classified catalog and to adopt a subject catalog in its place. These have always foundered on the obstacle of language. Using English as the language for subject headings is not acceptable to a national Jewish library in Israel, and Hebrew, despite its rapidly expanding use in all fields of learning, is still not considered adequate to meet the needs of all scholars. As a matter of fact, the JNUL does not have a unified alphabetic catalog; there are five distinct catalogs: Hebrew, Yiddish (although the alphabet is the same as Hebrew, Yiddish orthography is quite different), Arabic, Cyrillic (mainly Russian, of course), and “General foreign language” (all other languages, mainly English, German, and French). The last of these is by far the largest of all the alphabetic catalogs.

The classified catalog therefore provides a single center under a neutral numerical basis for bringing together cards from all the alphabetic catalogs in a specified order of language under the class number. The provision of an index to the classified catalog may answer some of the criticisms made by proponents of the subject catalog.

Classification Schedules

Edition 16 of the Dewey Decimal Classification is today the basic scheme used by the Classification Section, but in some subjects (philosophy, literature) Edition 14 has been retained and in some areas (psychology, history) Edition 17 has been adopted. In medicine, law, and public administration, the old UDC system (the “Brussels” classification) is used. As we pointed out above, Judaica has its own system, and this is also the case with Islamic studies.

The various class schemes are, however, used consistently, without overlapping, and only one particular schedule may be used for any specific area. Thus, despite the multiplicity of schedules, there is only one classified catalog.

In order to achieve greater flexibility, within the limits of a classified system, the staff of the JNUL Classification Section has freely improvised numbers using various techniques short of actually changing the num-
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bers in the schedules: by adding a letter to a class number (e.g., Small groups psychology—301.158(S)); by joining two numbers using brackets (e.g., Statistics for use in geography—311[91]); by adding country numbers in parenthesis after DC numbers (e.g., the petroleum industry in the U.S.—338.272.8(73)).

Thus in addition to the normal problems of retrieval experienced within any single classification scheme, this proliferation and free adaptation of systems has made the adoption of a unified index virtually imperative.

Indexing

The JNUL collection, which was begun some eighty years ago, numbers today about 2,000,000 volumes. Therefore, the work of indexing is being carried out simultaneously in various areas of the classified catalog by the individuals responsible for classification in each subject area. Unfortunately, the work up to now remains largely uncoordinated and forms only a small part of the work of several persons, each working independently.

This article will describe two of the indexes in the field of social sciences, which is the responsibility of the author. The indexes are by area and by subject. Both were begun retrospectively, on the basis of cards already in the catalog, and are now kept current with the new books as they are classified.

Area Index

This was the first index undertaken, partly because of the specific needs of many new area-oriented faculties (especially Asia-Africa Studies) and partly because it was relatively easy to get under way. It was initiated primarily to cover all the subjects in the social sciences and has been subsequently expanded to include subjects in all fields considered useful. The names of the areas and the subjects are in Hebrew; there is an index to area names in English. In the examples below, we have translated from the Hebrew.

Starting with 300, all cards in the classified catalog were reviewed in each class number and cards made out by the name of the area. Only areas in modern history were included. For example, for 316.761, a card was made out and filed alphabetically:

Uganda
General statistics 316.761

An authority card was made out for the subject and filed in numerical order:

31 . . . General statistics

The purpose of the authority card is to specify the designation of the subject or subjects covered in the class number. This may not be identical with the term used in the DC schedule—in any case, it is in Hebrew. Thus we avoid synonymous subject designations.
As new books are classified, the index is expanded, at the discretion of the classifier, by additions to (1) the areas covered, (2) the class numbers included, and/or (3) the subjects covered under a specific class number.

In cases where the class number is not subdivided by area, the class number may also be included if the publication contains information on a specific area. Thus, a publication on the cotton textile industry in India, which is classed 338.476.771, without subdivision by country, is included in the index as follows:

India
Cotton textile industry: economics 338.476.771

The small circle in front of the class number indicates that the number is not area-divided, which means that the reader must search through all the cards in this particular class number (usually they are few) in order to locate the book relating to the area that interests him.

The areas included in the index are those defined by the geographic divisions of DC Edition 17 and comprise countries, continents, blocs of countries, e.g., Eastern Europe, developing countries, Far East, in addition to the individual countries. In some instances parts of countries are indexed (e.g., Ukraine, Sicily); however, cities have thus far not been indexed.

After a country is included in the index, a standard reference card is inserted in the General Foreign Language catalog, under a subject listing of the name of the country, as follows (this is, in effect, an exception to the rule of no subject headings):

Uganda
For listing of classed material about this country see
[Area index -(in Hebrew)]
in classed catalog under:
[name of country (in Hebrew)]

The entries in the index for each area consist of the following:
1. Each area is preceded by a guide card which includes upward see also references, e.g., “Material on Uganda is likely to be found also in publications on East Africa.”
2. The first card is standardized and has been Xeroxed in advance for reasons of economy of time. It lists the four broadest subjects in order of generality; the number itself is listed, of course, only if material is actually available. In the following example, all four class numbers are found in the catalog:

Uganda
Geography & description 916.761
History 967.61
Culture 901(676.1)
Society 309.167.61
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3. All subsequent cards are in alphabetical order of subject. Generally there is one number on each card, except where the first word of the subject is identical. (This occurs more often in Hebrew than in English, because the noun precedes the adjective.)

Uganda
Planning, economic 338.967.61
Planning, social 309.2(676.1)

The number of subjects under each area is open and unlimited in contrast to the indexing system of the Boston University Library which adopted the limited LC subject listing under areas.*

There are no see or see also references among the subjects. Therefore, in order to locate the class numbers of relevance to his search, the reader, unless he is looking for something very specific and knows exactly how it is expressed in the index, will find it most useful to read through all the cards on the area. This may come to a considerable number in areas like the U.S.A., Great Britain, or India. Under Uganda, at the time of this writing, there were forty-six cards. However, because the practice of classifying by the most specific number widely scatters much of the material desired by persons studying areas, it is necessary to include each number in the index. Thus, for example, a reader interested in fiscal problems of an area, might be interested in publications classed in "inflation," but it might not occur to him to look under that specific heading.

Subject Index

The subject index for the social sciences was also undertaken first on the basis of a review of all the cards in the classed catalog and is now kept up to date by additions based on the ongoing classification of new books. The procedure is as follows:

1. An authority card is made for each class number included. Each card lists all the subjects covered in the class number, in Hebrew and in English. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Number</th>
<th>Hebrew Subject</th>
<th>English Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>323.2</td>
<td>Political struggles: pol. sci.</td>
<td>[Equivalent subjects in Hebrew]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revolution: pol. sci.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subversive activities: pol. sci.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coup d'état: pol. sci.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terror, political</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Subject cards are then made out in Hebrew and in English on the basis of the authority cards. These are afterwards edited to fit the

style of a relative index such as DC, and, if changes are made, they are made also on the authority card.

3. On the whole, form divisions are disregarded, with the exception of those which actually designate subject areas, such as, operations research (. . . o18.4) or the class number 658.018, which, as methodology in management, includes specific known techniques. The authority card for the latter is as follows:

658.018
Management-scientific methods
Games: management
PERT
Program evaluation and review technique
CPM
Critical path method
Mathematical models: management
Decision theory: management

[Equivalent subjects in Hebrew]

4. The same procedure is followed with regard to the special section of the classed catalog which contains all the material on Israel (Palestine). The subject index to this material is prepared parallel to that of the general subject index and the cards (of a different color, and with the heading Israel on each card) filed after cards on the same subject in general. Thus, for example:

(White card)
BUILDING INDUSTRY
Accounting 657.869
Cooperative associations 334.1
Economics 338.476.9
Management 658.99
Safety 331.823[69]
Workers 331.769
see also: HOUSING

(Yellow card)
ISRAEL
BUILDING INDUSTRY
Economics E 338.476.9
Workers E 331.769
Wages E 331.286.9

The initial formulation of subject names owed a great deal to the DC index. However, as new terms appear in the literature and decisions
are reached with regard to their place in the classification, these terms
are added to the index. Of particular importance, of course, are the
subjects in the class numbers adopted by us and not found in the DC
index.

Constant expansion and revision is required as class numbers are
revised. In response to reader questions, cross-references and new sub-
jects are added steadily.

The index is located at present at the top of the section of the
catalog containing the 300s. It is planned to add another bank of card
cabinets to the classed catalog which will be used to bring together in
one place, although not initially in a single alphabet, all of the various
indexes scattered throughout the classified catalog. Ultimately, the aim
is to bring together all of the indexes in the various subjects into a
single unified file.
The Indexing of "The Reference Shelf"

JOHN B. WHITE
Associate Professor of Library Science
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

The well-known H. W. Wilson Company publication called The Reference Shelf is partially indexed in many places, described in the article, but nowhere completely so. The anomalous character of the publication and its treatment in libraries are discussed.

A SMALL RED VOLUME on Federal Aid for Education which came into the writer's possession some years ago is a representative example of the H. W. Wilson Company's series published under the title of The Reference Shelf. Compiled in 1941 by Julia E. Johnsen, it was volume 14, no. 10, of the series. In its 286 pages it reprinted 26 articles, 8 of them under the heading "General Discussion," 9 affirmative, 9 negative, plus several pages of short excerpts under each of the three sections. At the end of the book a convenient "Summary of Arguments" was given in 15 pages, followed by an extensive 31-page bibliography, likewise divided into general, affirmative, and negative.

The usefulness of these little books to debaters is evident at once, even to those unfamiliar with the series. But not debaters only have benefited from these handy compilations. The subjects of the volumes are chosen for their timeliness. On the front endpapers of the book on Federal Aid a list is given of the titles of the previous five years that were still in print. Included were such topics as these: Western Hemisphere Defense; Compulsory Military Training; The United States and War; Radio Censorship; Dictatorships vs. Democracies; Reorganization of the Supreme Court; and other topics of paramount interest in the years just prior to World War II.

In more recent years there have been numbers devoted to The Water Crisis, Safety on the Road, Mental Health, The Peace Corps, The Outlook for Youth, America's Educational Needs, and many other important topics.

A west coast college library recently reported that it was assembling and photocopying for its students packages of articles on subjects of current interest. The Reference Shelf does not and could not cover all such topics. But for those it does cover, a library would do better to buy the volumes and give them away. On the subjects chosen, no library can do a job comparable to The Reference Shelf, in either content, convenience, or cost.
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The front endpaper of this little book also carries a statement about the indexing of the series: "The Reference Shelf is indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Education Index, Industrial Arts Index, Cumulative Book Index, and Book Review Digest." This statement provides the text for the present paper.

The kind of indexing referred to in this statement is not the thorough and complete indexing that librarians have come to expect from indexes like the Readers' Guide. It does not enable the user to locate a specific article by a given author. It is, rather, indexing of the catalog type, entering the books under author (compiler in this case), title, and subject or subjects.

An unsuspecting user might thus have been misled, seeing The Reference Shelf in the "List of Periodicals Indexed" at the front of the Readers' Guide. The 1941-43 cumulation of the Guide, for example, states that volume 14, number 8, through volume 16, number 4, 1941-1943, are indexed. This is true only in the limited meaning of the word.

The user who might wish to locate a statement of the views of a particular individual, such as John W. Studebaker, Samuel Brownell, William Munro, Senators Elbert Thomas and David Walsh—all of them represented in this volume of The Reference Shelf—would not be helped by the Readers' Guide. It has an entry for the compiler (and nine other of her compilations in the same series). It has, no doubt, the appropriate subject entries: from the heading EDUCATION—FEDERAL AID, which is not used, one is referred to EDUCATION AND STATE.

This is the same kind of general help given by the card catalog, though the subject headings chosen may differ. At all events, when a specific statement is sought, a general index reference of this kind is only an area hunting license.

Inconsistencies in indexing are almost inevitable over a period of time. It is in a spirit of appreciation of the Wilson Company's indexing achievements, and not one of niggling complaint, that these observations are made.

The Readers' Guide subject-indexed each number of The Reference Shelf under one or more appropriate general headings from the beginning of the series in 1932 until 1953, after which it was dropped from the Guide. The early numbers do not, however, have entries under the names of the compilers. Thus the work of Julia Johnsen, who edited some of the numbers of the first volume, is not fully reflected in the Readers' Guide.

The Representative American Speeches number, which has been a yearly feature of The Reference Shelf since 1938, was indexed in detail in the Readers' Guide but only until 1940. It was picked up by the Essay and General Literature Index, another Wilson service, which indexed it from 1946 to 1965. It is indexed completely, by authors and subjects, in Speech Index, edited by Roberta Briggs Sutton (New York: The Scarecrow Press, 1966). This subseries is, apparently, the only portion which is given complete indexing. It has its own cumulative
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The indexing of the series in Industrial Arts Index and in Education Index is, understandably, confined to numbers dealing with subjects that come within the special area covered by those indexes. Industrial Arts Index listed The Reference Shelf in its “List of periodicals indexed” until 1955. Education Index puts selected numbers under appropriate subject headings and, until it became a subject index only, under the name of the compiler. Thus the number on Federal Aid for Education is entered under Johnsen and under the subject heading, Federal Aid for Education. The volume is not analyzed. For example, the article it contains by John W. Studebaker is not entered under his name. His speech, “Democracy Shall Not Be Plowed Under,” was indexed from Educational Trends and Vital Speeches and the condensation in Agricultural Education Magazine. Education Index did not, however, pick up the fact that the speech was reprinted in volume 14, number one, the 1939-1940 Representative American Speeches number of The Reference Shelf, as noted in Readers’ Guide.

No one would expect the Cumulative Book Index to do more than catalog these books, listing them under author (compiler), title, subjects, and series. But after 1962 the series entry does not appear, though individual numbers continue to be entered.

Our endpaper quotation also stated that The Reference Shelf is indexed in the Book Review Digest. Some numbers were indeed found described in BRD, but Federal Aid was not one of them. Those found in the volumes for 1940 to 1942 were identified by series title but without volume and number. No series title entry was given in the title indexes for those years, nor in the cumulated title indexes for 1937-41 and 1941-46. Selective inclusion is in accord with the policy of BRD, but the statement that it indexes The Reference Shelf has to be seriously qualified.

In the publisher’s Standard Catalog series, the Public Library Catalog (formerly the Standard Catalog for Public Libraries) evidently includes all numbers of The Reference Shelf. The series listing in the index provides a list of all numbers published during the period covered, with references to the class numbers under which they are annotated. The Senior High School Library Catalog (formerly Standard Catalog for High School Libraries) similarly lists selected numbers.

The publisher’s Debate Index, which is itself a part of The Reference Shelf, includes it in its indexing. Again, this indexing is of the catalog type, and does not provide access to the full author and detailed subject content of the series. Its infrequency of publication (1964 being the most recent) makes it of little help in using the series.

The bibliographic content of the series suggests the Wilson Company’s Bibliographic Index as another approach to the subjects covered.
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The user of this index might be misled, however, into assuming that *The Reference Shelf* was not included, if he relies on the "Key to periodical abbreviations" at the front of each volume of the index. True, the publisher states that the key is to abbreviations and is not a complete list of periodicals indexed. *The Reference Shelf* was omitted, accordingly, because it is spelled out rather than abbreviated when cited. Another Wilson series, *The University Debaters Annual*, which is also indexed, is likewise omitted from the key list. Yet the publication Steel is found in the key list—abbreviation: Steel. Several other such examples were found.


The *American Book Publishing Record* (Bowker) includes the individual numbers, which can be located under compiler or under title, with the full bibliographic listing given under the appropriate classification. No entry is given under the series title.

Finally, the *National Union Catalog* and the Library of Congress catalogs provide yet another approach by compiler and subject.

All told, there are some ten or twelve avenues by means of which the general subjects covered by *The Reference Shelf* can be approached. All of them, however, are of the catalog type. None provides full access to the rich author and detailed subject content of these volumes.

Many libraries subscribing to the series have preferred to keep it together under a single classification number. The economy in cataloging is evident. In the years since the beginning of *The Reference Shelf* in 1922, six to ten numbers a year have been issued, totaling well over 300. Separate classification of each of these numbers would have been a costly burden.

Part of the economy was offset by the practice in most libraries of putting a set of cards in its catalog for each number. Not content to rely on the various other avenues, all doing much the same job, catalogers have provided this interesting example for students of library economy.

Other libraries have preferred separate classification for each number of *The Reference Shelf*. Libraries engaged in recataloging from Dewey to LC may decide to scatter the set that had formerly been held together, classifying each number individually. The absence of a thorough and complete index to the contents of the series admittedly weakens the case for keeping it under one call number. Unquestionably, separate classification facilitates the direct approach of user to shelf or section.

On the other hand, for a library that uses the unit card it is staggering to think of the number of series-title entries its catalog will contain. If the unit card is not used for the series title, it is nevertheless necessary
to list each number individually, for it has its own call number. Even with five to eight numbers per card, many extension cards are required.

With all due respect to the diligent and capable compilers of these volumes, how useful is it to have numerous cards in the already overcrowded catalog under the names of these individuals? With separate classification, each becomes the main entry, and therefore indispensable. Otherwise, one card for each, identifying him as the compiler of one or more numbers in the series, ought to suffice.

Catalogers sometimes need reminding that the term "main entry," used above, is a bit of library jargon. It is merely the entry on which the record hinges. It does not mean "most important" or "most used." For the user, the most likely access is by subject, and the subject is accordingly the "main entry" for him. For The Reference Shelf it is paramount. Who besides librarians ever makes use of the cataloger's main entry for these books, except when driven to it?

It is ironic that separate classification, which helps the user to bypass the card catalog, thus makes less necessary the multitude of cards.

The Reference Shelf is an anomaly. Is it a serial? Is it a periodical? The A.L.A. Glossary defines a serial as "a publication issued in successive parts, usually at regular intervals, and as a rule, intended to be continued indefinitely." It defines a periodical as "a serial in parts which are not monographs and usually contain articles by several contributors. It generally has a distinctive title and the successive numbers or parts are intended to appear at stated or regular intervals, and, as a rule, for an indefinite period."

Except for the statement about regularity, The Reference Shelf fits these definitions. As to regularity, it has generally been regular in the fact of annual publication. It is irregular in that the numbers are not tied to any month or particular time of the year. Surely that point is inconsequential.

While libraries must perform give heed to its serial nature, how many libraries treat it as a periodical? The fact that each issue is separately bound has not kept libraries from treating American Heritage and Horizon as the periodicals they undoubtedly are. The fact that each issue is devoted to a different subject invites comparison with the variety of subjects treated in the various issues of Daedalus or The Annals.

Yet, if it is a serial, it does not appear in the Union List of Serials, third edition, a work which bears the imprint of the H. W. Wilson Company. It was omitted from the 12th edition of Ulrich's Directory. Nor was it included in Bowker's companion volume of Irregular Serials & Annuals (1967). Ulrich's is usually the first tool the librarian thinks of when wanting to know where a publication is indexed.

If the reference value of the series is conceded, why is it not listed in Winchell? Walford, too, in the second edition of his Guide to Reference Materials (1966-68), omits it. One is tempted to conclude that
this valuable series has not been given the bibliographic attention that it merits.

These recommendations are suggested:

The convenience and the economy of holding The Reference Shelf numbers together are clear enough, if only a comprehensive index were available. Librarians should urge the Wilson Company to prepare and publish a cumulated index to the entire series thus far, 1922-70. This will fill a need while duplicating very little previous indexing. The fiftieth anniversary of the series, 1972, would be a most appropriate occasion.

Continued comprehensive indexing is essential. Why not include it in the Social Sciences and Humanities Index?

Series listing in the Wilson’s own Cumulative Book Index ought to be resumed, and the gap bridged.

The publisher should routinely include every number in his Book Review Digest. Perhaps some stepped-up publicity attending the publication of each number and for the series as a whole would gain wider recognition for it.

Bowker’s attention should be drawn to its omission from important bibliographies and trade tools published by that company. The series listing, brief though it is, should be restored to the title section of Books in Print. It ought to be in Ulrich’s or in Irregular Serials, whichever is more appropriate.

The final recommendation is no doubt asking too much of the publisher. For many years ten numbers a year were issued; recently, only six. The number of possible subjects, however, has not declined—far from it. Many subjects previously dealt with need updating. It is in tribute to a fine publishing project that one ventures to suggest an expansion once again to ten, or even more, numbers per year.

• 558 •

Library Resources & Technical Services
Worn Book Checklist for Academic Libraries

Les Mattison, Director
Bemidji State College Libraries
Bemidji, Minnesota

Decisions on the disposition of worn books from a library collection should be based on systematic evaluation. Since each volume is unique and its condition subject to many variables, a checklist of questions to be asked in sequence is offered. It differentiates between decisions that may be made by clerks and those that may need the evaluation of a librarian.

When books in poor physical condition come to the attention of a library staff member, they require evaluation as to whether they should be rebound, withdrawn, replaced, microfilmed, treated as rarities, ignored, or given minor repairs and kept in circulation. Making the decision should take into account a number of variables.

A worn volume might be inexpensively replaced rather than rebound if the title is in print or a revised edition is available. Or the library may have several other copies or editions which are sufficient to fill the need. The copy in question could, and likely should, be withdrawn.

But, for lack of a procedure, worn books may be set aside “until later” (sometimes much later) when a bemused “off the top of the head” consideration of the book’s condition and its place in the library’s collection may or may not result in a decision based on sound academic values. Or, for lack of a procedure, unneeded books may be automatically mended or rebound. Or, equally wasteful, an old book valuable for its cover or format may be ruined by routine binding.

A checklist of significant considerations, arranged for decisions in a sequence order, simplifies and regularizes the evaluation process. The checklist printed here was developed in the Circulation Department of the University of Minnesota Libraries. With adaptations it has also been used in the 85,000-volume Bemidji State College Library.

The form permits most of the routine decisions to be done by a clerk, passing on the less frequent but more difficult problems to a librarian whose critical evaluation is also aided by the list which helps him apply the criteria and reach a decision. While the form serves as a training aid, it also encourages the recording of decisions on the form which, kept with the book, explains its status, and reduces the need to evaluate the
book again. With the checklist, decisions may also be quickly reviewed should this become desirable.

Divided into two parts, the checklist would have routine decisions made by clerks and refer special problems to librarians conversant with the library's objectives, the scope of its collections, and the intricacies of bibliography and the book trade.

The device is offered for others to adapt. It has been on mimeographed \(8\frac{1}{2}''\times11''\) sheets with part II on the verso of part I. All the information about the book is thus available. The sheet may be folded lengthwise to protrude from the book or folded across the width to tuck into the book.

**WORN BOOK CHECKLIST PART I**

**QUESTIONs TO BE CONsidered BY THE CLERK:**

**CALL NO.**

A. Is this an early imprint, special edition, unusual binding, signed, or otherwise unusual?
   Yes ____. Refer to librarian.
   No ____.  

B. How many other copies does the library have?
   On the shelf? ____. Charged out? ____. Lost? ____.  
   Are there enough to fill the demand without this copy?
   Yes ____. Withdraw this copy.
   No ____.  

C. Book needs only slight repairs or replacement pages available through duplication.
   Yes ____. Order needed pages ____. Repair ____. Rebind ____.  
   No ____.  

D. Likely in print? (Check BOOKS IN PRINT).
   Yes ____. Reorder.
   No ____.  

E. Is condition of the book good enough to stand rebinding?
   Yes ____. Rebind.
   No ____. Paper too brittle or margins too narrow.
   DECISION: Retain ____. Withdraw ____. Refer to librarian ____.  
   By ____.  

**WORN BOOK CHECKLIST PART II**

**QUESTIONs TO BE CONsidered BY LIBRARIAN:**

A. Is the form or content significant enough to justify keeping this copy in our collection?
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Yes _____. Keep this copy in a portfolio _____, or box _____.
On open shelves _____.
On restricted shelves. _____.
No ___. Withdraw this copy.

B. Content available in variant edition. Yes _____. No _____.

C. Content available in variant form? Yes _____. No _____.
Microfilm _____. Microprint _____. Microfiche _____.
Facsimile reprint _____.
Vendor: __________________________

D. Copy available on second hand market? Yes _____. No _____.
Vendor: __________________________

DECISION: Retain _____. Withdraw this copy _____.
Reorder as checked above _____.
By __________________________
Library Services to University Branch Campuses: The Ohio State Experience

C. James Schmidt
Head, Undergraduate Libraries
Elaine K. Rast
Head, Regional Campuses Technical Services Division
and
John Linford
Information Systems Librarian
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

The Ohio State University Main Library acquires and processes books, on a cost-supported contract basis, for each of four regional campus undergraduate libraries. The system (a) accepts LC cards in full, revising only edition; (b) uses a combined requisition and order form; (c) pre-catalogs, using OSU Libraries’ large public catalog and proofslip file; and (d) organizationally combines acquisition and cataloging functions. Results include (1) drastically reduced cycle time, dependent on dealer delivery time; (2) reduced processing cost ($1.40/volume); (3) reduced original cataloging (5 percent of books received). The article describes requirements, rationale, and procedures, and diagrams procedural flow.

ThePastDecade has been one of incomparable growth in higher education. In addition to exponential increases in enrollments, library budgets and collections have also grown, causing an increase in the kinds and complexity of problems in library service. One facet of this growth has been the development of regional campuses or branches of universities. Many institutions reached what they felt was the maximum enrollment for their central or main campuses. The numeric definition of this “saturation point” varied, but the trend toward creation of regional or branch campuses as an alternative was frequently used, especially by publicly supported universities.

The relationship which a branch campus has with its parent institution varies widely, as for example the relationship among the nine campuses in the University of California system or the many units in the State University of New York compared with the loose affiliation of Oakland University with Michigan State University. In each case, when the relationship was devised, whatever its form, consideration had to be given to state laws and regulations, political climate and public opinion, geography, and population. This paper is a description of the relationship between Ohio State University and its four regional campuses with special reference to library services. In establishing the regional campus library/main library relationship, we have developed
some quantitative data on technical services which may be useful in other circumstances. It is also apparent that errors made in our planning are ones which, because of this experience, can be avoided by others faced with similar problems.

Ohio State University is a land-grant institution founded in 1869 with an enrollment currently exceeding 40,000 students on its central campus. The university is organized into seventeen instructional units: sixteen colleges and the graduate school. One of these colleges—University College—has as part of its mission the creation, development, and coordination of regional campuses. Fulfillment of this mission was guided by two policies imposed from outside the university:

1. Regional campuses or branches of state-assisted universities in Ohio receive their financial assistance directly from the state legislature, and these funds can be spent only at the specific branch for which they are appropriated.
2. According to the master plan for higher education, regional campuses or branches of state-assisted universities are to offer the first two years of baccalaureate studies in the liberal arts until the enrollment at any branch reaches 5,000 students. At that time a branch will become a separate state-assisted institution.

The effect of these two policies was to create campuses which, although fiscally independent, would nevertheless be dependent upon the resources of the central campus until at least 1985.

A third policy, originating on campus, which guided the development of these campuses was labeled “fullest possible articulation.” Briefly stated, this phrase was meant to describe a relationship in which each campus was tied as closely as possible to the central campus. For example, all branch campus faculty members, although paid by funds from their respective campuses and probably living in these or adjacent communities, are selected by the appropriate departments on the central campus in consultation with each campus director. Recommendations for promotions in rank, salary increases, tenure, and termination of contracts are made through the established departmental channels. Admissions, registration, scheduling, and grades are handled through the appropriate offices on the central campus. In effect then, fiscal independence coupled with the “fullest articulation” principle created campuses which are, in many respects, “customers” buying services from the university’s central campus.

I. Administration of Library Services

The relationship between libraries at the regional campuses and the library system on the central campus presented some problems for which a pattern had not already been set. These problems primarily involved the areas of book selection, buying, receiving, processing, cataloging, and payment of invoices. Fiscal separateness and fullest articulation seemed only to compound the apparent problems. The
first step toward solutions to these problems was taken when the Dean of University College and the Director of Libraries agreed that the University Libraries would assume full and complete administrative responsibility for library services and operations at each branch campus, which were to be funded at a specified level by University College. The funds to be provided were established by a series of formulas which outlined size of professional and clerical staff, book budget, supplies and equipment budgets, and student wages budget. A campus director may, with the approval of the Dean, provide funds in excess of the formula amounts (and some have), but in no case may a library's budget be cut below the formula level. It has been interesting to note that since July 1, 1967, when the agreement went into effect, no campus has had a library budget less than 4.5 percent of its total campus budget. This compares favorably with the ALA Standards for Junior College Libraries which suggest 5 percent.

The responsibility for implementing this agreement was assigned to the head of Ohio State University's Undergraduate Libraries. Prior to this agreement the Undergraduate Libraries Office had been concerned solely with service to the over 30,000 undergraduates on the central campus. However, given the nature of these campuses as primarily lower-division undergraduate units, it seemed logical to centralize responsibility for library service to all undergraduates.

The Undergraduate Libraries Office, then, serves as the coordinating agency for regional campus libraries. Budgets are developed through this office based on data and enrollment projections from the Dean of University College. Library faculty members assigned to these campuses are evaluated and recommended for promotions in rank, tenure, and raises through this office. Interlibrary loan requests are handled through this office, as is all other interlibrary communication. The head of Undergraduate Libraries chairs a monthly meeting of the head librarians from each campus and their staffs which serves as a regular and permanent forum for discussing problems of mutual interest.

II. Operation of Library Services

The first priority after July 1, 1967, was to prepare a procedures manual. The agreement between University College and the Libraries was based on the assumption that acquisitions and cataloging for regional campus libraries would be done by existing departments in the main library. Each campus would then reimburse the main library on a cost per volume basis. Fully processed books and sets of catalog cards were to be trucked weekly to each campus. Serials would be ordered centrally but received directly by each campus and claimed as needed by each campus. Binding was to be done by the University Libraries contract binder on a drop-shipped basis.

When the first procedures manual was drafted covering these and other points, the fun began. Within six months it became clear that the system as planned cost more than the Libraries were being reim-
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bursed and that the processing cycle time was too long. The actual costs for acquisitions and cataloging were higher than the projected costs. Actual costs were estimated to be more than $3.70 per volume while the reimbursement rate was $2.01. The processing cycle time (number of calendar days elapsed between the date a request was typed at a branch campus library and the date the book arrived ready for use) was too long. Actual cycle times ranged from a high of 268 days to a low of 61 days with a mean of 189 and a median of 192 days.

Given these data it was necessary to reexamine the assumptions made when services to branch campus libraries were planned. There appeared to be six alternatives:

1. Raise reimbursement rate to equal processing costs.
2. Revise procedures in existing departments.
3. Create a new department.
5. Contract with the Ohio State Library Catalog Center.
6. Allow each campus to do its own processing.

The first alternative was rejected because reimbursement at the actual cost would have been prohibitive for these libraries and because the detailed cataloging specifications which this higher cost supported were of questionable utility to lower-division undergraduates. The existing departments were unwilling to revise their procedures or to operate a parallel but simpler and cheaper system at a lower cost per volume for these libraries. Contracts with commercial firms were possible and one such firm submitted a quotation of $2.00 per volume, which was nearly equal to the reimbursement rate of $2.01 per volume. A contract with the Ohio State Library’s processing center, while cheaper than comparable commercial services, was not possible because the center was unable to take on additional customers at that time. Allowing each campus to do its own processing seemed to create an unnecessary duplication of labor, materials and staff, to burden each library staff with tasks which would consume time better spent on service to users, and to violate the spirit of the fullest articulation principle.

Thus the alternatives were narrowed to two: either contract for processing services with a commercial firm or create a separate technical services unit for these libraries which could operate within the cost limits imposed. Although we had a quotation from a commercial firm which was comparable to the reimbursement rate, we were convinced that we could perform these services at a lower cost per volume and with a shorter processing cycle time. So, on February 12, 1968, the Regional Campuses Technical Services Division (RCTSD) of the Ohio State University Libraries began operations.

III. Technical Services for Regional Campus Libraries

The design of the system and procedures for RCTSD proceeded from the requirement for lower costs and was based on two assumptions:
1. That lower-division undergraduates do not require as much detailed cataloging data as that produced for graduate students and faculty members. Reduced attention to detail was expected to result in lower processing costs.

2. Simplifying procedures and eliminating overlapping operations could cut costs and shorten cycle times.

We visited the Cataloging Center operated by the Ohio State Library, and the head of RCTSD made a second and longer visit to observe these routines in detail. The first economy in our system was to accept available cataloging without change. We established two initial sources of catalog data: the LC proofslip file maintained by the OSU Libraries Catalog Department, and OSU Libraries' own public catalog. After a few months, RCTSD's own "official catalog" file became the third source of catalog data. Any item without catalog copy from these sources is cataloged by the head of RCTSD—a professional cataloger purloined from the existing Catalog Department.

We agreed that LC copy (including the LC-assigned LC call number) would be accepted in full, when available. OSU Libraries have been using LC cards for many years, and this offered a high-assay lode of LC copy. We also agreed that if LC copy were not available for an item, OSU Libraries copy and call number would be accepted in full, again when available. Since OSU Libraries have been stringently following LC cataloging practice, this offered another source of highly acceptable catalog data.

Whenever LC copy was found in OSU's catalog (i.e., a printed LC card), the call number assigned to books processed by RCTSD would be that assigned by LC rather than by OSU. It was expected that this would reduce problems of call number conflict in the future. Under current practice, however, by searching the RCTSD catalog file first, it is likely that few conflicts of this nature (between OSU's and LC's call numbers) will be found.

Since we would accept all call numbers as assigned by LC, we had to develop some method for assigning classification numbers to those few titles requiring original cataloging. The method used is an arbitrary symbol placed at the end of the Cutter number, e.g., LB 2305 A64x; "x" was chosen to minimize the chances of such a number ever being used by LC.

A second major economy in the system design is a simplified approach to ordering. The requisition and the order forms were combined into one 5-part form which is completed by each campus library. Four copies are sent to RCTSD, which sends two copies to a vendor; one is requested to be returned by the vendor. One is filed in the order file by title, and one is kept out for searching. Orders are not verified prior to ordering since we were convinced that most vendors can identify a book without reference to librarians' official main entries. The relatively low number of wrong books received (none of which has been
inappropriate enough to be returned) has confirmed our opinions.

The third major economy achieved in the RCTSD system was to precatalog as many items as possible. Essential cataloging data is searched while a title is on order so that at least a main entry card and a spine label are available in the order file when most books arrive from the vendor.

Taken together, these three approaches have enabled us to operate a system in which orders are mailed to vendors within forty-eight hours of their receipt from a branch, and in which most books are processed and prepared for weekly shipment to the appropriate branch campus within forty-eight hours of their receipt from a vendor.

Our first confirmation of results appeared in a cycle time study completed four months after RCTSD began operations. A sample of 194 order slips was selected to compare length of cycle. A startling aspect of the detailed study was that “rush” items moved no more rapidly through RCTSD than nonrush materials, but, as the summary data in Table 1 shows, the total cycle time was significantly reduced by RCTSD. There is now no “rush” procedure in RCTSD since for all practical purposes there are no queues. A second cycle time study was completed in July 1969. These data are reported in Table 2. It is evident from these two studies that the cycle time has been reduced significantly by RCTSD, although the initial reductions of 74.5 percent and 73 percent in the median and mean respectively do not seem to carry through to the second study where the reductions were 57.3 percent in the median and 49.7 percent in the mean.

### TABLE 1
**LENGTH OF CYCLE (IN CALENDAR DAYS, JUNE, 1968)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to RCTSD (7/1/67-12/31/67)</th>
<th>After RCTSD (1/1/68--)</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(N = 82)</em></td>
<td><em>(N = 112)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2
**LENGTH OF CYCLE (IN CALENDAR DAYS, JULY, 1969)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement over 1967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Although we have not studied the matter in detail, we also feel that labeling an order “rush” does not significantly increase the speed with which a vendor fills the order.*

*Volume 14, Number 4, Fall 1970*
tions, the estimated dollar value of orders placed in excess of funds
was increased from 10 percent to 25 percent, and finally to 33 1/3 per-
cent. Third, the book contract was revised to specify a minimum of
one delivery per week.

Thus far the costs for RCTSD have not been calculated using time
and motion study analyses. At the beginning of each fiscal year, the
number of books to be purchased is projected by dividing an average
net purchase price per volume into the book funds available in each
campus budget (including federal funds). This figure is then divided
by the annual production rate (defined as volumes fully processed per
full-time employee) to determine the number and kind of staff needed
to process the books to be purchased. Once the staffing structure has
been determined, we convert this to salaries, student wages, supplies,
equipment, and travel, and then divide by the projected number of
volumes to determine charge per volume. The initial per-volume pro-
cessing charge to the campuses of $2.01 per volume has been reduced
to $1.40 based on this method. The steps followed for each campus can
be expressed in the formula

\[
(T - S) - \frac{T - S}{(P + C)} = N, \text{ where:}
\]

\[
T = \text{Total book budget} \\
S = \text{Cost of current subscriptions} \\
P = \text{Average net purchase price per volume} \\
C = \text{RCTSD processing charge per volume} \\
N = \text{Net funds available for purchase of books} \\
\text{after estimated processing costs have been allowed}
\]

RCTSD maintains statistics showing the number of employees at
work each day expressed in terms of full-time employees (FTE) and
decimal fractions thereof. This is averaged each month and the average
divided into total volumes produced that month. The result is what
we call our production rate. Table 3 shows the production rate since
TABLE 3
Production Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Vols.</th>
<th>Avg. FTE</th>
<th>Vols. FTE</th>
<th>%±</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968 March</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>+18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>2385</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>+10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>-24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>+ 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>-31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>+26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>+32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>-27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>+24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 January</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>+29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>-25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>- 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>+74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>-23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-47.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the beginning of RCTSD. These figures reveal obvious fluctuations in production rate, the peaks marking months of steady employment and the valleys denoting months when students were not working because of exams, vacations, and so forth, or months when the delivery of books from vendors lagged behind production. We have discovered that the use of production rate as an index has two serious deficiencies: it is not comparable to other data available in library literature, and it does not pinpoint bottlenecks in the system. However, as a gross measure, the production rate index does reliably reflect the output we can expect from the system. With the evidence of data collected over sixteen months, we can arrive at dependable projections of output for future fiscal years. We are currently projecting an annual production rate of 3,030 volumes per FTE, and have set as an immediate goal a 10 percent increase in that figure.

When RCTSD was created, we agreed that its performance would be evaluated after one year. Data collected through June 1969 is shown in Table 4.

IV. Conclusions

The problems of developing library services at regional campuses of Ohio State University have been challenging and stimulating. As a result of this experience, the authors have come to share some skepticism regarding automation of technical services in libraries. We are inclined to the view that simplifying manual systems may be more beneficial in many libraries than mechanization of those systems. Such a view inevitably clashes with the accumulated mystique of tradition and
with the professional preoccupation with detail often prevalent in technical services. Such a view also clashes with the theory that it is easier to bypass this mystique via automation and to eliminate the human effort required to answer questions of value and judgment. The latter, while tempting, seems to us like pulling a Conestoga wagon with a Caterpillar tractor.

Because our professional literature is remarkably devoid of benchmark data on cycle times, production rates, etc., designing a new technical services system, besides being a stimulating assignment, is also a frustrating one. The task of system design in technical services is complicated by the lack of an adequate proven statistical data base; each local situation has to accumulate its own. A shakedown period will always be necessary, but its duration and the number of problems discovered during it can both be greatly reduced by the record and wisdom of comparable experiences elsewhere.

Experience with RCTSD has produced some surprises, pointed out some errors, and produced some interesting and useful discoveries. The percentage of original cataloging necessary has been consistently lower than projected by more than half. (See Table 4.) The production rate has fluctuated more than we expected and has been lower overall than we had hoped. It is clear, however, that RCTSD has processed more materials at a lower unit cost with shorter cycle times than would have been the case with any of the other available alternatives. If delivery of materials from vendors could be increased, the cycle time could be further reduced. But that is another story.
Note: Files are searched in order of preferred data rather than in order of most productive "find" rate.
Dewey and Religion

Robert N. Broadus
Professor of Library Science
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

One of the great interests of Melvil Dewey’s early life was religion. His mother was “an austere Seventh-Day Baptist”1 and he himself once considered devoting his life to missionary work in Turkey2 (though his mind did wander a bit during that immortal sermon of President Stearns). It is to Dewey the man, then, as well as to the atmosphere of the late nineteenth century that we may attribute some of the peculiarities found in the early editions of the Decimal Classification—those such as:

263 Sabbath, Lord’s Day, Sunday
.7 Opening libraries and museums.

Another unusual feature was the minute detail given in several editions (e.g., the 15th) to Young Men’s Christian Associations, under which are 141 headings in various levels of generality, with the corresponding subdivisions recommended for women’s associations. Kephart was about right in observing that 267.34145 means “In Young Men’s Christian Associations, have the general secretary and his assistants, as salaried officers, a right to keep company with ladies.”3

Despite (probably because of) this religious orientation, numerous attacks have been made on the Decimal system, emphasizing its deficiencies and faults for the classification of religious books. To what extent have these charges been justified?

Inadequacy for large collections in religion

Specialists in theology have been in general agreement that the Decimal Classification is not good enough for a theological library of any great size. The 1917 report of the Theological Libraries Round Table stated: “Half of our larger libraries are classified by this system, but half of these are actively dissatisfied.”4 Julia Pettee worked out a new classification for the Union Theological Seminary Library because she found Dewey and other common classifications too poor.5 Eisenhart6 and Slavens7 later agreed with the assessment. Sister M. Norberta declared of the 15th edition: “... philosophy and religion continue to be inadequate to the needs of any Catholic library beyond the high-school level.”8

The unrealistic—sometimes bizarre—allotments of space in DC have been shot at frequently. For the field of religion one representative comment is: “Hinduism and Confucianism, which number their devotees...
by the million, are still on a level with minor Presbyterian sects." The criticisms are justified, but the sport never had much point, since Dewey himself was well aware of the difficulty.

The surprising part is that so many theological libraries use the DC. According to Kortendick more American Catholic libraries use DC than use any other system, though many of these have, of course, made extensive modifications. Since most specialists in other disciplines consider Dewey inadequate for their own fields, the complaints of theological librarians on this score are not unique. It must be remembered that the original purpose of the scheme was to serve not large specialized collections, but one college library.

The Perkins-Schwartz “Duet”

Other attacks on the DC have been based on the religious point-of-view of Dewey as a person. One of the most vicious denunciations ever made of any library classification system was that by Frederic B. Perkins and Jacob Schwartz in 1886, the year following publication of the second edition. Both men were associated closely with Dewey at one time or another, and each had by this time fashioned a classification plan of his own. (Schwartz’ scheme, remodeled several times, was surely one of the strangest ever devised by the mind of man.) In a long bill of particulars, the duet blasted away at Dewey on many fronts, but seemed preoccupied with his religious views. Criticizing his placement of insanity, catalepsy, etc., under “Mental philosophy” rather than under medicine, they threw in the remark: “As well put them where the Apostles would have put them, under Diabolic possession, in Theology.” The duet also howled about the “display of bigotry which, with surprising ingenuity, Mr. Dewey has managed to inject into his scheme.” They referred particularly to Dewey’s placing of Spiritualism and Supernaturalism under “Delusions” and to his calling Arianism a heresy.

In his reply, Dewey probably was wise to ignore the first charge (it would seem hard to answer) but after batting back the accusation of bigotry, seemed quite philosophic in explaining:

To have omitted Arian heresy so generally known by that name would certainly have aroused sharp criticism from a much larger class. We tried to ignore personal beliefs in assigning topics, but as often happens if there are but two horns to a dilemma, we just take one and let the other side abuse us for it. It’s merely choosing whose abuse to endure.

Roman Catholic

Representatives of several particular church organizations have lodged protests against Dewey, charging unnecessary bias. Roman Catholics have made more such complaints than has any other group. For instance, one big problem seems to be the conception of the church itself. Thus Sister Norbetta explained, “Catholics do not look upon the Church as a sect originating in post-Reformation times, but rather as identical with the Apostolic Church and continuous from it.” Kapsner
found similar fault with the *A.L.A. Cataloging Rules*, "... which disposes of the Catholic Church as being but one of several major religious bodies of the Christian faith. ... To a Catholic this procedure is foreign to his basic conviction." (He also spoke disparagingly of the DC in the same article.) Since many churches feel this way about themselves, it seems obvious that no one classification can satisfy them all (maybe not any two of them) on this point.

Hagler contended that Dewey's arrangement of the 200s is unsuitable for Catholics, as well as for some other churches, because it reflects the compiler's understanding of religion as a subjective and not a dogmatic experience. He put it frankly when he went on to say, "No system can classify religious materials without some evident and planned bias." Sister Norbertha acknowledged that no modification of Dewey will ever be acceptable to all religions.

The active interest taken by Catholic librarians caused many changes in the 17th edition, but Father Cook still looks for the day "... when the DDC sees fit to assign the Catholic Liturgy its own 'specific elements'!"

**Christian Science**

Because Dewey spent so much time in Boston, his handling of the Christian Science movement was curious. Even as late as the sixth edition (1899) no place had been made for this group in the 200s, but the index entry "Christian science therapeutics" referred the user to 615.851, "Mind Cure. Influence of mind on body" under medicine. In 1905 a letter directed to the Cataloging Section of the American Library Association by a representative of the Christian Science Publication Committee for California insisted (persuasively if a bit over-piously) that books on this religious body be classed under Christianity. In later editions this church has been placed in 289, "Other Denominations and Sects [of Christianity]." Fremont Rider, however, could not let the matter drop. In 1910 he had to take a jab: "The average scientist ... might look on Christian Science as a 'manifestation of mind' deserving of no place at all [in the classification tables]."

**Mormonism**

In another strange decision, the originator of DC placed "Mormonism" with "non-Christian Religions" in 298, despite the fact that for some time the church had been known legally as the "Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints." It remained outside the pale for a full half-century, during which time the 290s received other labels, such as "Ethnic and Other Religions." Not until the twelfth edition (1927) was this church placed among "Christian Sects" by being made 289.3.

**Judaism**

The treatment of the Jewish religion in the DC has varied, not always in the direction of improvement. In 1914 Walker complained that Dewey
should not have placed it merely among non-Christian religions. Such
treatment, he said, overlooks the fact that Judaism, too, is based upon
the Bible. He suggested the arrangement:

Bible
Judaism and Christianity
Judaism
Christianity

This recommendation has merit, but only a little. Surely it would seem
that even in a nineteenth century library collected primarily for Chris-
tians' use, materials on the Jewish religion would be more conveniently
located closer to materials on Christianity, rather than in remote 296.
On the other hand, to have implied that both religions are completely
subsumed under the heading “Bible” would not have been proper either
(except, perhaps, in some kind of evolutionary classification such as
Brown’s).

In recent years, because the DC has been adopted by many libraries
whose viewpoints, religious and otherwise, are so far different from those
of the original users of the system, the editors have tried to make it be-
come (in the appropriate words of the Apostle) all things to all men.
Thus the editor of the 17th edition was particularly eager to correct its
“historical bias toward Protestant Anglo-Saxon culture.” Though no-
ting the “addition of numerous provisions for topics of chiefly Roman
Catholic concern,” he promised that Edition 17 would “show clearly
throughout (as Edition 16 does not) that the editors are aware that reli-
gion and Christianity are not synonymous.” The seventeenth therefore
has (a welcome) fuller development for the other great world religions,
but for some reason not readily apparent, it carries over the heading
Edition 15), with the (Jewish) Old Testament as a subdivision. On this
point it would appear erroneous to say that “Class 200, ‘Religion’ has
been recast to make clear which divisions apply only to Christianity…”

Summary

There surely have been inadequacies and religious biases in Dewey’s
Decimal Classification. Some of these faults are attributable to the per-
sonal peculiarities of Dewey himself; some to the kinds of libraries for
which early editions of the system were designed; and some to the later
editors of the scheme. Most of these biases are forgivable because they
were inevitable—or at least human.

Probably any general library classification is more likely to be—or
seem—biased in religion than in any other discipline. Several factors
account for this warpage: the large number of materials to be classified;
the parochial and controversial vein of many books in the field; the fact
that, traditionally, people are likely to be narrow-minded in religion—
not considering beliefs other than their own to be particularly important.
Any hierarchical classification is, as we have been reminded so often,
always unsatisfactory to most users, but its faults are likely to be magnified when it is examined by religionists. On the whole then, it seems fair to conclude that the Decimal Classification's sections devoted to religion have stood up reasonably well against charges of opponents.
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Schrettinger on Class and the Subject Heading: A Note on Early Nineteenth-Century Thinking

SIDNEY L. JACKSON, Professor
School of Library Science
Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

Martin Schrettinger (1772-1851) pioneered in distinguishing between the function of subject classification and the function of subject heading. He dreamed of standardizing, but he did not think of lists or authority files. He was backward in over-looking long familiar cross-reference devices.

In 1829, BAVARIAN MONK-LIBRARIAN Martin Schrettinger (1772-1851) published his thoughts on the “systematic” (or classified) versus the alphabetical catalog, and made an indifferently received plea for subject guidance in alphabetical array (subject-headings or catchwords or both) under the label of Realkatalog. For all the exaggeration and confusion limiting his impact at the time, his ideas are worth attention.

The problem with the systematic catalog, he submits, is that it is so constructed that the operator must know not only that the book in hand concerns, for example, “Luxury” (“Luxus”), but whether the frame of reference is “The National Economy, the Police, theological or philosophical Morality, of History, or even Poetry, etc.” (“der Staatswirtschaft, der Polizei, der theologischen oder philosophischen Moral, oder der Geschichte, oder wohl gar der Poesie u. s. w.”; II:49).

The Realkatalog, on the contrary, focuses directly on the individual subject. He projects this instrument as the ultimate aggregate of special catalogs, listing all the material on one subject or another in books or parts of composite publications, somewhat akin to the vertical and other special files of later times. He further submits that to list only the titles of complete works is but the “first power” of a catalog. Bringing out individual titles by means of analytics raises it to the “second.” Adding data on the life of the author and the fate of his work brings it up to the

* Adapted from a work in progress, on the history of libraries and librarianship in the West.
** Versuch eines Vollständigen Lehrbuchs der Bibliothek-Wissenschaft; Munich-Lindau; Hefte 1-3, 1808-10; Hefte 4, 1829. The title means, “An Attempt at a Comprehensive Text on Library Science.”
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subject, he explains, by asking four questions:

1. What is the actual subject the work treats?
   ("Welches ist der eigentliche Gegenstand, den dieses Werk behandelt?")

2. Under what name will one ordinarily look it up?
   ("Unter welchem Namen wird man diesen Gegenstand gemeiniglich suchen?")

3. Under what other labels can the same thing also be sought?
   ("Unter welchen anderen Benennungen kann derselbe eben sowohl gesucht werden?")

4. Is this subject not so closely related to several others that one of them cannot really be treated apart from the rest?
   ("Ist dieser Gegenstand nicht mit einigen andern Gegenständen so nahe verwandt, dass einer derselben ohne den andern nicht wohl abgehandelt werden kann"; II: 143)

But they were missing a point worthy of note, even if Schrettinger had not expressed it very clearly. The contrast he drew was at bottom the difference between the function of a hierarchical subject classification, which relates topics to the larger ones embracing them and to the smaller ones within them, and the specific subject heading, which can bring together material from all manner of larger frameworks. The possibility that other libraries would adopt the same headings, by copying his model, was one of the reasons he envisaged the Realkatalog so broadly. The more practical corollary, standardization via authority files, apparently did not occur to him: he argues that assigning subjects in an alphabetical array is easier than placing them properly in a logical sequence, but admits unhappily that the whole job must originally be done by one person to minimize inconsistency. If he knew how inconsistent one individual can be, he kept his doubts to himself.

It appears, moreover, that Schrettinger was a trail-blazer in the whole area of what came to be known as subject headings. One defines a subject, he explains, by asking four questions:

1. What is the actual subject the work treats?
   ("Welches ist der eigentliche Gegenstand, den dieses Werk behandelt?")

2. Under what name will one ordinarily look it up?
   ("Unter welchem Namen wird man diesen Gegenstand gemeiniglich suchen?")

3. Under what other labels can the same thing also be sought?
   ("Unter welchen anderen Benennungen kann derselbe eben sowohl gesucht werden?")

4. Is this subject not so closely related to several others that one of them cannot really be treated apart from the rest?
   ("Ist dieser Gegenstand nicht mit einigen andern Gegenständen so nahe verwandt, dass einer derselben ohne den andern nicht wohl abgehandelt werden kann"; II: 143)

He next disposes of the familiar reliance on key words in titles with fresh emphasis on the risks involved. Citing "On the Sale of Goods from a Mortgaged Shop" ("Von dem Verkauf der Waaren aus einem hypothesizirten Laden"), he points out how useless it would be to draw the reader's attention to any one of the three nouns separately. Check as to common usage, he adds; it is too easy to devise a false heading from ignorance. He does not mention the compound-subject possibility.

Usage also brings up the question of language. Scholars will incline towards Latin, but Schrettinger thinks the mother tongue is a much
better choice. After all, "We labor in the first place for our countrymen" ("Wir arbeiten ja zunächst für unsere Landsleute"; II:149). Besides, while no language has just the right word for every need, the dead languages lack a great many terms required in contemporary life.

He is worried about synonyms, variety in spelling ("Censur" and "Zensur" for instance) and the tendency of terms to change their meaning from one age to another. But the solution already known for centuries, the cross-reference, is not mentioned in this connection. He simply pleads for consistency.

Where subjects overlap, one should use the most exact term, or the one which appears on the title-page, or all of them. No more than see-references does he think of the similarly venerable see also.

On the other hand, where a team has several meanings, Schrettinger advises distinguishing them with parenthetical guides, a solution widely accepted long afterwards. He also uses parenthetical modification to create subject subdivisions, such as Church History (General) and Church History (German) ("Kirchengeschichte (allgemeine)" and "Kirchengeschichte (deutsche)"; II:152). Nervous about the opposition, he adds a note, "be sure this does not become an array of systematic subdivisions."

Schrettinger's ideas were not very popular, partly because he was so earnest and argumentative. He says in the preface that he had to pay for the publication of his second volume himself. One hopes that is the least of the lessons taught!
Dr. S. R. Ranganathan

Pauline Atherton, Associate Professor
School of Library Science
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

The Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification is awarded in 1970 to S. R. Ranganathan for his Colon Classification which has profoundly influenced modern classification theory and research through its faceted analysis techniques, for his works on the principles and structure of the classified and the dictionary catalog, and for a lifetime of signal devotion to the advancement of library science.

If Dr. Ranganathan had done nothing more than publish *The Five Laws of Library Science*, he would have to be seriously considered for a Library Hall of Fame. The impact of these five succinct statements, first published in 1931, is still being felt around the world via transmitters, namely, Dr. Ranganathan’s students and followers who know the importance of these laws on every continent and in most every country where there is to be a philosophy of library service and development.

*The Five Laws of Library Science*
1. Books are for use
2. Every reader his book
3. Every book its reader
4. Save the time of the reader
5. A library is a growing organism

Library Resources & Technical Services
The explication and amplification of these statements by teachers in library science classes also help to perpetuate his teachings because these words stir students to think of and believe in library service above library work as their life goal. Few writers have caught the essence of librarianship in such few words and have been as eloquent as Dr. Ranganathan has in his several lecture tours around the world in the past forty years. His devotion to librarianship has led him to consider every facet of work in his native India, in England and America, and on the European continent. His many achievements, honors, and triumphs are comprehensively treated in a Festschrift volume entitled Library Science Today (edited by P. N. Kaula, published in 1965). Colleagues, friends and students contributed reminiscences, documentaries, and evaluations of Dr. Ranganathan’s works and life. This 832-page volume was a great tribute to a great man on his seventy-first birthday, on August 12, 1962. To read it in its entirety is an awesome task, but to sample it and get the measure of the man causes one also to stand in awe, for this man has accurately been described as the Yogi of librarianship (i.e., a person who has completely yoked himself to the object of achievement).

With such far-ranging interests as adult education and library administration, library research and scientific information, you might wonder why and when Dr. Ranganathan could focus on the field of cataloging and classification. His early training in mathematics and close association with Berwick Sayers may be the answer, but a deeper reason may be that he saw the need for librarianship to have a firmer theoretical base in an area where its greatest and most original contribution lay: the bibliographical organization of knowledge. As early as 1924 he felt this need, and he has worked continuously on it ever since.

Here then is where we would like to focus our attention in order to see how much more clearly we do see our role because of the writings and guidance of S. R. Ranganathan. He has stimulated generations of librarians to think logically and rationally about their work. He has devised ways of guiding our thinking. Combining scholarship and teaching, he laid the foundation for a new type of librarian, one who could design and build, analyze and synthesize, as well as follow in a great tradition. His Classified Catalogue Code and Colon Classification show his great care for detail, while at the same time they show his wide perspective and grasp of the function of cataloging and classification.

The many canons, postulates, and principles which he has enunciated in his Prolegomena to Library Classification, and in the hundreds of articles he has published, serve as documentation of the deep thought he has given to the foundations of our work. The third edition of the Prolegomena, just recently published, brings together his chief contributions in this area: the concepts of facet analysis, phase analysis, zone analysis, the levels of work in classification, chain procedure, diverse devices, and depth classification, to mention only a few.

His influence has been felt in his native land to such an extent that he is called “The Father of the Library Movement in India,” but his
work on the international level for UNESCO and FID have probably brought him the most fame in the United States. His critical appraisals of existing cataloging codes and classification schemes prevent us from ever looking at any of them as “sacred cows” again. The FID Study Committee for Classification Research under his direction in the early years served to focus attention on the need for international conferences on this important subject—at a time when traditional librarians looked on this area as the scientists looked on physics at the end of the nineteenth century. From such meetings came a growing awareness of the immense amount of work that needs to be done to bring our theories and practices up to the task of handling modern thought and knowledge in a modern way. Although he has spent most of his life in a country with a strong pull to the past and a tremendous struggle to make great strides in the present, his words and writings have stimulated workers in countries where progress and technology were advancing quite rapidly. In many ways he has probably helped bridge the gap between library automation and information storage and retrieval better than most of the writers and workers in the field, without having had firsthand experience with computers. This has been possible because he has stressed the fundamentals underlying the intellectual processes we are trying to perform.

In time and space his work outdistances most;
In personality he has no living equal;
In energy he knows no limit, working past the point of exhaustion for most;
In matter, the scales would indicate great weight.

Dr. Ranganathan’s life and works mark him as a great benefactor to library science.

P. K. Garde, left, accepts the Margaret Mann Citation for S. R. Ranganathan from C. Sumner Spalding, chairman of the Margaret Mann Committee, and Esther D. Koch, chairman of the RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section.

Library Resources & Technical Services
The Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association presents the Esther J. Piercy Award for 1970 to John B. Corbin in recognition of his contributions to technical services. In the ten years that he has served the profession, he has demonstrated unusual promise as an organizer, supervisor, consultant, author, and editor. His work is characterized by imagination, creativity, and skill, and he has given sound leadership to the technical services in his native state of Texas. His interests reflect unusually well the concerns of the person in whose name this award has been created, and his contributions exhibit the high standards of conception and performance that were hers.

Primarily a Texan in professional education and experience, John Corbin attended the Graduate School of Library Science, the University of Texas at Austin, as the Southwestern Library Association's scholarship winner for 1959. This followed his graduation from North Texas State University and library work at various times as a student assistant and Special Services duty at Ft. Belvoir Post Library, Virginia.
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Mary Pound
Chief Catalog Librarian
University of Texas
Austin, Texas
Following graduation from the GSLS in August 1960 and until September 1963, John was Acquisitions Librarian, the University of Texas at Arlington, where he reorganized the Acquisitions Department under a newly created Technical Services Program.

**Organizer and Supervisor**

Between September 1963 and February 1967, John worked as Director, Technical Services Division, Texas State Library in Austin, supervising a staff of about twenty and administering a book budget of about $500,000, mostly from Federal Library Services and Construction Act funds. A program of automation using unit record equipment was begun by Mr. Corbin in the Division in 1964. Following months saw the establishment of a centralized processing unit which provided cataloged materials for over thirty Texas public libraries under LSIL funding. A manual was prepared for the operation of the center, as well as articles describing the program in *Texas Libraries* and the *Texas Library Journal*.

This period also includes John's activities in the Texas Library Association in the organization of the Acquisitions Section before its official recognition as a Round Table and the planning of the First Texas Conference on Library Mechanization, held in Austin in 1966. *Proceedings* of the First Conference and also of the Second Conference (called the Second Texas Conference on Library Automation, in Houston in 1969) were issued under his editorship.

In March 1967, Mr. Corbin moved to the Tarrant County Junior College District, Fort Worth, to take the position of Director of Automation Services, Learning Resources Centers. Here he has planned, designed, and implemented in conjunction with the Data Systems Department an integrated system of automation in the District libraries (composed presently of two campuses but planned for five) done originally on an IBM 1401 computer, reprogrammed for an RCA Spectra 70, and now being converted for an IBM 360. Currently, programs are completely operational in acquisitions, cataloging, circulation, and budgetary accounting. A dozen other programs, including a computer-based and computer-produced book catalog of the District's library collections, are in effect.

Concurrent with this position, John taught "Automation in the Library," a three-hour graduate level course in the Department of Library Service, North Texas State University.

**Consultant, Author, and Editor**

Consultant services have been given by Mr. Corbin to the Houston Public Library (1964), the Ohio State Library (1966), and the Oklahoma Department of Libraries (1968) in surveys of technical services operations. Several Texas libraries received similar attention through his duties at the Texas State Library. During 1969, John presented a paper at the Clinic on Library Applications of Data Processing, the
University of Illinois; was lecturer-staff member at the Institute on the Critical Role of State Library Agencies, sponsored by the University of Oklahoma and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at Norman, Oklahoma; and was visiting lecturer at the “High School Library as a Media Center” Institute sponsored by the Department of Library Service, North Texas State University.

Building a basic research collection of geologic materials at the University of Texas at Arlington led John to the compilation of the *Index of State Geological Survey Publications Issued in Series*, published by Scarecrow Press in 1965.


Indexes of both the *Texas Library Journal* (quarterly publication of the Texas Library Association) and *Texas Libraries* (Texas State Library quarterly) reflect John’s contributions. In addition, he served as editor of *Texas Libraries*, 1965-66.

**Professional Activities**

As mentioned, John is an active member of the Texas Library Association, having served also in the Texas Regional Group of Catalogers and Classifiers, and the College and University Libraries Division (Chairman, 1970/71).

His recent activities in the Southwestern Library Association include planning for the preconference on automation held prior to the 1970 biennial conference of SWLA.

Mr. Corbin’s American Library Association assignments have included the following: committee member, Technical Services Standards Committee, RTSD, 1966-68; assistant chairman, Special Projects Committee, Junior College Libraries Section, ACRL, 1967-68; Southern Regional Coordinator, same committee, 1968-69; committee member, Book Catalogs Committee, RTSD, 1967-68, 1969-71; chairman pro tem, organizational meeting, 1966, of the Technical Services Directors of Processing Centers Discussion Group, RTSD.

Each of the above mentioned projects has been completed with competence. It seems likely that the profession will benefit in additional ways from John’s own high standards of performance. In August 1970, he entered a course of doctoral study in industrial engineering at the University of Oklahoma.
Regional Groups Report

MARIAN SANNER, Chairman
Council of Regional Groups

The activities of the regional groups continued throughout the year. The range of their interests can be seen in highlights from the program reports of fifteen groups.

Two meetings were held in 1969/70 by the Chicago Regional Group of Librarians in Technical Services. At the fall meeting, Mrs. Judith F. Krug, Director of the Office for Intellectual Freedom, spoke about problems of censorship and related American Library Association activities. The topic of the spring meeting was “Automation in the Library: Some Possibilities.” This all-day meeting was planned in cooperation with the Illinois Library Association’s Resources and Technical Services Division and College and Research Libraries Division. The program dealt with systems analysis and the use of automation in the areas of acquisitions, cataloging, and circulation.

At the fall meeting of the Technical Services Section of the Connecticut Library Association, Charles Funk and Henry Gilkes presented progress reports, respectively, on the union catalog project and computerized cataloging efforts on which they had reported initially the previous year. These reports were followed by one from Mrs. Katherine Cristiano, Greenwich Public Library, on that library’s experience in compiling a fiction catalog by computer. The spring meeting, jointly sponsored with the Connecticut State Library, was a workshop on filing based on the new ALA rules. An explanation of the basic rules was given by Mrs. Kathleen Mallison, Supervisor of Processing at the New Haven Free Public Library. This presentation was followed by a practice session in arranging cards for filing. The workshop, attended by fifty librarians, was a sell-out and will be repeated at a later date.

In May the Technical Services Roundtable of the Florida Library Association met in Fort Lauderdale. The program meeting was a joint session with the Association’s College and Special Libraries Division and the Florida Chapter of the Special Libraries Association. Richard Dougherty, Associate Director of Libraries, University of Colorado at Boulder, spoke on some of the problems and possibilities of cooperation in centralized processing.

The Illinois Library Association’s Resources and Technical Services Section was the cosponsor of a seminar on “Automation in the Library,” which was held in Northwestern University Library in May. Emphasis
was on the practical problems and achievements of automation in the Illinois area, and the four speakers were from that state: Mrs. Velma Veneziano, Northwestern University; Mrs. Ellen Roop Fisher, University of Chicago; Robert Hamilton, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb; Joseph Paulukonis, Technological Institute of Northwestern University.

The spring meeting of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the Kansas Library Association was held in May during the KLA Convention. The program consisted of a panel of five members speaking on the subject "3 by 5 or What." The remarks concerned the school and public library angle of centralized processing, MT/ST card reproduction, and xerographic card reproduction. Panel members were: Mrs. Margaret Meyer and James Soester, Topeka Public Library; Carl Kent, Kansas City Public Library; Crystal McNally, Coordinator of School Library Services, Wichita Public Schools; and Beverly Swanson, Johnson County Public Library.

Atlantic City was the site of the spring meeting of the Technical Services Section of the New Jersey Library Association. The speaker on this occasion was David Remington, Director of Professional Services for Bro-Dart Industries, Inc. The title of his address was "ANSCR (Alpha-Numeric System for Classification of Recordings): Where It Came from and How It Works." Mr. Remington described the scheme and distributed example sheets of the classification system devised by Caroline Saheb-Ettaba and Roger B. McFarland.

The Program Committee of the New York Technical Services Librarians conducted an opinion survey to determine the interests of the membership; the group's spring meeting was a response to the survey findings. Ryburn Ross, Assistant Director for Technical Services, Olin Library of Cornell University, spoke on the topic "Recent Organizational Changes in the Technical Services in Large Research Libraries." Mr. Ross presented the preliminary results of a questionnaire submitted to eighty ARL libraries on their organizational structure for technical services. Mr. Ross said that the 1960s were critical years for the technical services in academic libraries, but he indicated that the 1970s promise to be more critical.

The 1970 annual meeting of the Northern California Technical Processes Group was held at the San Jose Public Library. The morning session was devoted to a discussion between librarians and bookmen of "Problems in Acquisitions, 1970." At the afternoon session Abraham Tom, San Jose Public Library, spoke on the new ALA filing rules as adopted by one library. This was followed by a discussion on use of the Polaroid Camera with Library of Congress materials, other than MARC tapes, by Mrs. Nancy Musser, San Francisco Public Library, and Charles Kuster, San Jose State College Library.

The topic for the spring meeting of the Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians was "Blanket and Approval Order Plans." The speakers were Mrs. Eleanor Herling, Case Western Reserve University, and Hugh Atkinson of Ohio State University.
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A two-day spring meeting was held by the Ohio Valley Group of Technical Service Librarians. The topic of the first program session was “Automation in Action.” The group heard three speakers: William Studer, Allen Pratt, and Charles Davis discuss, respectively, “Regional Campus Libraries,” “Research Center for Library and Information Science,” and “SDI for the Public Library—Crawfordville Processing Center.” The dinner speaker was Robert R. Holmes, Assistant Director for Processing Services at the Library of Congress; he talked about recent activities of LC in the area of technical services. “Coping or Not: Traditional Methods vs. Changing Demands” was the subject of a panel discussion at the last session, moderated by Margaret Oldfather of Ohio State University. The panelists were Mrs. Odette Pratt, Indiana University, Mrs. Eva Kiewitt, Indiana University, and Robert Mount of Purdue University.

At their spring meeting the members of the Technical Services Division of the Oklahoma Library Association heard Dr. Edmon Low speak on “Something Old—Something New,” a discussion of new media and mechanization in libraries.

Williamsburg was the setting for the annual meeting of the Potomac Technical Processing Librarians. The afternoon program consisted of a panel discussion on the “Acquisition and Cataloging of Reprints.” Participants were Robert L. Beare, McKeldin Library, University of Maryland; Frederick Altman, Kraus-Thomson Organization; F. Ruffner, Gale Research Company; and Howard Sullivan of Wayne State University. The dinner speaker was Jim F. Comstock, editor of the *West Virginia Hillbilly*, the *Richwood Hillbilly Press*, and the *Appalachian Press*.

The Southern California Technical Processes Group held a two-day meeting in October on MARC II and its implications for libraries. At the group’s February dinner meeting the speaker was J. K. Fordyce, an organization development specialist. The spring meeting was held at the Kater-Krafts Binders and included a tour of the bindery.

The spring meeting of the Tennessee Technical Services Librarians featured a panel discussion on “Data Processing.” The panel members were Katherine E. Andrews and Mrs. Willodene Scott of the Materials Center, Metropolitan School District, Nashville; Raymond R. Dickinson, National Laboratory Libraries, Oak Ridge; and Mrs. Eleanor Morrissey of the Joint University Libraries.

The Texas Regional Group of Catalogers and Classifiers held its spring meeting in Amarillo. The speaker was Mrs. Florrinell Morton, Director of the Louisiana State University Library School, and the title of her address was “The Times, They Are A-Changing.” Mrs. Morton stressed the importance of using nonprofessional staff to the best advantage, especially in cataloging, because of the increasing volume of materials purchased by libraries and the lack of catalogers. Mrs. Shula Schwartz, El Centro Junior College, then gave a short report on library technician training programs at the college.
The past year and a half proved a difficult time for RTSD, as the Division faced not only the loss of its Executive Secretary but also the loss of two Presidents. When an accident left Margaret Brown incapacitated, Carol Raney, Vice-President (President-elect) took over, only to resign a few months later to accept the position of Executive Secretary. This left the Division with no officers, which necessitated the drafting of the newly elected Vice-President (President-elect) immediately after tallying the votes and more than a year before his scheduled term. Thus I faced the immediate and unappealing task of presiding at the Atlantic City activities of the Division with inadequate information and preparation.

As my term began chaotically, so it ended. The scheduled program meetings of the Division and its Sections faced numerous disruptions as Cobo Hall in Detroit was rocked by fireworks both real and verbal. Climaxing the sessions was the unhappy decision to recommend cancellation of program meetings on Thursday afternoon when it became evident that the extended membership meeting was considering actions vital to the Association and its members, most of whom were engaged in program meetings. The action imposed on the Association by the membership meeting should not be permitted to recur, for it presented your President and Board with two undesirable alternatives. That which we took had the unhappy result that a year's work and planning, the cost and time of invited speakers, and the cost of travel for those who came specifically to hear speakers, were all lost. The other alternative was to allow to be carried on, in our absence, vital discussions and actions which would affect all members. A particularly distressing casualty of this decision was the combined Sections meeting on Reprinting. The prepared papers will, at least, be published, hopefully at an early date.

At any rate, the program meeting on "Cataloging-in-Publication," although rocked by a more physical type of fireworks, was able to overcome the disruptions and struggle to a successful completion before the other problem became quite so apparent. In spite of the cacophony just outside the windows, a sizeable band of dedicated individuals persisted until the finale where they heard assurances from William Welsh (LC) that CIP will be resumed in a modified but more determined program. It is to be hoped that the presently projected three-year program will be the beginning of what can eventually become a worldwide effort to provide CIP for all publications in all languages.

In spite of these problems and those mentioned earlier, the Division has moved forward through the work of its Sections and Committees. One attempt to respond to the membership's expressed desire for new blood was the appoint-
ment by the new President of two junior members to each Division committee. These are special appointments over and above the allotted memberships described by the bylaws and for the limited term of one year. The experiment has seemed to prove successful with both junior members and more established members of the Division responding favorably to the undertaking. It is hoped that this project will be continued during the coming years.

The American Book Publishers Council/RTSD Joint Committee, Stephen Ford, Co-chairman, assisted with the planning of two major programs for the Detroit Conference: Cataloging-in-Publication and Reprinting. Meanwhile, reports were submitted to the committee on the following topics: Permanent/Durable Papers and Standards for Library Binding; the progress of Standard Book Numbers; ABPC studies on basic research on industry problems in marketing and on library schools and institutions as markets for trade books. A subcommittee was appointed to investigate the possibility of having hearings at state and regional meetings to identify possible acquisitions problems for consideration at a 1972 preconference institute.

Ritvars Bregzis, Chairman of the Book Catalogs Committee, reported that the Book Catalogs Directory is to be published in the Summer 1970, issue of Library Resources & Technical Services. The Committee is looking forward to reader reaction to determine updating and detail in future listings. Some time at the Chicago Midwinter meeting was allotted by the Committee to the study of its objectives, and the conclusion was that merging of its objectives and activities with those of the RSD Catalog Use Committee should be explored.

David C. Weber, RTSD representative on the Interdivisional Committee on the Conference on Interlibrary Communications and Information Networks, reported that the conference would be invitational with working sessions to be held September 28 through October 2, 1970 at Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia. The Committee will bring before the ALA membership the problems uncovered and the recommendations of the Conference, and will propose to the Division means for effecting improvement in developing interlibrary communications and information networks.

A list of processing centers has been compiled by the Centralized Processing Committee, Donald D. Hendricks, Chairman, to appear in the Summer 1970, issue of Library Resources & Technical Services. The Committee is considering identifying one to ten representative centers serving school libraries per state, since it is felt that there are now too many centers for an exhaustive list.

Library associations throughout the world have been sent an “inquiry” from Sarah K. Vann, Chairman of the RTSD Subcommittee on International Relations, asking for titles in the technical services area which might be more useful if translated. A progress report was made at the Detroit conference.

The RTSD-LED Library School Traveling Fellowship Interdivisional Committee, F. Bernice Field, Chairman, has been exploring sources of funds to enable teachers of technical services in library schools to get out into the field to see firsthand what is happening and what the problems are. Unfortunately, funds are difficult to raise at this time, but the Committee recommends that the project be suspended until a more favorable financial climate exists.

The Organization Committee, Margaret C. Brown, Chairman, presented function statements for six committees to the RTSD Board at Midwinter, and recommended that the Planning Committee be enlarged from five members to nine. This met with the approval of the Planning Committee, Margaret C.
Brown, Chairman, which also acted to rescind the action taken at Atlantic City to merge the Planning and Organizations Committees. The merger was proposed in order to simplify the RTSD committee structure, but the committees had second thoughts and the RTSD Board of Directors approved revocation of the merger. The Committee voted, and the Board subsequently approved, formation of an ad hoc Commercial Processing Services Committee to study the role of RTSD vis-à-vis commercial processing services.

A Documents Information Exchange was held at the Detroit meeting by the RSD/RTSD Interdivisional Committee on Public Documents, Margaret T. Lane, Chairman. At this time a beginning was made to update the Directory of Documents Librarians. The Documents Survey is progressing, with Indiana University receiving full funding from the Office of Education for the preparation of a research design.

The Resources Committee, under the chairmanship of James W. Henderson, has been considering a series of resources guides such as the one now under preparation at The New York Public Library Research Libraries.

The development of standard times in technical services continues to be the main concern of the Technical Services Costs Committee, Richard W. Boss, Chairman. In conjunction with the Library Technology Program, the Committee has examined two separate projects: (1) an evaluation and reformation of existing standard time studies with each activity studied available in a pamphlet which has a general introduction, a section of specialized methodology, and a section of work sheets and forms; (2) a new study of original cataloging and the bibliographical searching associated with it.

The RTSD/ISAD Interdivisional Committee on a Universal Numbering System for Library Materials, Warren J. Haas, Chairman, reviewed the status of the Standard Book Numbering system and voted to recommend to its parent Boards that the principle be endorsed and the use of SBN be encouraged. Subsequently, the Committee, in the belief that its mission has been accomplished, has recommended to its parent Boards that it be discharged.

The activities of the four sections of RTSD and their committees, which are summarized below, culminated in a joint section program on reprint publishing at Detroit, but as noted earlier, only the first of two scheduled sessions could be held.

The Acquisitions Section functioned with Connie Dunlap as Chairman. Its Reprinting Committee and the American Book Publishers Council sponsored a meeting with New York area reprint publishers to discuss possible improvements in the process of selecting and acquiring reprint editions. The reprint publishers expressed considerable interest in forming a Reprinters Association.

The principle task of the AS Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee has been the examination of problems with jobbers in the areas of claims, reports, invoicing, slowness of supply, and service concepts. A program meeting at Detroit on these topics was planned but, as mentioned earlier, was not completed. The Committee expects to proceed toward the establishment of guidelines for librarians and dealers.

The AS Policy and Research Committee is investigating the possibility of preparing a directory of antiquarian dealers, and the feasibility of publishing desiderata lists. The Textbook Proposal Committee has filed its report and has been discharged, and the reactivation of an International Subscription Agents List Committee has been proposed in order to keep that publication up-to-date.

The Cataloging and Classification Section, Esther Koch, Chairman, is giving
attention to the cataloging of nonbook materials, but three projects are under way that should answer the needs in this field. They are (i) a manual by Jean Riddle (published this spring by the Canadian Library Association) entitled *Non-Book Materials; the Organization of Integrated Collections*; a work being compiled by Antony Croghan on the organization of nonprint materials, scheduled for publication by the Library Association in the fall of 1970; and the U.S. Office of Education Institute on Systems and Standards for the Bibliographical Control of Media, the proceedings of which will be published before the end of 1970. The CCS program meeting at Dallas may be devoted to the subject of nonbook materials, and for these reasons a preconference institute on nonbook materials at Dallas has been cancelled.

The CCS Policy and Research Committee has been considering the recommendations of a Subcommittee on Machine Implications for Cataloging Research and Organization calling for the establishment of an interdivisional group (RTSD, RSD, and ISAD) to monitor, review, and recommend action on draft standards for bibliographical representation in machine-readable form of book and non-book library materials.

The CCS Subject Analysis and Organization of Library Materials Committee has been studying another of the above Subcommittee recommendations, on the need for continuing liaison with the Library of Congress in the development of a theoretical basis for subject headings, as well as guidelines for their application.

The CCS Descriptive Cataloguing Committee also has delayed action on the problems of cataloging nonbook materials pending publication of the Riddle and Croghan manuals. Both at Atlantic City and at the Chicago Midwinter meeting the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* were discussed by representatives of the American Library Association, the Canadian Library Association, the Library Association (Great Britain), and the Library of Congress, and it was agreed to issue a supplement of consolidated amendments to the *AACR*.

The CCS Audio-Visual Media in Libraries Committee is considering recommending the Riddle manual be adopted as official ALA policy, and the Committee is also working with the Library of Congress on the MARC format for motion pictures and filmstrips.

The CCS Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee has agreed that the recommendations of the Audio-Visual Media in Libraries Committee should serve as the guidelines for children’s nonprint materials. The Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee, *now ad hoc*, has become an effective link between the Library of Congress and those who work with children, and consideration should be given to making this a standing committee.

The Reproduction of Library Materials Section, Samuel M. Boone, Chairman, reports that the Committee on Photocopying Costs in Libraries has completed its assignment and scheduled its report for publication in *LRTS*.

A RLMS Committee on Photoduplication Order Form Revision has been appointed to study the feasibility of revising this form. The Library Technology Program was requested to pursue testing of roll microfilm cartridge systems. The section is also in the process of developing jointly with LTP a project to produce information on the establishment of photocopying services and on the management of microtext collections and reading facilities for them.

In the Serials Section, Betty J. Meyer, Chairman, the Duplicates Exchange Union Committee published a new address list for the Duplicates Exchange Union List.
The SS Policy and Research Committee has taken action to urge through ALA that state legislatures pass laws requiring one copy of all current state documents be deposited in the Library of Congress. Other recommendations of the Committee concerned the preservation of “underground” literature, the establishment of performance norms in serials work, and the broadening of the scope of the Committee.

Communication among members of the Section was fostered by the publication Serials Intercom and by discussion groups at yearly meetings. In progress is work on the draft of a Standard Serial Number program, and Phase I of a National Serials Data Program.

The Council of Regional Groups, Marian Sanner, Chairman, has had published the summaries of seven group reports in the Spring 1970, issue of LRTS, with those received since January to appear in the Fall issue. A workshop, with the presidents of four regional groups reporting on the activities of their groups was held at Detroit, as well as a luncheon honoring the 1970 recipients of the Margaret Mann Citation and the Esther J. Piercy Award.

The above seems to represent a significant amount of accomplishment, and, in fact, it does. Yet, after more than a year as President of the Division, I am quite concerned that the programs and goals of RTSD may be adversely affected by certain operational problems. Some of these problems have already been conveyed to our Executive Secretary, Carol Raney, and I hope that further discussions with her and the new RTSD President will provide at least some of the required solutions. These problems may be categorized as follows:

I. An inordinate amount of paperwork for the President.
II. Inadequacies in the organization of the Division manual.
III. Some communication gaps between the elected officers and the headquarters staff.
IV. A pressing need for greater cohesiveness of the Board of Directors and for communication among them.
V. A critical need to examine committee membership recruiting policies and procedures.

The consequences of these problems could well prove unfortunate for the Division unless corrected. For example: because of the difficult and frustrating task of soliciting recruits to committee membership, one of the most important and fundamental policy questions before us was largely unattended to except on an individual basis, that is, the nature of the Division’s response to the ACONDA report, which obviously has dramatic implications for RTSD and ALA. I recognize that this has been an exceptional year, and that due to the lack of a Vice-President, this task of committee appointments fell to the President. However, given the absence of any plans or budget for meetings of the Board of Directors, discussion of such fundamental issues is practically impossible.

As a consequence of these concerns, I would like to make the following specific recommendations:

I. That immediate plans and budget be prepared for periodic meetings of the Board of Directors, beyond those now possible at midwinter and annual conferences. Perhaps this can be furthered by the creation of an Executive Committee of the Board.

II. An early revision of the manual, which is the most vital and heavily used reference tool available to any officer of the Division. Such revision
should pull together in one place all available information regarding any unit of the Division. Such information is presently spread throughout the volume, and is often contradictory, thus creating many errors of omission and commission.

III. I have referred to the incredible amount of paperwork, little of it dealing with substantive matters, which seemed to inundate me this year. Since a great deal of the time, money, and effort went into recruiting committee members, I recommend two actions to reduce this load, to better coordinate selections, and to better inform those appointed.

a. That selection of individuals be done by the Vice-President, but that all appointment letters be issued by Division headquarters. This would permit the continuity provided by the Executive Secretary to often catch and bring to the attention of the Vice-President, appointments which for various reasons need to be reconsidered. It would provide an opportunity to send appointment invitations on standard forms indicating terms, requirements, and conditions of appointment.

b. That the office of Second Vice-President be established (or reestablished) to provide available manpower for situations such as we presently are in, for the second time in this just past decade.

IV. Allied to the above problem is that of the basic conflict between our need for experienced dedicated Division members to staff our committees versus the widespread desire to introduce “new blood” into Division activities. Add to this problem, the very real difficulty of identifying members, their interests and abilities, and determining their existing workload of assignments. Thus I recommend the establishment of a Task Force Group or Committee to explore the development of a process that might provide an annual “interest profile and vita” for those members who desire to participate (similar to the “Interest Sheet” used by ALTA), as well as exploring the totality of our policies and procedures regarding committee membership.

I would like to stress that the above remarks are made in a spirit of constructive criticism, aimed at improving the accomplishments of the Division. Although it seems difficult at present to see the end product of my own frenzied activities, I shall feel rewarded if as a consequence of our combined efforts, we can succeed in what I consider the most vital and important single effort of the Division this year: the attempt to reestablish “Cataloging-in-Source” by whatever name it will be called.

Acquisitions Section Report

CONNIE R. DUNLAP, Chairman

Because so much interest was displayed in the problems discussed at the Preconference in Atlantic City, the members of the Acquisitions Section were anxious to keep that interest alive and to seek solutions to those problems wherever possible. As a direct result of this, the Acquisitions Section joined with the other sections of the Resources and Technical Services Division in presenting a two-
part program to discuss problems resulting from the great increase in reprint publishing. By combining the program times of all four sections, it was possible to treat this complex area much more fully than would otherwise have been possible. Both librarians and publishers had a chance to air their grievances and to react to criticism. There can be little doubt that both publishers and librarians have gained a greater understanding of one another's needs and problems, and from this understanding will come a determination to solve these problems to the benefit and satisfaction of all.

At Midwinter, the Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee invited several book sellers to participate in a "round table" to discuss various problems frequently encountered by acquisitions librarians, to determine how dealers and librarians may unwittingly contribute to one another's inefficiency, and to discover the means by which many of these difficulties could be solved. Throughout the discussions, it was emphasized that librarians must come to the realization that greater standardization is necessary if book dealers are to improve their services measurably. The multitude of different order forms with varying amounts and quality of information causes the dealer to be inefficient, and this inefficiency not only delays shipment of the requested items but also increases the cost of books and services to the library. In an attempt to achieve greater standardization, the Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee continued its work on a uniform library order form, terminology and symbols, and dealer report forms. The Midwinter Round Table proved so fruitful that it was to have been expanded into a program meeting for the Annual Conference at Detroit, but it had to be cancelled because of the lengthy ALA membership meetings.

Other Acquisitions Section committees have also been actively seeking ways to assist the acquisitions librarian. The Policy and Research Committee is investigating the possibility of preparing a comprehensive directory of antiquarian dealers and the feasibility of publishing desiderata lists which would avoid the delays and arbitrary list reductions of currently available services. This committee has also proposed a study of comparative costs of microform and hard-copy serial runs. The Textbook Proposal Committee presented its final recommendations at Midwinter for an up-to-date working manual for acquisitions librarians. The staff of the ALA Publishing Services has recently located an author for this much-needed book. The Library Materials-Price Index Committee has issued new indices for microforms and for periodicals and serials services. These latest contributions will be especially helpful in budget planning. Future work will include out-of-print, newspaper, and audiovisual materials indices.

In order to keep International Subscription Agents List current, a request was made to the RTSD Board to reactivate this committee. It has been recommended that future lists be published in loose-leaf form or that they be printed periodically in LRTS so that new information can be made available as soon as it is known.

At the annual business meeting at Detroit, Acquisitions Section members agreed to abolish the Bylaws Committee. A section member will represent the section on the Division Bylaws Committee.

A special vote of thanks is due especially to the chairmen of the Acquisitions Section committees and certainly to all members of the various committees who worked so diligently to further the goals of the section and to serve all acquisitions librarians. Without their support and great effort, no amount of success would have been possible. We all owe them a debt of gratitude.
The year 1969/1970 saw the start of a new decade and prompted a quick glance at the history of the Cataloging and Classification Section. This section celebrated its 70th birthday this year, having been established in 1900 as the Cataloging Section of ALA. In 1940, it was changed to the Division of Cataloging and Classification, and in 1957 became the Cataloging and Classification Section of RTSD.

There is a legend that Adam said to Eve as they were ejected from the Garden, “My dear, we are living in a time of great change.” So it has been with the catalogers and classifiers in ALA, but no doubt when the section was established in 1900 one of the first items of business was to appoint committee members. Committees are still the heart of the work done by the section, and this is a summary of the work accomplished by them this year.

The major work of the section chairman, in addition to carrying on incidental business and correspondence during the year, was the planning, in cooperation with the chairmen of the other three RTSD sections, of the joint sections program meeting on reprints at the Detroit Conference. This was designed as a two-session meeting, with reprint publishers speaking at the morning session and librarians speaking at the afternoon session, and time for discussion by the audience. The morning session, which was preceded by a breakfast for all program participants, was most successful. Unfortunately the afternoon session was cancelled due to the prolonged ALA Membership Meeting that was still in progress; this proved a disappointment to participants, audience, and planners alike.

Traditionally, one of the most important committees in the section has been the Margaret Mann Citation Committee. C. Sumner Spalding was the chairman of this committee, which selected S. R. Ranganathan as the recipient. Dr. Ranganathan was not able to be present at the Detroit Conference, and the citation was accepted on his behalf by a former student of his, P. K. Garde, Chief Reference Librarian, United Nations Library. Dr. Ranganathan recorded an acceptance speech in advance, and the tape was played at the RTSD Membership Meeting.

The Nominating Committee (Dorothy Ladd, chairman) did its work early in the year, presenting a strong slate of nominees. The Bylaws Committee (Richard D. Johnson, chairman) transacted no business as a section committee and was voted out of existence at the Detroit Conference; its work will henceforth be carried on by the Division Bylaws Committee.

The Policy and Research Committee, under the chairmanship of Mary Herrick, presented a resolution which was passed unanimously by the CCS Executive Committee, recommending the continuation of the present type of activity organization in ALA because it encourages concentration of effort by librarians representing various types of libraries in areas of common interest, such as cataloging and classification. A Subcommittee on Machine Implications for Cataloging Research and Organization, known more conveniently by its acronym MICRO, was appointed, with Joseph Rosenthal as chairman, to grapple with the problems raised by the association of computers and cataloging. Seven recommendations were presented to the Executive Committee at the Chicago Midwinter Meeting. One recommendation, for continuing liaison with the
Library of Congress in the development of a theoretical basis for subject headings as well as guidelines for their application, was referred to the Subject Analysis and Organization of Library Materials Committee. Another recommendation, that the RTSD Book Catalogs Committee be encouraged to issue information and recommendations on considerations and techniques of producing book form catalogs by computer, was referred to that committee. It was voted by the CCS Executive Committee and approved by the RTSD Board of Directors that an interdivisional committee (RTSD, RSD, and ISAD) be established to monitor, review, and recommend action on draft standards for bibliographical representation in machine-readable form of book and nonbook library materials.

The Subject Analysis and Organization of Library Materials Committee (Paul Fasana, chairman) has edited the Proceedings of the Preconference on Subject Analysis of Library Materials held in Atlantic City in 1969, and publication is expected soon. Plans are being made to assist Ann Painter in the preparation of a book of readings on subject analysis, probably by supplying a bibliography. In reference to the MICRO recommendation referred to the committee, it was recommended, and the Executive Committee approved, that the committee chairman invite the Library of Congress to name a liaison person to the committee in order to formalize the communication channel between the committee and the Library of Congress. The Executive Committee also accepted the recommendation of the Subject Analysis Committee to investigate the possibility of being a cosponsor, with the National Federation of Science Abstracting and Indexing Services, of a three-day tutorial on “Indexing in Perspective” during the early part of 1971.

The Descriptive Cataloging Committee is always one of the hardest working committees in CCS, and this year has been no exception. The year was notable for the fact that, for the first time since the publication of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, representatives from the American Library Association, the Canadian Library Association, the Library Association, and the Library of Congress met together to discuss problems concerning the rules. Paul Berrisford, Chairman of the Descriptive Cataloging Committee, agreed to coordinate communication between the four groups; announcement of changes will be made in the LC Cataloging Service bulletins, with British and Canadian acceptance or nonacceptance of changes and additions indicated if simultaneous announcements are not possible. Romanization tables for Tibetan, Arabic, Persian, Pushto, Greek, Amharic, and Armenian were approved by the committee. Because of the great need for the development of rules for cataloging machine-readable data files, John Byrum has been appointed chairman of a subcommittee to isolate the requisite elements of description and recommend methods of description. Questions were raised concerning the kinds of problems that the Descriptive Cataloging Committee has to deal with (often calling for the expertise of a specialist), the geographical spread of the committee members making it impossible to hold meetings except at conferences, and the relation of the committee to the Library of Congress. The Policy and Research Committee agreed to work with the chairman of the Descriptive Cataloging Committee in a study of a possible new structure of the committee and the redefining of its responsibilities.

The (ad hoc) Audiovisual Media in Libraries Committee, established in 1968 under the chairmanship of Richard Darling, studied the manual by Jean Riddle published earlier in 1970 in a preliminary edition by the Canadian Library Association under the title, Non-Book Materials; the Organization of
Integrated Collections, and recommended it highly. The ALA Audiovisual Committee unanimously and enthusiastically endorsed the recommendation of the CCS Committee. Therefore the CCS Executive Committee voted to accept this book as an interim guide for the cataloging of nonbook materials, with the proviso that a permanent ALA/CLA committee be established to work on any necessary revision for the final edition and its supplements, and that the ad hoc committee remain in existence until the permanent committee is established.

The (ad hoc) Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee (Priscilla Moulton, chairman) is functioning at least until the 1971 Midwinter Meeting. It added its endorsement to the action taken on the Canadian Library Association manual on nonbook materials. The committee devoted major attention to the recently published list of subject headings for children's literature, the possible incorporation of these LC subject headings into a revised edition of Sears, and the growing interest in and endorsement of the standardization concept.

The section's representative to the RSD Catalog Use Study Committee, Jessica Harris, reports that the committee is considering a study of book catalog use and is in the process of selecting an academic library and a public library for a pilot study. The main question being studied is whether the type of survey used for previous studies would be applicable to a study of book catalog use or whether another type must be designed.

Donald Cook, CCS Assistant Editor of Library Resources & Technical Services since 1967, asked to be relieved of this responsibility due to many other pressures upon him, not the least of which is his election as the President of the Resources and Technical Services Division for 1970/1971. We are sorry to lose his editorial services, but are fortunate in having found an able replacement in Phyllis Richmond.

The Chairman wishes to express her appreciation to all who helped with the work of the Cataloging and Classification Section during the year. This includes members of the Executive Committee, committee chairmen and members, sectional representatives, and especially Carol Raney and her secretary, Janice Adams.

Reproduction of Library Materials Section Report

SAMUEL M. BOONE, Chairman

The year 1969-70 witnessed the successful conclusion of a number of long-term projects, the continuation of others, and several new projects which reflect the growing importance of photocopying techniques in the modern library.

In the area of photocopying technology, one of the more important functions of the American Library Association is the sponsorship of the American National Standards Institute's Committee PH5, which is concerned with standards for documentary reproduction. During the past year, standards in the following areas were reaffirmed: microfilm readers, micro-opaques, micro-opaque readers, and paper sheets for photo-reproductions. Standards were approved for specifications for microfiche and for the storage of processed film. Work is in progress for the establishment of standards for several new areas of documentary reproduction.

Hubbard Ballou, of Columbia University, who has represented the Associa-
tion on the standards committee for thirteen years, has submitted his resignation. The section has been fortunate to have such an able representative in this important post, and the section wishes to extend a special vote of thanks to Mr. Ballou for his years of devoted and skillful service.

The section further wishes to reaffirm its conviction of the vital importance of the American Library Association continuing its interested, but uncommitted, support of ANSI Committee PH5.

Another important project which came to fruition during the year was the publication of the fourth edition of the Directory of Institutional Photocopying Services, edited by Cosby Brinkley. The format of this new edition was changed to include items of information concerning interlibrary lending practices.

The ever-increasing role of photocopying in interlibrary lending was also recognized in the establishment of an ad hoc committee to study the feasibility of revising the Photoduplication Order Form to conform more nearly to current interlibrary lending needs, and to reflect changing practices in this growing area. It is now estimated that almost half of the interlibrary transactions in the country are filled by some form of photocopy. This committee is studying practices of members of the (British) Library Association and the Canadian Library Association with the hope of making the form internationally acceptable.

To assist libraries in the organization, administration, and staffing of photocopying services, the section has appointed a committee to implement a proposal to create training workshops for photoduplication laboratory technicians. The section has also proposed a cooperative arrangement with the Library Technology Program which would result in the publication of literature bearing on the organization and administration of photoduplication laboratories and in the organization of microtext collections.

The Library Technology Program has also been encouraged to pursue testing of roll film cartridge systems and the possible development of standards for such systems.

Looking to the future, the newly created standing Committee on Telefacsimile keeps abreast of developments in the field of direct distance transmission of documents.

Other concerns of the section have been with the ever-present problem of copyright issues. The section attempts to keep informed on developments in the legislative and judicial areas of this topic which might affect library applications of photocopying and has appointed a representative to keep it informed of such developments.

Serials Section Report

BETTY J. MEYER, Chairman

During 1969/70 the Serials Section continued its work through its committees and its representatives to joint committees with other divisions.

The Duplicates Exchange Union Committee under the chairman, Mary Pound, worked with a new committee as it was necessary to appoint one new member and to replace a committee member. The Duplicate Exchange Union list was reviewed and a new address list was published in November 1969, with a
revised mailing list to be issued. More libraries, including high school libraries, are interested in the program, and additional requirements for libraries wishing to join soon after establishment (libraries which do not have a back file of duplicate materials to share) are items which the committee expects to consider.

Mary Pound, University of Texas Library, Assistant Editor for LRTS, assumed responsibility for the article "Year's Work in Serials," and reported that there is no backlog of articles on serials to be published and that articles are being solicited.

The serial publication, *Serials Intercom*, edited and compiled by Barbara Gates, Oberlin College Library, continues to be sponsored by the section for communication purposes among its members. Two issues were to be released before the Detroit Conference.

The Policy and Research Committee, with Mrs. Elizabeth Greer, Joint University Libraries, as chairman, recommended at the Midwinter meeting, to the Executive Committee, that the Serials Section urge through ALA that state legislative bodies pass laws requiring that one copy of the current state documents be deposited in the Library of Congress. The recommendation was returned to the committee for reevaluating. As a result, at the Detroit Conference a motion was presented to the RTSD Board of Directors by the chairman to transmit to the American Association of State Libraries a statement supporting ASL in its efforts to gain the cooperation of state libraries in securing one copy of all current state documents for deposit in the Library of Congress. This support was offered primarily because of the need for improved bibliographic control of state documents. The section chairman also expressed the interest of the Serials Section in the furtherance of such research as represented by the draft study proposal on state and federal documents (the Fry study), and its willingness to assist ASL in such investigations wherever this seemed appropriate. Other action by the committee concerned the preservation of underground literature, and a recommendation at the Detroit Conference that an ad hoc committee be appointed to investigate work performance, costs, optimum allocation of personnel, and associated record keeping functions in the area of serials records. This committee is to be charged to work specifically in the area of manual serial check-in records. The recommendation was acted upon by the Executive Committee.

The Discussion Groups perform a valuable function within the area of serials as yearly meetings of interested members generate solutions to problems of libraries of comparable size. The informal organization is to be maintained, as it creates an atmosphere of a workshop, which the members prefer.

The Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, with Kenneth Soderland, University of Chicago, as the SS representative, reported the work on the pilot serial project using the MARC format which is Phase I of the National Serials Data Program. Phase II has not been funded, but it has been determined that the data bank program is feasible.

Mrs. Elaine Woods, SS representative to ISAD, and Robert Croneberger, both of the Library of Congress, continued to report on the work on the draft of the Standard Serial Number program. International numbers for serials are now being considered and it may be necessary to expand the program.

The Nominating Committee, chaired by Mrs. Janice Horn, Clarion State Library, presented the slate for the year 1970/71 for the elective offices. The full slate was accepted by the Executive Committee at the Midwinter meeting.

The chairman of the Conference Program Committee planned with the
Cataloging and Classification Section, Acquisitions Section, and Reproduction of Library Materials Section, a joint meeting for the Detroit Conference on "Reprinting: Programs, Directions and Challenge." The Serials Section chairman assumed the responsibility for the speaker from the public service areas.

The chairman is grateful to the officers, chairman of committees, the members, and the Executive Secretary for the section of ALA for their continued work to study and evaluate serials work, and the development of any new ideas and programs.

**Executive Secretary’s Report**

CAROL RANEY, Executive Secretary

After a year as your Executive Secretary, it is helpful to stop and reflect on the activities of the past year and think about the needs of the future. The 1969/70 year has been one of change for the RTSD office. There has been a complete change of personnel during the year. I arrived in the office in June, and my secretary, Mrs. Janice Adams, joined the RTSD staff in December.

I found that my experience as an officer of a Section and the Division was invaluable as an orientation to the organization, activities, and needs of the Division. I hope also that it has made me more understanding of the heavy load which officers carry! They not only have a full-time library job, but an important and time-consuming one for RTSD. One of the aims of the RTSD office in the years to come is to assist in every way possible to keep the Division’s activities running smoothly. By streamlining our procedures, I hope we can diminish the flood of paper with which this office has inundated officers and committee chairmen this year, while at the same time making the organizational mechanics smoother and easier for all.

Because of the recommendations of the ACONDA report and the uncertainty about the future of divisions in the ALA structure, it is difficult for anyone to make long-range plans for RTSD. However, I feel strongly that the subject area of our Division will remain important, regardless of ALA’s organizational structure. The Division’s activities must continue in some form. For example, the efforts toward standardization as expressed by the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, the ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards, participation in the work of the American National Standards Institute PH5 Committee, etc., must be carried on. RTSD or any successor needs to be a leader in identifying needs in the technical services area early enough to also be a leader in fulfilling those needs.

The amount of time this year in the RTSD office devoted to answering letters from librarians and nonlibrarians requesting assistance indicates the importance of having a central place where people can request help with questions of acquisitions, resources, cataloging, classification, serials, and reproduction of library materials. More bibliographies, reprints, etc., are needed to help with this consulting work. An important part of the work is keeping in touch with developments in the literature and also in technical services departments by visiting the field. This year I spoke at a meeting of the Resources and Technical Services Section of the Iowa Library Association and conducted two cataloging workshops at the Church and Synagogue Library Association conference.
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This year has been a busy one for the Division and the RTSD office. I would like to salute Carl Jackson who was catapulted into the presidency of RTSD immediately upon election and navigated the Division through a difficult year with skill. I salute also the Section chairmen, Connie Dunlap, Esther Koch, Samuel Boone, and Betty Meyer, who served with vigor and imagination, too. One of the pleasantest parts of the Executive Secretary's job is working with all the capable and energetic people who serve the Division and its units in so many capacities.

Council of Regional Groups Report

MARIAN SANDER, Chairman

The regional groups affiliated with RTSD are "where the action is." The two reports on regional groups, published in LRTS, contained summaries of the programs and activities of twenty-two groups and give an indication of just how active our regional groups are.

There are twenty-seven groups now affiliated with the Council of Regional Groups. Their memberships range in number from 50 to 520. The frequency of meetings varies among the groups from biennial sessions to four meetings a year.

The only meeting of Council members occurs at the annual conference, so that Council business is carried on by correspondence. Two general mailings were sent to all Council members during the year.

The annual Council of Regional Groups Workshop and Luncheon were held during the ALA Annual Conference in Detroit. At the workshop the officers of three regional groups described the work of their groups during the year: Florence R. Tucker, Michigan Library Association, Technical Services Section; Nadine Baer, New England Technical Services Librarians; and Elizabeth Nebehay, New York Technical Services Librarians. Carol Raney spoke about the RTSD office and its relationship to the regional groups. Following Miss Raney's remarks, there was opportunity for informal discussion and exchange of information among the Council members present.

This has been an interesting year and the Chairman has enjoyed the privilege of working with these active groups. This report ends, as most RTSD annual reports do, with an expression of appreciation to Carol Raney and her staff for their support during the year.

Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee Report

FRANCES HINTON, Chairman

The Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee held its annual meeting, October 27-28, 1969, at the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. A second meeting, in the same location, was held March 16-17, 1970. Minutes of both meetings have been distributed to all parties concerned.

Membership on the Committee was the same throughout the year: Edwin B. Colburn, Virginia Drewry, Doralyn Hickey, Frances Hinton, John A. Humphry, Mary Louise Mann, Pauline A. Seely, Marietta Daniels Shepard, and William J. Sherwin.
Welsh. At Meeting No. 62, October 27, 1969, the Committee elected Frances Hinton Chairman for a two-year term and Edwin B. Colburn Vice-Chairman for a one-year term.

The year 1969/70 was chiefly a period of tidying up final recommendations for Edition 18. The only new schedule to be discussed was the "phoenix" class 340 Law, prepared by Margaret Warren, the assistant editor. The Committee recommended approval of an arrangement by basic branches of law and later recommended a reordering of the branches so as to retain the basic numbers used in previous editions for International Law and Constitutional Law.

The year 1969/70 was chiefly a period of tidying up final recommendations for Edition 18. The only new schedule to be discussed was the "phoenix" class 340 Law, prepared by Margaret Warren, the assistant editor. The Committee recommended approval of an arrangement by basic branches of law and later recommended a reordering of the branches so as to retain the basic numbers used in previous editions for International Law and Constitutional Law.

The Index to Edition 18 received a great deal of attention. At Meeting No. 62 a true sample could be examined, one that actually indexed all schedules except 340 Law. Although some members felt the arrangement was too hierarchical, it was voted to recommend that the Index be completed in conformity with the principles followed and displayed in the sample. At Meeting No. 63 the Committee again discussed the sample in the light of specific criticisms of it. The previous recommendation was reaffirmed at this time. On April 3, 1970, the Chairman of DEPC met with the Directors of Forest Press to discuss the Index further.

The detailed Editorial Criteria for Abridged Edition 10 were reviewed at Meeting No. 62. A few changes were suggested, and the Committee recommended approval of the criteria.

The Index to Edition 18 received a great deal of attention. At Meeting No. 62 a true sample could be examined, one that actually indexed all schedules except 340 Law. Although some members felt the arrangement was too hierarchical, it was voted to recommend that the Index be completed in conformity with the principles followed and displayed in the sample. At Meeting No. 63 the Committee again discussed the sample in the light of specific criticisms of it. The previous recommendation was reaffirmed at this time. On April 3, 1970, the Chairman of DEPC met with the Directors of Forest Press to discuss the Index further.

The Index to Edition 18 received a great deal of attention. At Meeting No. 62 a true sample could be examined, one that actually indexed all schedules except 340 Law. Although some members felt the arrangement was too hierarchical, it was voted to recommend that the Index be completed in conformity with the principles followed and displayed in the sample. At Meeting No. 63 the Committee again discussed the sample in the light of specific criticisms of it. The previous recommendation was reaffirmed at this time. On April 3, 1970, the Chairman of DEPC met with the Directors of Forest Press to discuss the Index further.

The Directors of Forest Press took action on most recommendations made by the Committee. By the end of June 1970, only the number of volumes in Edition 18 remained to be decided. Publication of DC&e, however, never materialized. Several recommendations that had been deferred or disapproved by the Directors were approved after the Committee clarified the reasons for its stand. In turn, the Committee withdrew or reversed some recommendations that would have increased the size and cost of Edition 18.

At Meeting No. 63 the Committee learned that Pauline Seely will leave the Committee to become Assistant Executive Director of Forest Press. At the same time Virginia Drewry announced that she would not be available for another term as ALA representative on the Committee. Both will be missed.
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The United States Book Exchange, Inc. (USBE) is the result of a happy coincidence of ideas and circumstances. The idea of a cooperative clearing-house for exchange of library duplicates goes back at least as far as Melvil Dewey (1876) and Dr. G. M. Gould (1898), a founder of the Medical Library Association Exchange. The fortuitous circumstance which provided the idea with operative realities was the creation and existence of the American Book Center for War-Devastated Libraries, Inc. (ABC) from 1944 through August 1948. The ABC grew out of the experience of the American library community in rehabilitating libraries after World War I and out of subsequent plans, carried on throughout World War II to help in the necessary worldwide post-war restoration of libraries and library services. When ABC reached its planned conclusion on August 31, 1948, it left to the newly formed USBE its assets of 100,000 periodical issues, extensive free operating space in the Library of Congress, the interested cooperation of a great number of libraries and librarians in the U.S. and abroad, and five staff members trained in the particular and peculiar demands of a clearinghouse service.

Eight months before the demise of ABC, a group of thirty librarians and educators met in New York to discuss the possibilities of a successor agency which would be a self-supporting exchange clearinghouse, serving libraries all over the world. As a national exchange center, USBE would serve libraries within the United States as that central depository and distribution center which U.S. librarians had been thinking of and making tentative plans for during the seventy-two years since Dewey’s suggestion. The international orientation at this time of USBE’s beginnings reflected not only the nature of the ABC but also the activity abroad throughout 1947 and 1948 which resulted in the establishment of the UNESCO Clearinghouse for Publications, and in UNESCO encouragement of new and existing national exchange centers. It was to a considerable extent the expectation of distribution abroad by USBE which led the Rockefeller Foundation to authorize a grant to USBE to enable the beginning of exchange operations on January 1, 1949.

During 1949, its first year, USBE completed organization plans and began to distribute publications. The original and still-operative plan for financing consisted of levying a fixed flat fee for each book or each periodical sent to a library, with the total earnings from these fees to cover the total expenses of the nonprofit operation. At first, U.S. and Canadian libraries were to be assessed fees, covering the whole processing costs, for items they received, whereas it was hoped that part or all of the costs to foreign libraries could be met from block funds provided by American institutions. By the end of 1949, 120 libraries had been enrolled as exchange members, eighty-five in the United States and Canada and thirty-five abroad. Distribution of 32,434 publications to foreign institutions during 1949 included a number sent as gifts to non-exchange libraries, with the costs of all being borne by the Rockefeller grant. The 27,341 items shipped to domestic institutions brought in USBE’s first $5,400 in earnings.

By the end of 1949 it was becoming very clear that few foreign libraries would be able to begin to pay handling fees when the Rockefeller grant was concluded. The cold war, worldwide economic difficulties, and the Korean War in 1950, made it even more plain that exchange to libraries in a large part of the world would need almost total financial support from outside for a long
time. To meet this need, USBE was able to negotiate a series of contracts, beginning in 1950, with that division of the State Department which later became USIA, to help support the cost of preparing and shipping exchange shipments abroad. These contracts also paid USBE to accept gift shipments from American donors and to screen and ship them to U.S. Information Service libraries abroad for distribution.

Increasing demands from abroad led USBE to seek further government aid from the Foreign Operations Administration, later the Agency for International Development. A contract negotiated in 1954 enabled USBE to serve libraries abroad for ten years. Using the contract funds in effect as a bank account from which they could pay USBE handling fees and shipping costs, almost two thousand libraries abroad requested and received a total of 2,523,563 publications before the AID contract ended in 1963.

In late 1958 USBE moved from the Library of Congress, and from two small warehouses in which the USIA operation and part of the exchange program were housed, to its own leased building in North East Washington, D.C. USBE’s own growth and the Library’s need for space required the move. A grant from the Rockefeller Foundation paid for the massive transfer. Inasmuch as operations in leased housing were more expensive than in free space, USBE declared its first major increase in fees since beginning operations; however, it retained the original pattern of charging a fixed flat handling fee for each type of publication, the amount based on the overall average cost of processing the type. In the new location, USBE found it possible to operate more efficiently and to plan for larger expansion. These plans were encouraged by the findings of a survey, financed by the Council on Library Resources and completed in 1958. (See Edwin E. Williams, A Serviceable Reservoir, Washington, D.C., 1959.)

In 1961 a series of difficulties began with the discovery of a larceny ring including certain USBE employees who were selling valuable duplicates to dealers. The dismissals resulting from the discovery of this ring provided an incentive for the establishment in 1962 of a union among USBE employees. After its first year’s contract the union made impossible demands over and above the pay advantages and fringe benefits which USBE had maintained and increased over the years. In the course of negotiations the union refused to accept USBE’s invitation to examine its books, but continued to insist on raises above both the proper pay level for the jobs and USBE’s ability to pay. A strike ensued, during which pressure from the union was influential in AID’s decision to postpone renewal of its current contract with USBE when it expired on November 30, 1963. USBE legally replaced the striking employees, and there was no subsequent union contract. In 1967 the National Labor Relations Board ruled that USBE, as a noncommercial organization, is not under its jurisdiction. As a policy, USBE maintains a salary level for its employees as close to Civil Service scale as possible.

The outcome of nonrenewal of the AID contract found USBE at the beginning of 1964 without finances for foreign distribution, beyond the ability of libraries abroad to pay their own handling fees and shipping costs. The massive and sudden cut in foreign distribution made USBE’s second major raise in fees necessary. At the same time an annual membership fee was initiated. Because of the changeover in program emphasis, USBE found 1964 a difficult year. However, the distribution of publications to libraries in the United States and to the few remaining foreign members reached 85 percent of the 1963 distribution, and USBE survived.
From 1965 through 1969 USBE has continued in its role of exchange purveyor to a membership of up to 1,725 institutions including around 200 foreign libraries, each of which pays its way in USBE from its own funds or through individual grants. In 1965 and 1966, distribution remained about the same although the potential in materials, requests, and membership increased. It was thus apparent that the fees being charged were not sufficient to pay for handling of all the potential within the present operation. The Board of Directors authorized the formation of a Special Advisory Committee to study several areas, including the bases and amounts for fee increases. A new fee pattern based on their recommendations went into effect on January 1, 1967, raising the amounts and making a more realistic assignment of costs to varying processes. Three years later, on January 1, 1970, some fees were revised upward again, to meet increased costs.

In spite of these changes in detail, the original funding plan remains: libraries support USBE in the cost of processing their duplicates through their payment of fees (membership and handling) covering the average cost of the process involved. Through this financial support, and the tons of publications sent to USBE on exchange each year by these libraries, USBE has developed into an organization serving a membership of 1,725 libraries which receive publications at the rate of 650,000 books and periodicals each year. These come from a stock of four million books and periodicals, built up from the receipt of over twenty-five million publications in twenty-one years, and now housed in two buildings in Washington, D.C.

**LC PRACTICE WITH REGARD TO U.S. DOCUMENTS**

The RSD/RTSD Interdivisional Committee on Public Documents wishes to share with documents librarians generally, a statement by C. Sumner Spalding, Assistant Director for Cataloging, Library of Congress, on LC practice with regard to U.S. documents. This statement was requested by the Committee on behalf of the Public Documents Committee of the New York Library Association. It is dated January 15, 1970.

**Selection.**—Documents that by their character are of importance to the Library's service requirements or that are likely to be subject to heavy demand by card subscribers are selected for addition to the collections. Monographs in subject series may not be analyzed if slight in character or may be analyzed on a selective basis, depending on the importance of each particular number. (*Comment:* The procedures for selection are under review by the Library primarily because there is evidence that the present set-up often results in considerable delays prior to the cataloging process.)

**Cataloging.**—Descriptive cataloging of documents selected for the collections is now not only on a current basis but backlogged documents of recent imprint are being withdrawn from arrerages for cataloging. Current legislative hearings and reports, and other legislative, judicial, and administrative publications pertaining to U.S. law go through the process quite rapidly. Other documents selected for research value may either go through or may become backlogged in the subject cataloging or the shelflisting operation. This is due to the freezing of vacancies that has become necessary, because of the tightening of funds available to the Library to do its work. (*Comment:* This situation is most unfortunate, but it should be realized that other valuable research materials are in exactly the same situation at present. It appears that this situation should improve slightly in the near future. If so, there is a prospect that the cataloging of some backlogged documents may be completed. Documents of relatively minor research importance, although selected for cataloging, are not likely to be cataloged until the fiscal situation improves very substantially.)
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Cataloging Policies.—The Anglo American Cataloging Rules were adopted by the Library of Congress on March 20, 1967. All headings for government entries established since that date follow the provisions of these rules; similarly, the choice of entry for all new works received since that date is made according to the provisions of the Anglo-American rules. However, all headings established prior to March 20, 1967, under the A.L.A. Cataloging Rules, continue to be used unless revision of the heading is required. In the case of new editions of works for which earlier editions were cataloged prior to March 20, 1967, the choice of entry for the earlier editions, made according to the ALA rules, is applied to new editions in cases where the two codes vary in this respect. This policy of superimposition is fully explained in Cataloging Service, bulletins 79 and 80.

All changes in cataloging rules proposed by the Library of Congress are submitted to the ALA Descriptive Cataloging Committee for approval. The approved changes are then submitted for consideration to the Library Association (British) and the Canadian Library Association. The changes become effective upon publication in Cataloging Service.

The Library of Congress has reconsidered AACR 81B as applied to subcommittees of legislative committees. The resulting entry of many subcommittees directly under the heading for the subcommittee has proved unsatisfactory. The ALA Descriptive Cataloging Committee has approved a change whereby subcommittees of the legislative committees of the Congress are to be entered under the name of the parent committee. This change will become effective when published in bulletin 88 of Cataloging Service.

Authority List.—The obligations of the Library of Congress to its immediate clientele and to the research library community in general are such that the preparation and publication of an authority list of Federal Government headings cannot be considered in the present stringent fiscal circumstances. The manpower for such a project would have to come from the ranks of catalogers which would mean, in turn, that fewer titles would be cataloged. As long as the NUC is readily available as a partial substitute for such an authority list, it would appear that funds available for cataloging at LG would have to be of a much greater order before a project of this sort could be contemplated.

Classification.—Basically, documents are classified in the same way as nondocuments. Legislative hearings and reports form an exception to this practice. In some classes, document material may be assigned a specific subclass.
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TO USE DEWEY 18

The Library of Congress has announced that on January 1, 1971, it will begin to assign Dewey Decimal numbers from the forthcoming Edition 18 of the Dewey Decimal Classification and to print the results on catalog cards and in book catalogs, as well as to record them on the MARC tapes.

Edition 18 of the DDC is now in press and is expected to be published in mid-1971 by Forest Press, Inc. from its new address, 85 Watervliet Avenue, Albany, New York 12206. Although libraries utilizing LC's bibliographic services may thus receive classification numbers the meanings of which have not yet been published, they will enjoy the advantage of early use of many important new expansions, such as those for mathematics, law, economics, nuclear physics, the biological and medical sciences, history, and geography.

The decision of the Library of Congress to apply the provisions of DDC 18 before publication is based on a desire not only to take early advantage of an edition of Dewey deemed superior in many respects to DDC 17, but also to promote international cooperation through coordination with the British National Bibliography, which has already decided to use DDC 18 on January 1, with the beginning of its new five-year cumulation, 1971-1975.

LRTS EDITORIAL CHANGES

At the 1970 Annual Conference of the American Library Association in Detroit, the LRTS Editorial Board voted to recommend to the RTSD Board of Directors that the position of Managing Editor of LRTS be abolished, effective December 31, 1970. Because the major portion of the Managing Editor's duties have been absorbed by the Central Production Unit staff of the American Library Association, the position seems no longer to be required.

Beginning with the Winter 1971 issue, the remaining duties associated with the Managing Editor's job will be transferred to the newly appointed Assistant to the Editor, Robert Wedgeworth, a doctoral candidate in library service at Rutgers University.

Also beginning with the Winter issue, the Assistant Editor for Cataloging and Classification will be Phyllis Richmond, professor at Case-Western Reserve University. She replaces C. Donald Cook, who is currently president of RTSD.

The Fall 1970 issue of LRTS is the last one to be printed by The William Byrd Press of Richmond, Virginia. In an attempt to consolidate the production work of the various ALA journals, LRTS will, in the future, be printed by The Ovid Bell Press. The staff of LRTS, and the Managing Editor in particular, would like to express to The William Byrd Press and Willis A. Shell, Jr., with whom we have worked so long, our sincere appreciation for a “job well done.” It is with considerable regret that we terminate a relationship begun with the inception of the journal. In parting, we can only say a deeply felt “thank you” for the excellent work provided by the officers and staff of The William Byrd Press.
AACR AMENDMENT BULLETIN

The Library Association announces the establishment of a new service, the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules Amendment Bulletin, which will publish all additions and changes to the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (British Text) in a form suitable for precise and detailed amendments to be carried out in copies of the full British Text. The Bulletin will also publish summarized information about amendments to the North American Text, especially indicating divergences between this and the British Text. The principal medium for publication of detailed changes in the North American Text will continue to be the Library of Congress Processing Department's Cataloging Service bulletins. The first issue of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules Amendment Bulletin is now available from the Publications Manager, The Library Association, 7 Ridgmount Street, Store Street, London WC1E 7AE. No charge is made for copies of the Bulletin, and applicants for the first issue will be placed on the mailing list to receive subsequent issues as they are published.

GUIDELINES FOR PROCESSING NONBOOK MATERIALS

For some time catalogers have needed guidelines for processing nonbook materials. At the 1970 Detroit Conference of the American Library Association, the Executive Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division endorsed a recommendation of the section's Audiovisual Media in Libraries Committee, by voting to accept the publication, Non-Book Materials; the Organization of Integrated Collections, published by the Canadian Library Association, as an interim guide for the cataloging of nonbook materials, with the proviso that a permanent ALA/CLA committee be established to work on any necessary revision for the final edition and its supplements.

LIBRARY & INFORMATION SCIENCE ABSTRACTS (LISA)

A worldwide circulation has rapidly been built up during LISA's first year of publication. A number of comments have been received from users, especially on the subject arrangement. The Library Association's Publications Committee has now formed a Sub-Committee to enquire into all aspects of this arrangement. The composition of the Sub-Committee reflects the interests of users, the Classification Research Group, Aslib, and the Library Association. The first meeting was held on March 4th and alternatives to the present arrangement were discussed. Further meetings are to be held during 1970. It would greatly aid the work of the Sub-Committee if the views of more users, especially those outside the United Kingdom, were known. Comments should be sent to Tom Edwards, Editor, LISA, The Library Association, 7 Ridgmount Street, Store Street, London, W.C.1., U.K.
Z39 NEWS RELEASE

The American National Standards Institute Standards Committee Z39 on Standardization in the Field of Library Work, Documentation and Related Publishing Practices announces the recent publication of the American National Standard for the Abbreviation of Titles of Periodicals. This standard was prepared by Subcommittee 3 of Committee Z39 under the chairmanship of James L. Wood, Librarian at Chemical Abstracts Service; the development of the standard was made possible by support received from the Council on Library Resources and the National Science Foundation.

The publication of this standard, a revision of the 1963 standard entitled Periodical Title Abbreviations, culminates a successful two-year joint American National Standards Institute—British Standards Institution effort to develop an Anglo-American standard for the abbreviation of periodical titles; and the rules contained in this standard are fully compatible with those in the British Standard 4148:1969, Recommendations for the Abbreviation of Titles of Periodicals. In addition, the standard has been recommended by a special ad hoc committee of International Standards Organization Technical Committee 46 on Documentation, for adoption by ISO as the revision of ISO Recommendation R4-1953.

The recommendations of the standard are applicable to serial publications of all types and to many nonserial publications, including monographs and proceedings of meetings. They are intended to guide and assist authors, editors, librarians and others working in various areas of information transfer activity in preparing unique, unambiguous abbreviations within a specific frame of reference for the titles of publications cited in footnotes, references and bibliographies.

To facilitate the effective use of this standard, a list of standard abbreviations for words found in serial and nonserial titles has been prepared by Z39's National Clearinghouse for Periodical Title Word Abbreviations and is available from Chemical Abstracts at a nominal cost.

Copies of the standard, designated Z39.5-1969, are available from the American National Standards Institute, 1430 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10018 at $2.75 per copy.
ERIC/CLIS ABSTRACTS

Selected and edited by ROBERT WEDGEWORTH

The following abstracts are based on those prepared by the Clearinghouse for Library and Information Sciences of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC/CLIS).

Documents with an ED number may be ordered in either microfiche (MF) or hard copy (HC) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. Orders must include ED number and specification of format desired. Payment must accompany orders totaling less than $5.00. For orders totaling less than $9.00, add $0.50 for handling.

Documents available from the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Virginia 22151 have CFSTI number and price.

Atherton, Pauline, and others. Evaluation of the Retrieval of Nuclear Science Document References Using the Universal Decimal Classification as the Indexing Language for a Computer-Based System. 1968. 46p. CFSTI PB 179 679. MF $0.65, HC $3.00.

A single issue of Nuclear Science Abstracts, containing about 2,300 abstracts, was indexed by Universal Decimal Classification (UDC) using the Special Subject Edition of UDC for Nuclear Science and Technology. The descriptive cataloging and UDC-indexing records formed a computer-stored data base. A systematic random sample of 500 additional abstracts, taken from a collection of about 196,000, was also indexed by UDC. An experimental design was developed such that the potential result of retrieval tests with the full collection could be inferred from actual results obtained from the two smaller data bases. Sixty questions were collected from nuclear science research organizations in North America and Europe. Two search analysts, neither of whom was familiar with the policies and practices of the indexers, formulated logical search statements with UDC numbers. The resulting queries were processed against the UDC-indexed data bases. They were also processed by two other information services. Twelve questions, a subset of the original sixty, were chosen for more detailed analysis. The results are presented in the report.


The purpose of this document is to present a final description of the original MEDLARS system as it evolved through four years of operation. The system is described as it was functioning on January 1, 1968. Among the various system elements discussed are: (1) the input subsystem, including journal selection and coverage, Medical Subject Headings (MeSH), and indexing; (2) the retrieval subsystem, including request analysis, search formulation, file search, and printout of retrieved citations; and (3) the publication subsystem, including the MEDLARS photocomposer and computer programs for producing MEDLARS publications. A summary of operating experience for the period includes discussion of system problems, changes, and evaluation. Also discussed is the extension of MEDLARS technology to the cataloging of books and serial titles. This system produces two major products: (1) catalog cards for the central NLM card catalog and (2) the NLM current catalog, a computer-produced book-form catalog available to other medical libraries on a current and frequent basis for use as an acquisitions and cataloging tool.

Library Resources & Technical Services

Institution (Source): Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, Ottawa (Ontario).

A related document is ED 019 095.

This document consists of two papers presented at a conference in Montreal, April 1968, sponsored by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries. The subject of the conference was the Downs Report (ED 019 095). The paper by Robert Blackburn is an attempt to project the operational and capital costs of academic libraries in Canada during the next ten years, based on the principles stated in the Downs Report. Calculations are based on the best figures available in the summer of 1968. The second paper, *The Downs Report in Perspective* by Basil Stuart-Stubbs, discusses general trends in universities, libraries, and in knowledge itself that have a direct bearing on the present and future situation of libraries. This document also includes copies of both papers in French.

Newhouse, Joseph P. *Libraries and the Other Triangle Under the Demand Curve.* 1970. 11p. CFSTI AD 701 187. MF $0.65, HC $3.00.

A simple theory of library services was developed as a normative tool to aid libraries in answering the question: which books should be bought by the library. Although the theory was developed for normative purposes, it generates testable predictions.

Stolk, H. A. *Glossary of Documentation Terms.* 1970. 43p. CFSTI AD 700 329. MF $0.65, HC $3.00.


The glossary consists of approximately 585 terms used by documentalists. This compilation draws on the terminology from such disciplines as: computer science, information science, library science, mathematics, and linguistics. Relatively few initialisms or contractions of terms are included. The arrangement of terms within the glossary is alphabetical, and "see" references are provided for synonymous terms.

*The 3 R's: Reference and Research Library Resources.* June 1969. 20p. ED 032 919. MF $0.65, HC $3.00.

Institution (Source): New York State Education Department, Division of Library Development.

The New York State Reference and Research Resources Program (3 R's) is a statewide program designed to serve the research community by ensuring speedy access to advanced research library materials for students and faculty in institutions of higher education, as well as for research workers in business and industry in the state. The program was inaugurated in 1966 by a legislative appropriation and is administered by the New York State Library, Division of Library Development, Bureau of Academic and Research Libraries. This general description of the program covers: (1) the historical background; (2) the 3 R's systems; (3) financial support; (4) statewide projects, including facsimile transmission (FACTS), the New York State Interlibrary Loan Program (NYSILL), the "New York State Union List of Serials," and electronic data processing; (5) current programs; and (6) future plans.
REVIEWS


There cannot be too many books on the subject of copyright infringement and fair use until—and in order that—the dilemma be solved. As Barker so aptly points out in his excellent book, "... publishers, although obviously in business to make a profit, are also extremely necessary toward the furtherance of education and research, and widespread practices of photocopying which deprive them of rightful monetary gain may develop a trend toward fewer and more costly publications." There is some evidence to indicate that, in periodical publishing, anyway, this trend is already underway. Although Barker's book is concerned with the photocopying practices within the United Kingdom, the practices there sound strikingly similar to those employed by many libraries in the United States.

Based on a questionnaire sent to the member libraries of Aslib (Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureaux), the book outlines the current practices involving single and multiple photocopying of copyrighted materials. The cross section of libraries responding includes 105 academic libraries; 89 public libraries; 17 government research establishments; 59 scientific, technical and learned societies, institutions and associations; and 139 industrial and commercial organizations. Thus, it represents a quite good statistical sample. The questionnaire, which is reproduced in the appendix, asks for yearly figures of (a) journal articles and (b) extracts from books copied in single and multiple copies including microfilm and microfiche copies. The figures from each library group are presented and analyzed separately and further comments on the part of the respondents are added as being worthy of note. Among the findings are the following:

1. Photocopying from periodicals is far more extensive than from books. (Perhaps an indication that publishers, more so than authors, are in danger of being financially damaged.)

2. Multiple subscriptions to periodicals appear to reduce the number of multiple copies produced, as well as photocopying generally; but the duplication of book stock appears to have no discernible effect on the photocopying of extracts.

3. Multiple copies averaging up to 550 per library are made of periodical articles. This would seem to be a flagrant violation of "fair use" as understood in both the U.S. and the U.K.

4. Librarians find the present law relating to photocopying a hindrance and, in many instances, are violating the regulations. The reasons are rarely economic but rather of immediate need.

5. The majority who make copies would gladly pay for them (to the extent that such copying exceeds that already permitted by law) provided they did not have to obtain permission in advance in every case and that the payment procedure was administratively simple. Regrettably, Barker's proposed solution for making payments is anything but administratively simple.

6. Photocopying is expected to increase as machines become more efficient and the demands of schol-
ars grow. Nor will demand be lessened by the development of computer information storage and retrieval centers.

To those interested in photocopying, fair use, and copyright, the findings will not be new. A restating of them, however, serves to remind us that "unless some kind of control (not prevention but, rather, regulated permission) is exercised, photocopying could become so extensive that it would no longer be economically possible to publish the things that copiers wish to copy." It would have been better if Barker referred specifically to multiple copying in this context.

The author believes a solution to the problem would need to encompass "...a system which allowed the making of single copies of a particular length without the need for prior permission or payment, coupled with a licensing system for making copies of longer extracts and multiple copies, with an upper limit (on length and numbers) beyond which copies might not be made without prior permission." He also believes it would help immeasurably to have the "general license" incorporated into the law. The parties concerned would have to agree on a fee per page/ per copy, and though still a matter for wide discussion, he feels this could be accomplished without much difficulty. In saying this, the author indicates he is an incurable optimist. He states further, the system of charging must be "simple and lend itself to automation (for records and accounting)."

Barker's own proposal toward a solution would be the setting up of a central authority authorized by individual copyright proprietors, on whose behalf it would: (a) issue licenses to those wishing to make photocopies and willing to undertake to keep records in an agreed form and make periodic payments, and it would be unlawful for anyone to make copies ... without such a specific license; (b) receive fees; (c) maintain a central fund of fees "... from which those whose works had been copied would be paid in proportion to the extent to which their works had been copied." This proposal is strikingly similar to a plan put forth in the United States as early as 1940, and subsequently from time to time by the Authors League of America and other interested parties.

Barker also suggests that publishers need to consider possibilities for making photocopying unnecessary. Journal publishers, for instance, might consider first issuing abstracts or summaries and then supplying separate prints of the full articles; or, they might publish more offprints of articles to meet an apparent demand. (Publishers might ask who would bear the economic loss if the demand never materialized.) They might also consider, in return for a higher subscription rate, allowing copying to a specified limit. (A surprising number of periodical publishers, in the United States, at least, now charge a higher subscription rate, and, in some cases, a much higher rate, to libraries than to individual subscribers.) Book publishers might consider the possibility of publishing certain tertiary level textbooks in parts, as well as in bound volumes, although, as he points out, this would naturally increase the publishing risk, and thus the price.

It is obvious that so complex a problem as photocopying of copyright materials cannot be resolved by a single solution. A central authority, such as Barker describes, might work for the photocopying handled by some agency (library, corporation, etc.), but when individuals can themselves operate a copying machine, as is the widespread practice in the United States, another system of control and fee collecting would need to be devised, assuming, of course, that it was deemed necessary. Barker, fortunately, does not pretend
that this aspect of the picture does not exist. His book, unfortunately, does not deal with it. It does, however, fulfill the author's hope that it might "provide a useful basis for discussion among users of copyright material and copyright proprietors." The inclusion of the U.K. copyright law and its interpretation represents a very valuable part of the book.—Matt Roberts, Binding Officer, Preservation Office, The Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.


One of the fascinating aspects of the application of data processing to library services is the infinite variety of circumstances, systems, problems, and results which emerges. Several variables combine to make this so, such as the characteristics of an individual library, the computer configuration and auxiliary equipment to be used, the administrative arrangements, the nature and availability of funds, and, most important, the moment in time when the particular application takes place, for all these variables are time-dependent, and usually in a nonlinear fashion.

Fascinating? It depends on your point of view. There certainly need be no lack of topics for discussion at conferences for a long time to come, but what advice does one give to the library manager in this field? Libraries have been running computer systems for nearly a decade now; what is their cumulative experience? Has this volume any answers to give?

If you read carefully, the answer to the last question is "yes." One thing does seem clear, and that is that now, in the summer of 1970, every librarian ought seriously to be planning where and how he should be using appropriate mechanised methods in his own library. A fair range of illustrative library situations is included in this volume, each showing a different approach to mechanisation. On the other hand, there is little variety in the computer equipment used, although one is able to compare experience with older and newer machines, and that not always to the disadvantage of the former.

A paper by T. C. Dobb (a librarian turned computer manager) could have made a most valuable contribution to the literature. Entitled "The Administration and Organization of Data Processing for the Library as Viewed from the Computing Centre," it recounts experience and gives examples of potential problems in one university. Unfortunately, the only real advice Dobb can give us is to concern ourselves with the right people rather than with the right (administrative) structures—because people do things and structures do not. This is true, but we are no further on than when we started.

But Dobb touches on a vital point when he compares the different approaches of librarians and systems men (or, to use the latest terminology, "data processors") to their work. There is a lesson for us all here, first to choose and define objectives, achieve them in an organized and logical manner, and then to monitor performance so as to optimize the operations.

Two other papers fail in their task of demonstrating the suitability of the IBM programming language PL/I for library work. True, they are full of praise, but are unable to come down even to the level of the librarian semi-skilled in programming, to show just how and why PL/I improves on the other languages successfully used in library work.

Stephen Salmon has a well-written and informative paper on the development of automated systems for the Library of Congress Card Division.
This, of course, concerns us all, and it is heartening to learn of the improvements in service that have resulted in this division. But remember, the Card Division is not a library, but a factory, and the two are very different—which is precisely why it is so (comparatively) simple to automate a factory, and so (comparatively) difficult to automate a library.

Another factor emerges clearly from this volume—the growing movement to introduce on-line library systems. In fact three of the eleven papers presented here deal with on-line systems. Two prime characteristics of such systems are their improved "response" and their increased cost, as compared with batch processing. In other words, better service at higher cost. Clearly there are library situations where such features must be appropriate, and others where they are not, so that it is disappointing not to find in any of these papers any objective and systematic evaluation of the suitability of these advanced systems in the libraries where they are being used.

Librarians must beware of the dangers of following blindly a rapidly advancing technology. While improvements in service are to be welcomed, is there not, however, for any given library at a given point in time, an optimum level of service, which is not necessarily the highest level of service? Sometimes in achieving this optimum, a librarian will find that no suitably advanced technology exists. But on other occasions, surely, the librarian will be forced to say "No. I do not need to use this latest piece of equipment. Something simpler would suit my needs better."

We need some librarians to say "No." They will give us all some needed guidance in a difficult and rapidly changing situation.—R. T. Kimber, School of Library and Information Studies, Queen's University, Belfast, Northern Ireland.
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This work, an outgrowth of a thesis for the M.Sc. degree at the University of Dublin, physically appears much more like a volume of poetry than "an attempt to bridge the gap between librarian and computer specialist." Although brevity is a quality often sadly lacking in library/computer literature, I would view the purchase price of this particular volume with considerably more equanimity had it indeed been filled with verse. Henley attempts to explain computers to the librarian, and to give the machine expert an understanding of library problems, and ends up by accomplishing neither objective.

Chapter 2, "An Introduction to the Computer," covers everything from binary digits to real-time multi-access computing (in eight pages!). The explanation here suffers by comparison with the corresponding passage in The Computer and the Library, by N. S. M. Cox, J. D. Dews, and J. L. Dolby (Newcastle upon Tyne, University of Newcastle upon Tyne Library, 1966), probably because the latter work seems truly concerned with inducing understanding while Henley's writing seems to be more occupied with displaying his own knowledge.

The next chapter, on "Library System Requirements," discusses possible applications including serials systems (with holding lists, recording of current receipts, claiming for nonreceipts, renewing subscriptions), cataloging control, and networks. To be sure, all of these are conceptually feasible, and, as Henley points out, there are now operating or prototype examples of each. However, the presentation is completely misleading with regard to the degree of difficulty in implementation, to say nothing of a factor virtually...
unmentioned throughout the book—cost. Perhaps Henley is taking the long-range view, but the uninformed and unwarned librarian may well read him and assume that push-button librarianship is here for the asking.

The author's true bias—or orientation toward the machine—appears as he proceeds with a teasingly inadequate discussion of file organization, bearing little relation to library or bibliographic problems, and showing none of the implications of various types of file organization for different library systems or subsystems which may be vitally affected by file structure. There follows a chapter on information retrieval, most of which deals with coordinate indexing (clearly explained), selective dissemination of information, and a superficial examination of the problems connected with hierarchical structuring of subject indexes and/or classification systems. A more than proportional share of space is allotted to a description of the author's experiments in devising a series of programs for input of and access to bibliographical information (journal articles with simple citations) in the context of an error-prone situation. The final chapter, which purports to be a philosophical overview of computer applications in the library/information field, is unrewarding, in terms both of raising significant issues and of the possible solutions outlined to the somewhat minor problems which are discussed.

It is difficult to imagine how the bibliography, accompanying a supposedly scholarly work in the discipline of information science, could have passed an editor's scrutiny. The complete citation for the Airlie Conference proceedings is: Markuson, B. (ed.). Proceedings of the 1963 conference of Libraries and Automation.


As a whole, this book might be satisfactory for the purpose of fulfilling a degree requirement: it carries a well-written review and summary of selected items from the library/computer literature, and some evidence of interesting personal hands-on experimentation. Nevertheless, the literature review is not comprehensive enough, nor are the experiments either conclusive or of enough significance to warrant presentation in this form.—Joseph A. Rosenthal, Chief, Preparation Services, The New York Public Library, New York, N.Y.


Addressed to the research worker having difficulty in finding reports and documents in his own collection, this book attempts to provide him with a basic knowledge of indexing theory and practice, an overview of all the types of indexing systems now in use, a guide to assist him in choosing the indexing system best suited to his needs, a discussion of basic aspects of index use and preparation, and a glimpse at information storage and retrieval systems of the future. If it is indeed possible to encompass these topics adequately in 135 pages, Jahoda has not demonstrated it.

The larger part of the book consists of chapters dealing with the various types of indexing systems now in use: conventional, i.e., alphabetic subject, classified, and alphabetic-classified; coordinate; keyword-from-title; citation (are there many personal citation indexes?); and “other,” e.g., faceted, author, and combinations. These sections suffer from the fact that the author, attempting simplicity, conciseness, and novelty in his presentation, has frequently achieved only confusion. It is simply not possible to explain the principles of facet classification to someone
without bibliographical sophistication in a matter of three pages. Author indexes merit less than a page. The whole subject of the physical arrangement of the documents themselves is given short shrift, and it is regrettable that Jahoda was unable to cite his own finding (American Documentation 20:377-80, Oct. 1969) that searching in a collection of documents filed under subject compared favorably in speed and efficiency with a special KWIC index. One would feel more sympathy with the author’s evident need to be brief if he had not compensated for his skeletal treatment of basic topics with dispensable proximities elsewhere.

To quote one example from the chapter on keyword-from-title indexes: “The three decks of cards are fed into the computer in designated order. If all is well the computer will then go to work. It examines the first word in the first title given to it and determines whether or not it is a delete word. This is not done by any feat of magic. . . .” A researcher seeking knowledge of the various indexing schemes now in use would derive more profit from the clearer explanations given in Sharp’s Some Fundamentals of Information Retrieval or Lancaster’s Information Retrieval Systems, the latter published, like Jahoda, in the publisher’s Information Science Series.

One would expect the real heart of the book to be Chapter 9, on “The Planning, Design, and Evaluation of Personal Indexes,” in which the researcher is guided in the choice of an indexing system optimal for his specific needs. Here again he must be disappointed. The author provides a decision flowchart by which choice is to be made, along with brief explanations and discussions of the questions asked, the whole occupying little over thirteen pages. Unfortunately many of the questions are of a type which the researcher is not likely to be able to answer, and many require prejudgment or arbitrary choice on his part. Nor are unequivocal decisions provided in all cases.

There are notable omissions throughout the book, omissions only partly to be excused by lack of space. In the chapter on “Controlled Index Vocabularies,” Jahoda quotes Gaster’s bibliography on thesaurus construction but makes no mention of the COSATI standards for thesaurus construction. There is no mention, in the section on evaluation, of Lancaster or the Cranfield analyses and their sequelae. There is very little said about the MAC-TIP Project at MIT, despite the number of reports available on the successful use of this system by individual researchers. There is no mention of the AIChe coordinate indexing system designed for the use of its personal members, and not a word about the computer-based FAMULUS system, devised by Yerke expressly for the use of individual researchers at the Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station at Berkeley.

One might have expected Jahoda, himself a teacher of librarianship, to suggest, somewhere in the book, that a visit to a research library and a talk with a trained librarian might be of some use to a researcher wanting to improve his information system or start a new one. The researcher could do worse.—George Piternick, School of Librarianship, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
ing roles, establishing goals, and presenting the guidelines” for attaining the objectives set forth in the seventy-five numbered paragraphs which make up the bulk of the text of this volume. The Standards view the state library as the capstone of the library program of each state and as the leader in “planning, initiating, directing, and inspiring.”

This leadership should be used to assure the coordination of all types of library services for the benefit of each and every citizen of the state. The state library is charged with the responsibility for securing funds to finance adequate library service. Comprehensive state plans, cooperation, larger units of service, interstate library compacts, consultant services, and networks are prominent topics. Networks are to be linked to other networks, extending outward to become national and international.

The Standards are intended to be practical, not unattainable goals. They encompass virtually every type of library service and library user—public, school, college, and state institutional libraries; special subjects or collections such as law, history, archives, and legislative research; and special users such as government officials and handicapped persons. The appendix contains statements on the responsibility of the states for collecting state and local history and on the relationship and responsibilities of the state library to state institutions.

While there can be little difference of opinion on the desirability of standards, one is apt to feel a little overwhelmed when reading them. So much talk about planning, coordinating, researching, networking, and cooperating should not lull us into the belief that these alone will provide satisfactory library service to everyone. We may forget that the basis of all good library service is the individual librarian working in one library, large or small, and usually helping just one person at a time.

Few will doubt the need for planning and leadership at the state level. There may be doubt, however, that most state libraries are now equipped or qualified to do most of the things set forth in these Standards, which state, “Leadership and top quality service will not be possible unless the very best librarians are attracted to state service.”

TheALA blurb accompanying this volume describes it as a “complete revision” and an “extensive revision,” and refers to the Standards as “new.” In her Preface, the Chairman of the Revision Committee writes: “That the revisions are so few is a tribute to the soundness of the original document,” which is a more accurate description—Ray O. Hummel, Jr., Assistant State Librarian, Virginia State Library, Richmond, Virginia.
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General Procedures Used in Compiling the Index

(1) Topic words and phrases have been selected as index terms, on the basis of what appears to be the current common usage in the literature itself. If the topic word is identical with, or very closely related to, the first word in the title of an article or of a book being reviewed, the title has not been separately listed.

(2) Cross references have been inserted sparingly; in most cases, multiple listings have been preferred to the use of syndetics. The few references which do appear are generally utilized because of the imprecision of a term in common parlance.

(3) Personal names of all authors of articles, book reviews, and books reviewed have been included, along with a few names used as subjects. There has been no attempt to distinguish, typographically, the name used as author from the name used as subject.

(4) An "r" in parentheses following a page reference signifies that a book by that person, of that title, or on that topic has been reviewed on those pages.

(5) Corporate names have been indexed under the common form of the name as it normally appears in print (not in inverted form). Acronyms and initialisms are recorded as such, and they are filed as words, whether they are so pronounced or not.

Paging of the Volume

Pages 1-160: Number 1 (Winter 1970)
Pages 161-320: Number 2 (Spring 1970)
Pages 321-480: Number 3 (Summer 1970)
Pages 481-640: Number 4 (Fall 1970)

Doralyn J. Hickey, Managing Editor

A

Acquisitions Section (RTSD), Annual report, 596-97.
Bylaws, 137.
Nominees, 134-35.
Administration of libraries, 147-48(r), 296-300, 458-62, 472-73(r), 474-75(r), 562-73.
ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards, 497-501.
American Association of State Libraries, 621-22(r).
American National Standards Institute, 619.
American Society of Indexers, 300.

Volume 14, Number 4, Fall 1970

Anderson, James F., 31-55.
Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 68-83, 174, 297, 306-08(r), 612.
Approval plans, 168-69, 395-99, 400-06.
Arizona State University, 434-38.
Arkansas State University, 31-55.
Atherton, Pauline, 582-84.
Atwood, Virginia Woll, 68-83.
Audiovisual media. See Nonbook materials.
Auld, Larry, 458-62.
Austin, Charles J., 109(r).
Automation, 146-47(r), 147-48(r), 149-51(r), 182-84, 247, 251-52, 311-12(r), 314-15(r), 618-19(r).
Awards, 582-84, 585-87.

623
Barker, Ronald E., 616(r).
Benedict, Joel A., 434-38.
Bennett, Josiah Q., 497(r).
Benson, Nettie Lee, 148-49.
Bishop, Gwyneth H., 468(r).
Blanket orders, 5-68, 68-69, 258-68, 305-88, 400-06.
Book catalogs, 181-82, 341-54, 502-16.
Book Catalogs Committee (RTSD), 341-43.
Book Exchange (U.S.), 607-09.
Boone, Samuel M., 600-01.
Breggis, Ritvards, 342-43.
“Brief History of USBE,” 607-09.
Brinkley, Cosby, 468(r).
Broadus, Robert N., 574-78.
Burkhalter, Barton R., 445-54.
Bylaws changes, 156-37.
Campbell, H. C., 308(r).
Card sorting, 445-54.
Carroll, Dewey E., 618(r).
Cataloging and Classification Section (RTSD).
Annual report, 598-600.
Bylaws, 137.
Mann Citation, 582-84.
Nominees, 135.
Cataloging-in-publication, 175-76.
The Cataloguing Requirements of the Book Division of a Rare Books Library, 467-68(r).
Cayless, C. F., 146(r).

Centralized processing, 169-70, 180, 269-78, 312-14(r), 355-89.
Centralized Processing Committee (RTSD), 355-56.
Chaplin, A. H., 292-96.
Charno, Steven M., 148(r).
Chemical materials, 298-99.
Children's materials, 249.
Classification, 84-91, 579-81.
Dewey, 176, 259, 517-29, 530-45, 574-78, 604-05, 611.
Classified catalogs, 546-52.
Colloque sur les Implications Administratives de l'Automatisation dans les Grandes Bibliothèques, 147-48(r).
Colorado academic libraries, 170, 312-14(r).
Commerical processing, 138, 170-71, 180.
Computer-assisted procedures, 31-55, 247, 251-52, 311-12(r), 468-69(r), 502-16, 530-45, 618-19(r), 619-20(r).
Conceptual Design of an Automated National Library System, 149-51(r).
Conventional entries, 428-33.
Cooperation Between Types of Libraries, 473-74(r).
Cooperative processing, See Centralized processing; Shared cataloging.
Copyright, 171, 203-06.
Corbet, Charles B., 429-30.
Corbin, John B., 585-87.
Cost studies, 95-67, 279-89, 472-73(r), 474-75(r).
Cunningham, Jay L., 311(r).
Custer, Benjamin A., 527-29.
"Cut to Fit," 31-55.

Danish public libraries, 474-75(r).
Data processing, 31-55, 618-19(r).
Decimal classification, 176, 178, 250, 471-72(r), 517-29, 530-45, 574-78, 604-05, 611.
"Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee Report," 604-05.
DeHart, Florence E., 56-57.
"Delight and Pitfalls of Subject Cataloging," 98-108.
Demos, John T., 395-99.

Library Resources & Technical Services
Entries, 428–43.
ERIC/CLIS abstracts, 139-45, 301-05, 463-66, 614-15.
Esther J. Piercy Award, 585-87.
Exchanges, 92-97, 607-09.
"Executive Secretary's Report," 603-04.

F
Fasana, Paul J., 147(r).
"Foreign Blanket Orders," 258-68.
Form headings, 428-33.
Forsyth, V. J., 468(r).
Fristoe, Ashby J., 165-73.

G
Gimbil, Henning, 474(t).

H
Hansard, James W., 31-55.
Harris, Jessica L., 502-16.
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Hebrew materials, 309-11.
Heinritz, Fred J., 472-73.
Hendricks, Donald D., 355-56.
Henley, J. P., 619(r).
Hines, Theodore C., 502-16.
Hinton, Frances, 604-05.
Hitchcock, Jennette E., 474-75.
Hoag, LaVerne, 445-54.
Hovnc, Clara, 546-52.

Information Dynamics Corporation, 439-44.
Information systems, 109-21, 298-99, 308-09(r), 470-71(r), 619-20(r), 620-21(r).
International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts, 131-32, 184-85, 292-96.
International Relations Subcommittee (RTSD), 122-32.
"Internationalizing RTSD," 122-32.
An Introduction to UDC, 471-72(r).

J
Jackson, Sidney L., 579-81.
Jackson, W. Carl, 591-96.
Jahoda, Gerald, 620(r).
Jewish National and University Library, 546-52.

Johnson, Donald W., 434-38.

K
Keyword retrieval systems, 530-45.
Kimber, R. T., 618-19.
King, Donald R., 468-69.
Koch, Esther D., 598-600.

L
LaHood, Charles G., Jr., 469-70.
Lancaster, F. W., 109(r).
Lane, Alfred H., 92-97, 138.
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Law materials, 428-33.
LEEP (Library Education Experimental Project), 530-45.
Leonard, Lawrence E., 312(r).
Library and Information Science Abstracts, 613.
Library of Congress:
Card Division, 174-76.
Cataloging policies, 609-10.
Classification, 84-91, 151-52(r), 177, 249, 421-27, 530-45.
Processing Dept., 236-57, 517-29, 611.
RECON, 184, 256.
Subject headings, 249.
Library Resources & Technical Services, 462, 611.
“Library Services to University Branch Campuses: The Ohio State Experience,” 562-73.
“Library Surveys and Development Plans,” 299-300.
Linford, John, 562-73.
“The Long-Term Effects of Approval Plans,” 400-06.
Lucy, Mary Lou, 468.

M
Maier, Joan M., 312(r).
Manuscripts, 325-40.
MARC, 182-83, 250, 256, 530-45.
Margaret Mann Citation, 582-84.
Mason, Alexandra, 467-68.
Mason, Donald, 469(r).
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 472-73(r).
Mattison, Les, 559-61.
McKinlay, John, 517-27.
McMaster University, 439-44.
Mechanization. See Automation; Computer-assisted procedures; Data processing.
Meise, Norman R., 149(r).
Microfilm rate indexes, 399-94.
Microforms, 189-203, 266-13, 390-94, 439-44.
Micrographic Catalogue Retrieval System (MCR), 439-44.

N
National Library of Medicine, 109-21.
National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, 171-72, 175, 241-43.
National Serials Data Program, 183, 231, 257.
National Union Catalog, 172, 254-55, 439-44.
Networks, 109-21, 149-51(r), 298-99, 473-74(r).
Newberry Library, 325-40.
Newspapers, 148-49(r).
Nitecki, Joseph Z., 485-96.
Nominees, 134-35.

O
“Ode to a Library Course,” 297.
Ohio State University, 395-99, 562-73.
Ordering. See Acquisitions procedures.

P
Painter, Ann F., 470-71.
Passman, Sidney, 470(r).
Perreault, Jean M., 151(r), 471(r).
Phonorecords, 421-27.
Photocopying, 279-89, 433-38, 439-44, 468(r), 616-18(r).
Photocopying Costs in Libraries Committee (RLMS), 279-89.
Piercy Award, 585-87.
Piternick, George, 620-21.
Potts, Hilary, 146(r).
Price indexes, 169, 235, 399-94.

Library Resources & Technical Services


Public libraries, 474-75(1).

R

Raffel, Jeffrey A., 472(r).

Raney, Carol, 603-04.

Ranganathan, S. R., 582-84.

Rare books, 467-68(r).

Rast, Elaine K., 562-73.

Rate indexes, 390-94.

Reader-printers, 439-44.

Ready, William, 439-44.

"Recataloging a College Score and Phonorecord Collection," 421-27.

Reclassification, 151-52(r).

RECON, 184, 256.

Recordings, 421-27.

The Reference Shelf, 553-58.

"Refining by the Second," 497-501.

Regional Groups reports, 290-91, 588-90, 604.


Religious materials, 574-78.

Reprinting, 138.

Reproduction of library materials, 189-230, 279-89, 468(r), 469-70(r), 616-18(r).

Reproduction of Library Materials Section (RTSD).

Annual report, 600-01.

Bylaws, 137.

Nominees, 135.

Resnikoff, H. L., 468(r).

Resources and Technical Services Division (ALA), 122-32.

Annual reports, 591-604.

Bylaws, 136.

Nominees, 134.

Piercy Award, 585-87.

Regional groups, 290-91, 588-90, 604.

(See also names of committees and sections.)


Roberts, Matt, 616-18.
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S

Salmon, Stephen R., 314(r).

Sanner, Marian, 290-91, 588-90, 604.

Schaeffer, Rudolf F., 98-108.

Schieber, William D., 311(r).

Schmidt, C. James, 562-73.

"Schrettinger on Class and the Subject Heading," 579-81.

Scientific and Technical Communication, 470-71(r).


Selection of materials, 5-18, 168-69, 395-99, 400-06.

Seminar on the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 306-08(r).


Serials Section (RTSD).

Annual report, 601-03.

Bylaws, 137.

Nominees, 135.

Shared cataloging, 171-72, 175, 241-43.

Sharp, N. F., 306(r).

Shishko, Robert, 472(r).

Shoffner, Ralph M., 311(r).

Shores, James R., 297.

Smith, Katherine R., 5-18.

Southern Oregon College, 497-501.

Spalding, C. Sumner, 306-08.


Stansfield, Cynthia M., 471-72.

State libraries, 269-78, 621-22(r).

State University of New York at Binghamton, 407-20.

Stevens, Norman D., 109-21, 146-47.


Subject cataloging, 98-108, 177-80, 579-81.

Subject headings, 249, 579-81.


Syracuse University School of Library Science, 530-45.

Systematic Analysis of University Libraries, 472-73(r).

T

Talmadge, Robert L., 312-14.

Taylor, Gerry M., 31-35.
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Technical Services Cost Committee (RTSD), 56.
Tesovnik, Mary E., 56–67.
Thomassen, Cora E., 478r.
Towards a Theory for UDC, 471–72(f).

U

Union lists, 148–49(r), 232.
Universal Decimal Classification, 178, 471–72(r).
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 485–96.
"The Use of Conventional Headings in the Cataloguing of Primary Legal Materials," 428–33.

V

Van De Voorde, Philip, 455–57.
Vann, Sarah K., 122–32.

W

Weber, David C., 149–51.
Wedgeworth, Robert, 258–68, 469, 611.
Welsh, William J., 236–57.
White, John B., 553–58.
Wienpahl, Robert W., 421–27.
Wilden-Hart, Marion, 400–06.
Willard, D. Dean, 428–33.
Work Simplification in Danish Public Libraries, 474–75(r).

Y

"Year's Work" papers, 165–235.

Z

LOCATE OVER 187,000 PUBLISHING SCIENTISTS

in a matter of seconds... you can... with ISI's new

International Directory of
Research & Development Scientists®

We've made it easier for you to keep in touch with scientific colleagues all over the world. Using the IDR&DS®, you can quickly locate the most recent affiliations and addresses of colleagues and others who are active in research. The IDR&DS is compiled from the Author Indexes and Address Directories of ISI's CURRENT CONTENTS® editions. The IDR&DS also contains a Geographic Index by country/city. For the U.S., states are given. Bonus feature is an Organization Index. You'll find the IDR&DS invaluable—for corresponding with fellow scientists, for writing for reprints of articles, and for arranging meetings and conferences. Whenever available, Zip Codes have been included.

$60.00

Please enter my order for the International Directory of Research & Development Scientists®:

☐ check enclosed     ☐ bill organization     ☐ bill me

Name ___________________________ Dept. ___________________________
Organization _______________________________________________________
Address ___________________________________________________________
City ___________________________ State _____________________________
Zip ___________________________ Country ___________________________

ISI® Institute for Scientific Information

325 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106, Tel.: (215) 923-3300 Cable: SCINFO, TELEX 84 5305
Now Published by the American Library Association

A Biographical Directory of Librarians in the United States and Canada

formerly Who's Who in Library Service

Lee Ash EDITOR

* New Fifth Edition now ready
* 20,000 biographies of librarians, archivists, and information scientists
* Includes librarians employed by U. S. governmental agencies and stationed abroad

In addition to basic biographical data, each entry gives information on languages read or spoken, professional activities, memberships and offices in professional and other pertinent organizations.

A Biographical Directory of Librarians in the United States and Canada is a unique fund of facts available from no other single source.

$45.00


ALA

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
50 E. Huron St., Chicago 60611
ANIMALS NEAR AND FAR
by Helen Hoover, illustrated by Symeon Shimin

Famous for her nature writings, Mrs. Hoover here takes the young reader on "vacation" studying wildlife along the way—from the home of Hawaii and polar bear of Alaska to the Baltimore oriole and Great Plains prairie dog. Ages 4-8; Grades K-3. $4.50 $4.12 L/L Oct. 15

OLD WITCH AND THE POLKA DOT RIBBON
by Wende Devlin, illustrated by Harry Devlin

An hilarious sequel to the popular Old Black Witch! which was made into a film titled Winter Of The Witch starring Hermione Gingold. This one tells how the witch outwits Mrs. Butterbean and wins the cake-baking contest. Ages 4-8; Grades K-3. $3.95 $3.47 L/L Oct. 15

SANTA MAKES A CHANGE
by Sol Channel, illustrated by Jerome Snyder

Santa's old red suit is getting baggy, and many suggestions for a change are offered by his helpers and his reindeer. But nothing seems as good as the old suit, which Santa says has "a lot of wear left in it, and anyhow, how would the boys and girls know me without it?" Ages 4-8; Grades K-3. $3.95 $3.47 L/L Oct. 15

MEXICALI SOUP by Kathryn Hittle and William D. Hayes, illustrated by Anne Rockwell

Mama's Mexicali soup was really something special. But eager to conform to the ways of the big city, Maria bids her travel out the poletees, while for Antonio she omits the peppers, and for Juan the onions, and so on until...! This is a reversal of the classic "Stone Soup" story, set in a colorful Mexican-American background. Ages 4-8; Grades K-3. $3.95 $3.47 L/L Sept. 15

THE ROUND SULTAN AND THE STRAIGHT ANSWER
by Barbara K. Walker, illustrated by Friso Henstra

This Sultan loved to eat, and all the doctor's pills, diets and exercises did no good. But a wise old hamal provided the "straight" answer to the problem. Ages 4-8; Grades K-3. $3.95 $3.47 L/L Oct. 15

THE STEPPING-STONE BOOKS to Science and Social Studies, Grades 1-4

This new series of non-fiction, curriculum oriented books is designed to meet the growing need in primary grades for lively, easy-to-read, informational books. Separate "Guidelines For Teachers" provided.

THE SHIP THAT TIME FORGOT by Jules Verne

A suspenseful tale of a voyage to the past. Ages 7-10; Grades 5-7. $4.25 L/L Oct. 15

THE ESKIMOS: People Of Alaska by Linda W. Seiler, illustrated by David L. Ralston

Each book $3.47 L/L (single edition only)

Two New BACKGROUND BOOKS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

EXPLORING OCEAN FRONTIERS, On Who Owns The Seas by Frances and Walter Scott. This book seeks to answer questions that have arisen with the current exploration of the ocean's depths. Also included are chapters on submarines, habitats, fisheries, minerals and the Law of the Sea. Ages 12-up; Grades 7-up. $4.95 $4.29 L/L Oct. 15

SOCIETY AND THE ASSASSIN, On Political Murder by Bernardt J. Hurwood. This book traces the history of assassination and discusses the impact of the assassin on history, society as the assassin, not as heroes and villains, and America's "violent past and uncertain future." Ages 12-up; Grades 7-up. $4.95 $4.26 L/L Nov. 2

The symbol L/L denotes Parents' Magazine Press Longlife Library Bindings.
Attention:
Libraries with large collections in given subject areas

Bro-Dart's
Books-Coming-Into-Print
Program is designed for you

Books-Coming-Into-Print, a program of Bro-Dart’s Stacey Division, the nation's leading academic bookseller, simplifies book selection and acquisition for libraries acquiring extensively from given subject areas. And, it vastly reduces the costly, time-consuming task of evaluating thousands of notices and reviews. You receive unique Advance Notice Cards on all books of potential interest and, when published, books are sent on approval.

Books-Coming-Into-Print has been developed to speed and simplify book acquisition in specific disciplines for your library. By using our comprehensive Subject Thesaurus, you profile your library's requirement; you choose the areas in which you collect in depth, you select the type of book and level of publication which you normally require, you specify the other criteria you use in book selection.

Using this information, we evaluate all new book announcements and notify only those that match your profile; regardless of how broad or narrow your areas of special interest or desired academic level. You'll thus receive an Advance Notice Card prior to publication for each title which falls within your profile.

You'll be dealing with one source for new books from more than 4,000 publishers. This program applies to all books in the humanities or the sciences, continuations, and monographs by commercial and non-commercial publishers.

For additional information on this time and money-saving service, write Dept. LRTS-94.

EASTERN DIVISION: 1609 Memorial Ave., Williamsport, Pa. 17701
WESTERN DIVISION: 15255 East Don Julian Road, City of Industry, Calif. 91746
In its effort to computerize certain of its bibliographical records, the Harvard University Library is converting to machine-readable form the shelf-list and classification schedules of Widener Library, Harvard’s central research collection. As each class is completed, a three-part catalogue of the holdings of the class is published in the *Widener Library Shelflist* series. The first part contains the classification schedule and a list of the entries in call-number (i.e. classification) sequence. The second part lists the entries in both author and title sequence. The third part lists them again chronologically by date of publication. Thus, each entry appears four times. Each catalogue is a valuable tool for scholars and librarians since it makes an important contribution to the bibliography of its subject. Volumes 1 through 20 average 70 entries per page. Beginning with volume 21, all page copy is photocomposed in double columns, with approximately 140 entries per page. 8½ x 11; durable paper; cloth bound.

**Volumes in print:**

5-6. LATIN AMERICA. 1966. 1,492 pp., 27,292 titles. 2 vols., $65.00

7. BIBLIOGRAPHY. 1966. 1,066 pp., 19,643 titles. $40.00

9-13. AMERICAN HISTORY. 1967. 4,087 pp., 83,867 titles. 5 vols., $175.00

14. CHINA, JAPAN AND KOREA. 1968. 494 pp., 11,388 titles. $25.00

15. PERIODICAL CLASSES. 1968. 758 pp., 25,685 titles. $25.00

16-17. EDUCATION. 1968. 1,610 pp., 32,722 titles. 2 vols., $60.00

18. LITERATURE: General and Comparative. 1968. 189 pp., 5,065 titles. $10.00


20. CANADIAN HISTORY AND LITERATURE. 1968. 411 pp., 10,212 titles. $17.50

21. LATIN AMERICAN LITERATURE. 1969. 498 pp., 16,900 titles. $40.00

22. GOVERNMENT. 1969. 263 pp., 7,190 titles. $20.00

**Volumes in preparation:**

23-24 ECONOMICS. 1970. 1,800 pp., 65,000 titles. 2 vols., $95.00

25. CELTIC LITERATURES. 1970. 192 pp., 7,500 titles. $25.00

26-27. AMERICAN LITERATURE. 1970. 1,600 pp., 50,000 titles. 2 vols., $95.00

28-31 SLAVIC HISTORY AND LITERATURES. 1970. 2,700 pp., 93,000 titles. 4 vols., $190.00

32. GENERAL HISTORY. 1970. 35,000 titles. $50.00

33. REFERENCE COLLECTIONS. 1970. 160 pp., 5,000 titles. $10.00

34. AFRICAN HISTORY AND LITERATURES. 1970. 500 pp., 16,000 titles. $35.00

Information subject to change.

*Distributed for the Harvard University Library. Volumes may be ordered separately, or standing orders may be placed for the entire series. All orders and requests for information should be sent to*

**HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS**

79 Garden Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
From Baker & Taylor—
A reliable monthly information source for new scholarly books

Each month Baker & Taylor’s new publication, CURRENT BOOKS FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIES, keeps university, college and special libraries abreast of virtually all new books of interest to them. And, it provides an opportunity to select new titles for fast delivery—without the necessity for wading through masses of pre-publication material or awaiting reviews of scholarly books which often appear long after publication.

If your university, college or special library is not now using CURRENT BOOKS FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIES, please write to your nearest Baker & Taylor division. We’ll be pleased to send you a sample copy. One subscription is available to individual university, college and special libraries without charge.

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO.
OLDEST & LARGEST BOOK WHOLESALER IN THE UNITED STATES

Eastern Division: Somerville, N.J. 08876, 50 Kirby Ave.
Midwest & Southern Division: Momence, Ill. 60954
Western Division: Reno, Nev. 89502, 380 Edison Way
Interstate Library Service Co.: (A Subsidiary):
Oklahoma City, Okla. 73118, 4600 N. Cooper

Baker & Taylor New Books Inspection Centers:
Los Angeles, Calif. 90036, 5820 Wilshire Blvd.
Houston, Tex. 77019, 1701 W. Gray St.
Boston Vicinity: 372 Main St., Watertown, Mass. 02172
Now the corporate librarian has a non-secret weapon.

Science Citation Index®

Scientific and technical personnel often fail to delegate the responsibility for literature searches to the library, where it belongs. They think information searches are too complex for "laymen" to handle.

If this is the attitude in your company, Science Citation Index® is the best non-secret weapon to prove what a professional librarian can really do. SCI® is the only index to science and technology that permits a librarian to find, in just a few minutes, the relevant articles needed to answer critically important questions like these. Not just for R&D but Marketing, Personnel and many other departments.

1. Has industry applied this concept before?
2. Is the proposal technically feasible?
3. Has there been a clinical evaluation?
4. Was this patent cited in the recent literature?
5. What companies are working in the field?
6. What is the state-of-the-art?
7. What are the potential new markets?
8. What has this man published on the subject?
9. Has this applicant's research had significant impact?
10. How strong is R&D in the acquisition being considered?
11. Is this research necessary, or has someone already done it?

12. Are there new uses for this product?
13. Are the data obsolete?
14. Is there a more economical synthesis for this compound?
15. Does this compound have significant biological activity?
16. Does the development program have a marketing payoff?
17. Is there a better method?
18. Who are the top men in the field?
19. What are the relative merits of the two approaches?
20. Does the methodology promise a route to solution?

SCI's subject coverage matches its utility. SCI indexes completely over two thousand scientific journals. Every article, review, letter, correction. Four million individual entries are contained in the latest annual issue. All of them derived from the literature of the past 12 months. And you get all this quarterly, cumulated annually. Weekly updating service also available through ISI's unique ASCA® system. Think how much time you can save your R&D staff. What better way to emphasize the real dollar and cents value of your library is there?

Want even more convincing reasons to use on your library committee? Just return the coupon.

Please send me full information on Science Citation Index®

NAME/TITLE ________________________________
LIBRARY ________________________________
COMPANY/DIVISION ________________________________
ADDRESS ________________________________
CITY ________________________________ STATE __________ ZIP __________
COUNTRY ________________________________ TELEPHONE ________________________________
Purchasing Library Materials in Public and School Libraries

Evelyn Hensel and Peter D. Veillette

Purchasing procedures and the relationships of libraries to purchasing agencies and dealers. Guidelines for evaluating book dealers, bidding contracts and invoices. Case studies compare and contrast the purchasing methods of six library systems. Tabulation of questionnaires, examples of form letters, book bid invitations, and contracts are appended. Very useful to libraries of all types. paper $3.00

The Procurement of Library Furnishings

Specifications, Bid Documents and Evaluation

Frazer G. Poole and Alphonse F. Trezza, Editors

Architects, library representatives, designers and library equipment manufacturers treat the problems of library furnishings procurement. Topics covered include contracts and purchase orders, preparation of bid documents and specifications. Highly informative; sponsored by ALA's Library Administration Division. Helpful to libraries of all types and sizes. paper $3.75

Library Automation

A State of the Art Review

Stephen R. Salmon, Editor

A non-technical report on the proceedings of the first Institute on Library Automation sponsored by the Information Science and Automation Division of ALA. Details progress in information networks, building planning, systems analysis and design, cataloging and other areas. paper $7.50

International Subscription Agents

An Annotated Directory, 2d ed.

Comprehensive directory of more than 200 dealers who handle orders for foreign periodicals. Includes agents' addresses, names of countries, materials and services available, business data. Prepared by a joint committee of the ALA. paper $3.50

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611
MCRS means Micrographic Catalog Retrieval System. And Micrographic Catalog Retrieval System means that you can get books in the hands of your patrons faster, easier and more economically.

MCRS is a rapid-access information retrieval system which:

☐ Reduces LC search time to under two minutes and cuts main entry search time in half.

☐ Keeps you 'Depository Library current' without requiring any filing of Depository Cards or Proof Slips.

☐ Eliminates filing errors by eliminating filing.

☐ Is so easy to operate that any staff member can begin to do effective searching after only a few minutes of instruction.

☐ Offers the capability of speedy economical in-house card production.

If you would like to know more about how the MCR System can speed technical processing in your library and save operating costs at the same time, use the convenient coupon below.

INFORMATION DYNAMICS CORP., WHERE THINGS HAPPEN...AND THEY HAPPEN TO SERVE THE LIBRARY COMMUNITY.

[Form to fill out for more information]
An important new bi-weekly information service bringing you:

- Up-to-date information and informed opinion
- Peripheral vision of developments in other fields
- Insight into the meaning of new technologies, such as computer-microfilm interfaces, laser recording, video systems, and UMF (ultramicrofiche)
- An "early warning system" to alert you to new trends and applications
- Confidence that your micrographics knowledge is current

NEWS COVERAGE INCLUDES:
- New trends and developments
- Products and services
- Systems and applications
- Emerging technologies
- New companies
- People and associations
- New publications
- Conventions and trade shows

EDITORIAL FEATURES INCLUDE:
- Responsible, independent, staff-written editorials
- Authoritative guest editorials
- In-depth articles on new trends and developments
- Company profiles

A Guide to a Selection of Computer-Based Science and Technology Reference Services in the U.S.A.

compiled by
Science and Technology Reference Services Committee
Reference Services Division, American Library Association

Compilation of 18 professional societies, government agencies, and private organizations with reference services available in machine-readable form. Each description includes the characteristics of the data base, the equipment configuration, and the use of the file. Most of the services are also available in a printed version. 32 pages, $1.50 prepaid, $2.50 if billed.

Order from: Reference Services Division, ALA
50 E. Huron St.,
Chicago, Illinois 60611

LOOKING FOR ANOTHER COLLEGE LIBRARY JOBBER?

FOR COMPLETE INFORMATION ON OUR SERVICES:
WRITE OR CALL
COLLECT: 314-739-3100
ATTN: MR. LESSER

Midwest Library Service
11400 Dorsett Road
Maryland Heights, Missouri 63042
Just Published!

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ASSOCIATIONS

THOUSANDS OF REVISIONS!
HUNDREDS OF BRAND-NEW ENTRIES!

For fourteen years the Encyclopedia of Associations has been the busy librarian’s key to primary sources of up-to-date information on every conceivable subject. The new Sixth Edition of this indispensable reference work has been enlarged and completely revised, with changes, corrections, and/or additions in over 90% of the entries, plus over 1100 brand-new entries.

Through their publications, projects, research reports, personal replies to questions, and other services, associations are a unique source of essential, timely information. The Sixth Edition of the Encyclopedia tells you precisely whom to contact for reliable facts on such pertinent subjects as ecology... data processing... women’s rights... atomic research... birth control... civil rights... industrial waste... under-developed nations... lasers... urban problems... geriatrics... cultural exchanges... space exploration.

VOLUME I: NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

This basic source-of-sources covers nearly 14,000 national, nonprofit membership organizations. Included in the broad coverage are selected non-membership groups; foreign groups of interest in America; U.S. local and regional groups of national interest; and citizen action groups and governmental advisory bodies concerned with specific problems.

Typical entries cover seventeen vital items, including the organization’s name, address, and telephone number (if supplied by organization); its purpose and objectives; name and title of chief executive; number of members; publications; and convention schedules.

Organizations are grouped into nineteen categories according to their principal interests (Business, Hobbies, Social Welfare, etc.). The listing for any organization can be found instantly through the 30,000-item keyword/alphabetical index, in which organizations are listed both by complete proper name and under the keyword or keywords which best identify their fields of activity.

VOLUME II: GEOGRAPHIC AND EXECUTIVE INDEX

This two-part index provides two additional approaches to organizations and their executives: The GEOGRAPHIC section lists in state and city order the associations which are arranged in Volume I according to subject interest. The geographic index includes executive names. The EXECUTIVE section lists by surname executives mentioned in Volume I, and gives their titles and the names of their organizations. Both indexes include phone numbers (if supplied by organization); the geographic index includes addresses with zips.

VOLUME III: NEW ASSOCIATIONS AND PROJECTS

New associations are of particular interest to researchers because such new groups tend to be concerned with new ideas and new problems on which they are often the only sources of current information. NAP, a quarterly supplement to Volume I, reports promptly on hundreds of such organizations during the period between editions of the basic volume. NAP listings contain all the same details included in entries in Volume I, plus a cumulative index in each issue.

ORDER ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ASSOCIATIONS TODAY AND EXAMINE FREE FOR 30 DAYS

VOLUME I: National Organizations of the U.S. $32.50
VOLUME II: Geographic and Executive Index $20.00
VOLUME III: New Associations and Projects $25.00/year
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HERE'S NEWS ABOUT THE FIVE LATEST ADDITIONS:

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ASSOCIATIONS. Sixth Edition. For fourteen years EA has been the busy librarian's key to primary sources of up-to-date information on every conceivable subject. Enlarged and completely revised, EA-5 contains changes, corrections, and/or additions in over 90% of the entries, plus over 1,100 brand-new entries. Volume I: National Organizations of the U.S. covers nearly 14,000 national, nonprofit membership groups. These organizations are divided into nineteen categories according to their principal interests; typical entries cover seventeen vital items, including organization's name, address, phone number, purpose, and objectives, and publications. Listings can be found instantly through the 30,000-item keyword/alphabetical index. Volume II: Geographic and Executive Index is a two-part index providing approaches to organizations in Volume I according to headquarters city and state and names of their executives. Volume III: New Associations and Projects, a quarterly supplement to Volume I, reports promptly on hundreds of new, vital groups concerned with new ideas and new problems. Volume I (Ready Now) 1468 pages. $32.50. Volume II (Ready Now) 532 pages. $20.00. Volume III, $25.00/year.

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF BUSINESS INFORMATION SOURCES. Compiled by Paul Wasserman, Betsy Ann Olive, Eleanor Allen, Charlotte Georgi, and James Woy. Enlarged, revised, and retitled, this is the 1970 edition of Executive's Guide to Information Sources, which was included in Library Journal's "Best Business Books of the Year" when it was first published. The first of the two large volumes is organized according to subjects ranging from accident insurance to zinc industry. Under each subject heading are full references (with publishers' or other addresses) to sourcebooks, periodicals, organizations, directories, handbooks, bibliographies, and other sources of published and unpublished information important to executives and researchers alike. The second volume provides the same kinds of information on geographic subjects such as cities, states, regions, nations, etc., on which the arrangement of the volume is based. (In press; ready November) Two volumes. New, handier 8 1/2" by 11" page size. 738 pages. $47.50.

ACRONYMS AND INITIALISMS DICTIONARY. Third Edition. Nearly double the size of the Second Edition, the revised and expanded AID-3 will be a frequently consulted guide to the fast-growing international language expressed in alphabetic contractions. Many of the approximately 84,000 terms in AID-3 are new acronyms for space activities and equipment, pollution control groups and methods, drugs, technical processes and materials, agencies, movements, breakthroughs, and popular expressions. To keep pace with this rapidly growing vocabulary Gale will publish annual supplements to AID-3 (1971, 1972 issues, $15.00 each). (In press; ready November) New 8 1/2" by 11" page size makes four times more terms scannable on each page. 550 pages. $22.50.

PARADISE LOST: A CONCORDANCE. Compiled by Gladys W. Hudson. Filling a great need, this complete, accurate, and usable work is the only modern concordance for Milton's Paradise Lost. So that the concordance might be useful as both a literary and a linguistic tool, the text selected as a base was the second edition of Paradise Lost, published in 1674, which included Milton's own corrections and retained his language, but which also established the divisions into books and lines followed by all modern editions. The listing of each element in hyphenated words, the retention of Milton's spelling, and other important editorial decisions are fully explained in the Preface. At the end of the work is a "frequency listing" of all words in Paradise Lost, including those omitted from the concordance, in the order of the frequency of their appearance. (In press; ready October) 374 pages. $25.00.

STATISTICS SOURCES: A SUBJECT GUIDE TO INDUSTRIAL, BUSINESS, SOCIAL, EDUCATIONAL, FINANCIAL, AND OTHER TOPICS FOR THE UNITED STATES AND SELECTED FOREIGN COUNTRIES. Third Edition. Edited by Paul Wasserman, Eleanor Allen, Charlotte Georgi, and Janice McLean. Ever since the first edition of Statistics Sources was chosen for Library Journal's list of "Best Reference Books," librarians have recognized the basic usefulness of this unique dictionary-style guide to thousands of sources of statistics concerning a wide range of man's activities, products, governments, and environmental features. The Third Edition broadens the scope and depth of coverage to a remarkable degree; the new edition is 50% larger than the second, with entries on about 11,000 subjects compared with 8,000 in the previous edition. (In preparation; ready December) About 625 pages. $27.50.

ORDER AND USE ANY TITLE FREE FOR THIRTY DAYS
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